JEWELS FROM THE WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Horace k. Mann

THE
LIVES OF THE POPES
IN
THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

VOLUME I

THE POPES
UNDER THE LOMBARD RULE
A.D. 590-795

PREFACE.

Since the appearance of Bower's *History of the Popes*, no complete attempt has, I believe, been made to publish in an English dress, and in a form which could in any way be called either full or scientific, the Lives of the Popes of the early Middle Ages. That Bower may be well replaced will doubtless be readily conceded when it is remembered how notoriously prejudiced against the popes he was—so prejudiced that his greatest opponent was John Douglas, the Protestant Bishop of Salisbury—and that his history is now one hundred and fifty years old. And there is scarcely need to call attention to what has been done to advance our knowledge of the History of the Middle Ages during that interval. Not only have the sources of that history been published in a more accurate manner, but fresh historical documents have been brought to light in very considerable number. This is especially true of the history of the Papacy.

It has been said that no complete attempt has been made to replace Bower. Brief Manuals of the *Lives of the Popes* have been published, and there is an English translation of the short lives of Artaud de Montor. Political sketches of the Papacy have been written, like Greenwood's Cathedra Petri; and much may be gleaned of their history from such books as Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*, and the History of the City of Rome by Gregorovius, now in course of translation into English. But none of these works aims at giving anything like a full, authoritative or systematic account of the life of each succeeding pope. Some of them are of the shortest; some merely, in the simplest sense, popular and without any pretension of being based on the original sources; while others, if full and scientific, only treat of one or other portion of the doings of the popes.

The history of many of the later popes has indeed been well treated of by Ranke, whose work has long been before the English public. In more recent years Creighton has written on the Popes of the Reformation Period, and still more recently has the history of the popes from the fifteenth century onwards been most admirably and fully penned by Dr. L. Pastor, whose splendid biographies of the *Popes of the later Middle Ages* are now being published in an English translation by Kegan Paul & Co.

But while in Meyrick's *Lives of the Popes* a simple account of the early Roman pontiffs is given, it may, I think, be safely asserted that, apart from the publication of a few biographies of certain distinguished popes (such as Bowden's *Life of Gregory VII*), nothing has hitherto been done to improve upon Bower's narrative of the Popes of the early Middle Ages. This want I have endeavoured to supply. With what success must be left to others to determine. The ground I have gone over and have yet to travel is anything but new ground. It has been well worked by men of other countries. My task will, to a large extent, but consist in making known to my countrymen, in the language they love, the labours of other men in other lands; or in bringing together the results of such isolated work on individual popes as already exists in English.

But it will, of course, cease where Pastor has begun, if not before. That is to say, it will certainly not extend beyond the accession of Martin V in 1417. For, with that pontiff's life, the full biographies of Pastor commence.

It may be asked why, in writing of the Popes of the early Middle Ages, I do not begin before the very end of the sixth century, and why in making a volume of the *Popes and the Lombards,* I only begin with St. Gregory I, seeing that other popes before him came into contact with those barbarians? To these queries I would reply, in the first place, that historians are not agreed as to when the Middle Ages should be said to begin; and that, in the absence of any unanimous verdict, they may be defined to commence after the invasion of Italy by the Lombards, the last of those Germanic hordes whose fierce onslaughts broke up the Roman power in the West, when the East and West were beginning to show unmistakable signs of complete separation both in religion and politics, and when, out of the confusion of the wreck of Western Roman civilisation, the modern nations were beginning to emerge.

And to the second question I would answer that, though it is true that the Lombard invasion (568) took place in the pontificate of John III, and that he had two successors before St. Gregory the Great, I decided to omit the biographies of John III, Benedict I, and Pelagius II (either because they were unimportant, or because any prominent question that was raised in their time came up again under Gregory I, and could be treated of in any account of him), and to begin only with Gregory the Great. And to this course I was moved by positive reasons not a few. First, to Englishmen, he is naturally the most interesting of all the popes. He begins a century—the seventh. With him, too, may be said to commence the series of contemporary biographies in the *Liber Pontificalis*. A great deal, comparatively speaking at least, is known of him. Born before the invasion of the Lombards, he was the first pope, as far as is known, who came into personal contact, so to speak, with them. And, finally, he was far the grandest figure of his age.

In conclusion, I would state that, at the risk of appearing pedantic, I have given profuse references to the original sources. This I have done that what is both naturally and justly sure to be called the bias of a Catholic priest in favour of the popes may be the more readily watched. And I have freely quoted the very words of the contemporary authorities, not only because some idea of their style, and of that of the authors of their age, may be acquired by the perusal of them, but because my own experience, and that of others which has been brought to my notice, have convinced me that many derive considerable pleasure from reading the very words of the authors on whose sense and veracity they have to rely.

It only remains for me to thank very sincerely, in the first instance, my old friend the Rev. Mark Habell, B.A., for his very great kindness in carefully revising for me the proof-sheets; and, in the second, my Bishop, the Right Rev. T. W. Wilkinson, of Hexham and Newcastle, for granting me access to the splendid library of Ushaw College; and Dr. H. W. Newton, Mayor of Newcastle-on-Tyne, Basil Anderton, Esq., B.A., and the authorities generally of the Public Library of the City of Newcastle, for their courtesy in permitting me free use of the books in the Reference Library.

ST. GREGORY I THE GREAT (590-604)
SABINIAN (604-606)
BONIFACE III (607)
ST. BONIFACE IV. (608-615)
DEUSDEDIT (615-618)
BONIFACE V (619-625)
HONORIUS I (625-638)
SEVERINUS (640)
JOHN IV (640-642)
THEODORE I (642-649)
ST. MARTIN I (649-654)
ST. EUGENIUS I (654-657)
VITALIAN (657-672)
ADEODATUS (672-676)
DONUS (676-678)
ST. AGATHO. (678-681)
ST. LEO II (682-683)
ST. BENEDICT II. (684-685)
JOHN V (685-686)
CONON (686-687)
ST. SERGIUS I (687-701)
JOHN VI (701-705)
JOHN VII (705-707)
SISINNIUS (708)
CONSTANTINE (708-715)
ST. GREGORY II. (715-731)
GREGORY III (731-741)
ST. ZACHARY (741-752)
STEPHEN II (752) and STEPHEN (II) III (752-757)
ST. PAUL I (757-767)

STEPHEN (III) IV (768-772)

HADRIAN I (772-795)

ST. GREGORY I THE GREAT

A.D. 590-604.

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

MAURICE, 582-602. PHOCAS, 602-610

KINGS OF THE LOMBARDS.

AUTHARI, 584-590. AGILULPH, 590-615

EXARCHS OF RAVENNA.

ROMANUS, 590-597. CALLINICUS, 597-602.

SMARAGDUS, 602-611. (SECOND TIME.)

THAT the reader may be able to appreciate to their full extent the difficulty of the work that Gregory was called upon to take in hand, and the true nobility of his mind and character, a brief survey at least must be taken of the state of the civilised world at the time when he became Pope. Against the manifold evils which this survey will bring to our view had Gregory, it might be said almost single-handed, to struggle, that all which Christian civilized men hold dear might be preserved. Whether the student of this period of history look to the East or to the West, and whether he look at the physical aspect of their various countries, or at the moral and intellectual condition of their peoples, he will find much to sadden him. The effect of the frequent blows by which the barbarians in the fifth century smashed to pieces the Roman Empire in the West, and of their wanderings in great *army-nations* over its broken ruins in the sixth century in search of a resting-place, proved fatal not only to law and order, to religion and morality, to house and temple, but even to the very soil. For the barbarians, and famine and plague that lurked in their train, not only brought death to the wretched citizens of the Empire, but they so devastated whole tracts of country that they have remained barren wastes to this day. “Death” wrote Salvian (*c.* 485) begot death”. “Not the Castle on the rock, not towns on lofty cliffs, not cities by the running rivers have been able to escape the craft and warlike fury of the barbarians”, is the sad wail of the poet. And to come to the days at which this history begins, we have the word of Gregory himself:

“Lo! throughout Europe everything is in the hands of the barbarians. Cities are destroyed, fortresses dismantled, provinces depopulated. There is no one left to till the soil. Idolaters are daily glorying in cruelly shedding the blood of the faithful”.

Learning, which had for a long time been on the wane both in the East and West with the declining empire of Rome, had by the seventh century fairly disappeared in an abyss of ignorance. So that when St. Gregory ascended the Throne of the Fisherman, apart from a little learning in Rome, and a great glare but not much substance of it in Constantinople, it was only in distant Ireland that intellectual culture could be said to have had a place whereon to lay its head. However, when he made England Catholic, Gregory prepared another home wherein learning found a refuge. In the countries themselves of the old civilisation, in the West especially, there was small hope indeed of the revival of their ancient civilisation. To the great pontiff of Rome, to that untiring Christian watch man on the Seven Hills by the Tiber, must our eyes turn as to almost the sole hope of a return in Europe to the arts and sciences of civilised life.

In the countries of the Eastern Empire civilisation was fast disappearing, on the one hand under the inroads of the Persians and other barbarians, and on the other under the weak tyranny and maladministration of many of its rulers, who would be great at least in the number of their dogmatic edicts. Their constant vain interference in matters of religion, their action in the Arian, semi-Arian, Nestorian and Monophysite heresies and in the controversy on the Three Chapters, did but serve to accentuate those differences in faith on which the minds of the Easterners were fixed to the detriment of everything else. So that when the undivided attention of emperor and people ought to have been given to the advances of the Persian, the Avar, the Slav and the Lombard, the attention of the one was largely taken up with teaching bishops the truths of religion, and of the other in disputing about abstruse theological propositions. In the din of religious controversy they drowned the noise made by the barbarians who were thundering at their gates. They turned against one another the violent energy that should have been directed against their external foes; and they rendered their minds unfit for practical endeavours against the barbarian by being engrossed with the effort of determining the exact theological purport of the learned works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret and Ibas! Its after history shows that the East did not belie the sad promise it gave in the days of Pope Gregory I. Its after history proved that civilisation left to the care of the Eastern Empire would have perished for ever. What Goth and Persian began, Saracen and Turk completed. The Saracen commenced his work of destruction a few years after the death of Gregory, had soon torn away the fairest provinces of the empire and laid upon them that general blight under which they are still festering. The Oriental patriarchs, *i.e.* those of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, within the century which followed the death of Gregory, had lost practically all their liberty at the hands of the Moslem. The Patriarchs of Constantinople, who under their emperors had had but little of it, finally lost that little at the hands of the Turk. With the loss of freedom these patriarchs and their subjects of course soon lost their learning and culture. After, the days of Gregory, distinguished Greek and Oriental ecclesiastics, who had once shed so much lustre on the Church by their transcendent abilities, were only conspicuous by their rarity. The patriarchs of Constantinople would fain have concealed their slavery even from themselves; and while, with ever-increasing power, the Roman pontiffs were taking the title of “Servant of the Servants of God”, they, with decreasing influence, would have grander titles. Mere creatures of imperial masters, they would be Universal Patriarchs. In his devoted struggle for faith, morality

and freedom, then, Gregory neither received a helping hand nor scarce heard an encouraging voice from the emasculated East.

A view of the West would scarcely give Pope Gregory more consolation than the contemplation of the East. Ireland was indeed Christian and in the enjoyment of a comparatively high state of learning and civilisation, and was preparing to send forth to the continent of Europe those missionaries, who throughout the seventh century laboured so successfully to spread the faith or morality of Christ in Gaul, in Belgium, in Switzerland and even in Italy. But in England the Angles and Saxons had driven in direful disorder the Britons with their civilisation and Christianity into Cornwall, Wales and Brittany, and had again enveloped this island in the darkness of barbaric ignorance and paganism. Germany, that seething centre which had poured forth the hordes that overwhelmed the Western Empire, was still fiercely pagan. The various kingdoms of which France was then composed, although Catholic in name, were suffering from the countless evils which are the result of constant internecine strife, and still contained within their boundaries many professed heathens. Spain had become the home of the Visigoths and their Arianism. And Italy, once the very centre of the world's power and civilisation, and destined to be the source to which the Western world newly civilised was to turn for its religion—what is to be said of it ? Wretched indeed was its plight in the days of Gregory. In the history of Rome and Italy we see a law of the physical order exemplified in the political. To every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. From Rome and Italy had gone forth century by century conquering armies that overran the world. And century by century invading hordes poured down into Italy to avenge the world's defeats. The centuries during which Italy smiled beneath the "Roman peace", were followed by centuries during which the face of the country was seared by war, famine and pestilence. Rome, which had sacked the chief cities of the world, and which Cicero had looked forward to standing ten thousand years, was, after its first capture by Alaric, the Goth, in 410, taken more than once again even before the birth (540) of Gregory by different barbaric nations. As Cardinal Newman tersely put it: "First came the Goth, then the Hun, and then the Lombard. The Goth took possession, but he was of a noble nature and soon lost his barbarism. The Hun came next, he was irreclaimable but did not stay. The Lombard kept his savageness and his ground. He appropriated to himself the territory, not the civilization of Italy; fierce as the Hun and powerful as the Goth, the most tremendous scourge of Heaven". During the sixty-two years (493-555) that the supremacy of the Ostrogoth lasted, Italy enjoyed a measure of peace and prosperity; but during the two centuries of Lombard domination there was nothing but war and wretchedness for Italy and Rome. Again was Italy one battlefield. The Lombards were ever at war either with the wretched Italians, with the Franks and the Greeks, or with themselves. Such being the social and political condition of the East and West, it will not surprise anyone to read in the letters of Gregory that in the Church simony was rife both among the Greeks and Latins, and that in the West not only were idolatrous practices widespread, but that idolaters were still to be found in Sardinia, Gaul and even Italy.

As our estimate of the character and conduct of St. Gregory and his successors in the seventh and eighth centuries must largely depend on the view taken of the Lombards and their rule, it will not be out of place to discuss them and their doings for a brief

space longer. When the Lombards first appear on the pages of history at the very beginning of our era they are set down as having their abode about the mouth of the Elbe and described as worse than the Germans in ferocity. During the course of the next few centuries they moved southwards, and when, with hordes of other barbarians, with their wives and children and such belongings as they had, they poured into Italy (568) from the north-east, its most vulnerable point of attack, and overran great part of it during the early manhood of Gregory, their fierce cruelty was still conspicuous. They were indeed possessed of a wild recklessness that passed for courage, and oft displayed a rough and ready justice that wins admiration from men who are not unfrequently wont to see justice hampered by forms of law. But Arians or pagans in religion, they persecuted the Catholics subject to them, and treated the conquered Italians with contempt. Especially did they rage against the clergy and the monasteries, and amongst the latter destroyed the famous Benedictine Abbey of Monte Cassino (589). The Lombards were in Italy what the Normans were afterwards in England. They behaved to the conquered Italians in the same arbitrary manner as the Normans did to the Anglo-Saxons, or as the Turks now often do to their subject Christians. They were an army of occupation, and as such were hated by the people. We can hence easily understand how the provinces that were not subject to them dreaded them. So poorly were the Lombards united among themselves that although their third ruler, Authari, is depicted, rightly or wrongly, as planting his lance on the shore of Rhegium to show that the Southern Sea alone was to be the border of his kingdom, the Lombards never succeeded in conquering all Italy. Rome never fell into their hands, nor did they ever subdue the Duchy of Naples. And it took them nearly two hundred years to overthrow the Exarchs of Ravenna. As these free states only naturally wished to retain their freedom, who would deny them the right of getting help when and where they could, and of using every fair means in their power to remain free? It will be important to bear these considerations in mind when the relations between the Popes and the Lombards come to be noticed.

When Gregory became Pope Italy was, for the most part, under the dominion of the Lombard kings, who resided at Pavia. Their power was helped or resisted, as the case might be, by thirty-six hereditary dukes. Of these, who were all more or less independent, the chief ones were the Dukes of Spoletum and Beneventum. Partially separated from the northern half of the Lombard kingdom by the line of forts along the Flaminian Way, which for a long time remained in the hands of the Empire, they were, on that account, enabled to act with less dependence on Pavia, and often showed their autocratic power by making war on their king. The districts of Italy not ruled by the Lombards were subject to a greater or less degree to the “Roman” emperor. His representative, an exarch, who had supreme civil and military authority, resided at Ravenna. In addition to a province under his own immediate jurisdiction, known, in the most restricted application of the term, as the “exarchate of Ravenna”, there were subject to the exarch the Duchies of Istria, Venetia, and Rome, the Pentapolis, Calabria, Bruttium, Sicily, and a number of towns along the coast of Liguria forming the province of Maritima Italorum. A few isolated places here and there, such as Naples and Salernum, were also “imperial”. The exarchate comprised the modern Romagna with the marches, or valleys, of Ferrara and Commachio. A maritime Pentapolis, *viz*., the cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, and Ancona, along with an inland

Pentapolis, *viz*., Jesi, Cagli, Gubbio, Fossombrone and Urbino, and the city of Osimo, constituted the Duchy of the Pentapolis. The Duchy of Rome extended from Civitavecchia (the old Centumcellae) to Gaeta and Formia along the coast, and inland from Civitavecchia to the course of the Tiber from Amelia and Narni, with the southern portion of the present province of Rome and the small northern part of the present Campania around Gaeta and Fondi. The Duchy of Venetia included the towns of Concordia, Oderzo (the ancient Opitergium) and Altinum with the islands of Chioggia, etc., of the lagoons. The island of Grado, of which we shall hear plenty in this volume, Trieste (the ancient Tergeste) and Pola were the principal belongings of the Duchy of Istria. The Duchy of Calabria, which included part of Apulia, seems to have been formed with Bruttium in the seventh century by the Emperor Constans "into a single administrative district, with the official name of Calabria, which, when the Empire lost most of the true Calabria, clung to the toe" of Italy as far north as the river Crathi. These great divisions of Italy had not the boundaries assigned to them above for any great length of time. They were constantly fluctuating. But on the whole, the sway of the Lombards increased, if but slowly. More or less isolated from many of his dependencies by intervening hostile Lombard territory, and often having as much as he could manage in his efforts to keep the Lombards out of Ravenna, the exarch had naturally but little control over the more distant provinces of Italy that were supposed to be subject to him. Left to themselves, they had to look after themselves. And long before the Image controversy in the eighth century caused the people of many of the duchies to openly throw off all allegiance to the emperors at Constantinople, many of them were practically independent. Thus we shall see the Romans, abandoned by exarch and emperor, turn to the popes in their temporal as well as in their spiritual necessities. The "temporal power of the Popes", declares even Gibbon, "insensibly rose from the calamities of the time"

In passing from the public affairs of his times to Gregory himself, as an 'Anglo-Saxon' priest in communion with the See of Rome, and writing in 'Northumbria', I cannot do better than begin with the words of another Anglo-Saxon cleric in communion with the See of Rome, who wrote also in Northumbria, about Gregory the Great some twelve hundred years ago. "The Holy Catholic Church", says the monk of Whitby in his little preface, "never ceases to celebrate her teachers in every nation, who, rejoicing in the Lord, she glories, were sent to her by the will of Christ; and, in faithful writings, hands down their memory to future ages, that they may place their hope in God, and, not forgetting His works, may seek to do His will; so we too, to the best of our ability, and with the help of God, may treat of our master, and describe him whom with all the world we may call Saint Gregory". Like the greater number of those whom the Church honors as saints, Gregory was of noble birth, and sprung from a family of saints. Arguing with De Rossi from inscriptions, it is the opinion of the learned that Gregory belonged to the patrician family of the Anicii, a family famous in the annals of the State and of the Church. A Lucius Anicius Gallus subdued the Illyrians and became consul *B.C.* 163; and in 541, about the year of Gregory's birth, the last 'consul ordinarius' (as opposed to the perpetual consulship of the emperors) was no less a personage than Flavius Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius. No less famous in the history of the Church was the Anician family. Speaking of the virgins it had given to the Church of God, St. Augustine wrote "The descendants of Anicius make a more

generous choice in giving their illustrious family the glory of foregoing marriage than in multiplying it by fresh members, and by imitating in the flesh the life of angels rather than by increasing the number of men through physical birth… May virgins desirous of securing the splendor of the Anicii make choice of their holiness". It is also said that to this family belonged the patriarch of Western Monasticism, St. Benedict (*d.* 543). Whether Gregory belonged to this family or not, it is certain that his family was saintly. His 'Atavus' (third or fourth grandfather) was Pope St. Felix III (483-492), who had been married before he had taken sacred orders. His mother, Sylvia, and his aunts Tharsilla and Emilina, are counted amongst the saints. His father, the Senator Gordianus, before his death, joined the ranks of the clergy and became a 'regionarius', *i.e.*, one of the seven regionary deacons who looked after the interests of the poor in the seven regions into which the ecclesiastical authorities had divided the city. The same uncertainty prevails about the date of Gregory's birth as about the other chief events of his life before he became Pope. It must, however, have been about the year 540. Whenever he was born, it was in the paternal mansion on the *Clivus Scaurus*, a declivity of the Coelian Hill, a home in the very midst of the architectural glories of ancient Rome, and where the Church dedicated to our Saint now stands. On one side of his home was the Lateran palace of the popes, and opposite to it the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine, at that time still intact. The destruction of the great classical monuments of ancient Rome took place mainly during the Middle Ages; and we have no less an authority than that of Belisarius bearing testimony to the wonderful grandeur of Rome even at the time of the early days of Gregory. When, in 546, Totila, King of the Goths, had resolved to make of Rome "pasture land for cattle", Belisarius wrote to dissuade him from putting such a barbaric idea into execution. "Beyond all doubt Rome surpasses all other cities in size and in worth. It was not built by the resources of one man, nor did it obtain its magnificence in a short time. But emperors and countless distinguished men, with time and wealth, brought together to this city architects, workmen, and all things needful from the ends of the earth; and left as a memorial to posterity of their greatness the glorious city, built by little and little, which you now behold. If it be injured, all ages will suffer. For thus would the monuments of the worth of the ancients be removed, and posterity would lose the pleasure of beholding them".

Of Gregory's early youth, passed in the midst of such elevating surroundings, we know nothing. But great must have been the impression made upon his youthful mind by the troubles he saw inflicted on Rome by its rapidly succeeding captures by Totila, Belisarius and Narses. These early impressions, deepened by similar calamities he saw inflicted on different parts of Italy by the Lombards throughout the course of his life, were doubtless the cause of the vein of melancholy which pervades his writings. This tinge of sadness, which led him to see in these political disasters a prelude to the approaching end of the world, is noticed by most of Gregory's biographers and cannot but be observed by anyone who will take the trouble to read almost any portion of his writings. In his early studies he displayed a tenacious memory, good judgment, a zeal for learning and a respect for antiquity. He soon had the greatest reputation in Rome for certain branches of knowledge.

He must have begun early to take a part in the government of the city, for in 573 we find him Prefect or chief magistrate of Rome with the care of its public buildings and corn supply. Called, however, to higher things, Gregory for a long time resisted the voice of God. But riches and worldly dignities could not satisfy him. And after founding six monasteries in Sicily out of his inheritance and after converting even his home on the Coelian into another, he gave up everything he had in the world and became a Benedictine monk in the house where he was born. "And he who was wont to go through the city clad in the 'trabea', and all aglow with silk and gems, served the altar of God clad in a worthless gown".

In the cloister he devoted himself with all the fervent energy of his character to the work and austere life which become a monk. Indeed, in the matter of austerities he pushed them too far, brought himself to death's door, and injured his health permanently. This, however, did not interfere with his happiness. And in later years he often expressed keen regret at the loss of his peaceable life in his monastery on the Coelian. It is quite characteristic of the man that in the cloister he was not merely a monk, or 'servant of God' (servus Dei), as monks were then emphatically called, but a monk of monks, or 'servant of the servants of God', as he already signed himself even before he became Pope. He was not, however, suffered to remain long in the enjoyment of that monastic peace, by which, though still in the body, he was enabled to live out of and above it.

Pope Pelagius II (578-590) made him one of the seven regionary deacons of Rome who had to superintend the 'serving of tables' in their respective districts. It was while going his rounds in this capacity that he is said to have encountered those Saxon slave boys who so filled his mind that he could not rest till he had done something for his 'Angels of the North'. Soon after his ordination as deacon, Pelagius did but add to the burden of temporal affairs already laid on Gregory's shoulders. The Pope sent him (*c.* 579) as his apocrisiarius or nuncio to Constantinople, trusting that by his birth and talents the accomplished deacon might be able to procure some help for Italy against the Lombards, These papal nuncios date in the main from the days of Justinian, the first of that name who sat on the imperial throne at Constantinople; and they received the Greek appellation (*apocrisiarii*), given them by the writers of those times, from the fact that it was their business to carry out the 'answers' or instructions which had been given to them by those who sent them. For the same reason they were sometimes called by the Latin name of like meaning—'responsales'. To be sent as apocrisiarius to Constantinople was to graduate for the Papacy. When the Eastern emperors had arrogated to themselves the right of confirming the papal elections, it was clearly of moment, in order to avoid disagreements, that men should be chosen as popes who would not be wholly unacceptable to the emperors. And it was, moreover, very advantageous for the Church that such should be elected to fill the Chair of Peter as were acquainted with the Church and State in the East. Hence we find Vigilius, Pelagius I, St. Gregory, and Sabinian, all of whom had been apocrisiarii at Constantinople, elected popes.

To form conjectures as to the thoughts of men on any given occasion is the work not of the historian but of the poet or novelist. For once, however, play may be given to the fancy, and on that *authority* may be set down the ideas that passed through the mind

of Gregory on his journey to Constantinople. When driving south, along the Appian Way and passing by Forum Appii and the Three Taverns, the young apocrisiarius thought with tenderness of the brethren going thus far to meet St. Paul when he came to Rome after his appeal to Caesar. Threading his way through the Caudine Forks there may have flashed to his mind with pride the dash made for them by his countrymen when Rome's star was in the ascendant. And if not before, certainly when he reached Egnatia and found there a scarcity of water, he must have thought of "Gnatia Lymphis iratis exstructa", and how amusingly Horace had long before described this very journey he was now making to Brundusium. Tossed about on the Adriatic when crossing to Dyrrhachium, his imagination will have conjured up Caesar and his fortune in a small boat, the sport of the waves. Arrived at Dyrrhachium, Gregory continued his route by the Via Egnatia, one of the greatest military roads of the Empire, and which even Cicero, some five hundred years before, had spoken of as connecting "us with the Hellespont". In passing by the lofty Lychnidus (a town which will appear again more than once in these pages) could Gregory have speculated as to whether the Slavs, of whose ravages in Illyricum he often speaks with anxiety in his letters, would ever be masters of it and found there a capital? When he came to Thessalonica, it is more than likely he may have left a letter for its metropolitan, as he was a papal vicar. Journeying on through Amphipolis and Philippi again, he thought of St. Paul and his travels "round about as far as unto Illyricum" (Rom., xv. 19). By the time he had reached Cypsela on the Hebrus in Thrace, the Via Egnatia had traversed 500 miles, and had still many a weary mile to run. Arrived at Perinthus, then called Heraclea, where most of the roads which led to Constantinople met, his thoughts began to turn more definitely to his journey's end, Constantinople. He reflected how its bishops, from being simple suffragans of Heraclea, had become patriarchs, and how with imperial aid they had even pushed themselves above the ancient patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. He wondered where their ambition would end. At length the Via Egnatia terminated, and Gregory entered Constantinople by the 'Golden Gate' at the south-west corner of the city.

Of the official work which Gregory had to perform in the Eastern capital of the Empire, a good idea can be got from a letter of instructions to him from Pelagius II which has been preserved. The Pope informs Gregory that he has sent to him the notary Honoratus, who, fresh from Ravenna, is thoroughly acquainted with the condition of affairs in Italy, and along with the notary, Bishop Sebastian Honoratus will give Gregory all the necessary information, and, should the latter think fit, the notary will tell the emperor (Maurice) of all the disasters which, against their plighted word, the perfidy of the Lombards had inflicted on the peninsula. The bishop too had promised the Pope to point out to the emperor the dire straits in which the whole of Italy lay. "Wherefore", continues Pelagius, "consult together how you can, as quickly as possible, bring aid to our necessities. For the republic *(i.e.,* the empire) is in such a desperate pass here that, unless God move the compassion of the emperor to grant to us a *Master of the soldiery* and a *Duke,* we are utterly helpless; for Rome is particularly defenseless, and the exarch writes that he cannot send us any help, as he declares that he has not force enough to defend Ravenna. May God therefore move him to come at once to our assistance before the troops of the *unspeakable race* are able to seize the places still held by the republic".

Besides spending much of his time in trying to obtain from the emperor men and munitions of war for Italy, which Maurice would not (probably because he could not) spare, Gregory had to use his influence at Constantinople for others besides the Pope. Municipal authorities appealed to him to protect their rights against the tyranny of imperial officials. And Gregory obtained from Maurice a confirmation of the rights possessed by the civic authority of Naples over certain islands.

In the midst of all these secular affairs which his position forced Gregory to attend to, he endeavored, as far as his business engagements would allow him, to lead the same life of prayer and study that he had done in his monastery of St. Andrew. Several of his fellow monks attached to him by the bonds of love had followed him to the imperial city. Gregory regarded this as brought about by God, "that by their example as by an anchor he might be bound fast to the quiet shore of prayer, whilst he was ceaselessly tossed about by the waves of secular business". In the midst of all the worries and vexations which accompany dealings with the great, Gregory, urged on by his monks, and especially by St. Leander, Bishop of Seville, who had come to Constantinople to solicit aid for St. Hermenegild against his father Leovigild, delivered homilies to them on the book of Job. In this work, remarks the Lombard deacon, Gregory so treated of the virtues and vices that he seemed not so much to explain them in words as to make them stand out in living forms. Whence, concludes Paul, he must have attained to the perfection of those virtues, the effects of which he set forth so well. Thus, though residing in the splendid palace of 'Placidia', the usual residence of the papal apocrisiarii, though constantly engaged in intricate diplomatic negotiations, and necessarily coming into daily contact with men and women who, in that gay and corrupt centre of civilization, were of the world worldly, Gregory still contrived to live, to a very large extent, the retired, studious and mortified life he had led in his Roman monastery.

THE HERESY OF EUTYCHIUS (Eutyches)

Before Gregory returned from his mission to Constantinople, he was the means of withdrawing Eutychius, the patriarch of that city, from error. The patriarchs of Constantinople seem to have had a natural bent towards unsound doctrine, and Eutychius was no exception. He taught that after the general resurrection our bodies will be impalpable, more subtle than air, seemingly calling in question the identity of our present bodies with our risen ones, Gregory argued with the patriarch not only with learning, but what is more important, with sweetness. At first, indeed, he only got the better of the argument. The patriarch, though beaten in discussion, wrote a book on his theories. The dispute came to the ears of Tiberius. To listen to and even to give dogmatic decisions on theological subjects was a weakness with the Greek emperors. Tiberius would have the disputants before him. After hearing the arguments of both sides, he concluded to burn the work of Eutychius. In the end Gregory gained the patriarch as well as his argument. For on his deathbed (582), in the presence of some of Gregory's friends, Eutychius grasped the skin of one of his hands by the other and said, "I confess we shall all rise with this flesh".

But if Gregory found it necessary, whilst still nuncio, to raise his voice against heresy in the person of the patriarch, he found it equally necessary to defend others from a similar charge. Actuated, it would seem, by motives of envy, many persons took pleasure in ascribing various heretical tenets to certain pious Christians; among others, at least later on, to Theoctista, the sister of the Emperor Maurice. Many who were thus accused betook themselves to the papal apocrisiarius, and as he could not find that they really held any false doctrines at all, he not only did not pay the slightest heed to the accusations, but received the *heretics* into his friendship and defended them against their accusers.

Despite all this varied work accomplished by Gregory at Constantinople, and despite the fact that he there made many life-long friends, he left the imperial city (585 or beginning of 586), after standing god-father (585) to Theodosius, the son of Maurice, without ever thoroughly mastering the Greek language. His sojourn at Constantinople had lasted perhaps some six years, and if his efforts to obtain a *Roman* army for the deliverance of Italy from the hated Lombard were not successful, no doubt his representations had something to do with the money sent to the Franks by Maurice to induce them to attack the Lombards. Between the years 584-590 the Franks had invaded Italy four if not five times. And if they did not make much headway against the Lombards, their ravages would have helped to make the latter ready to conclude a three years' truce with the exarch Smaragdus. It was during the early months of this truce that Gregory was recalled to Rome.

Once back in Rome, Gregory was soon again inside his beloved monastery. But a man with his capacity and secretary willingness for work was not to be allowed to remain in peaceful retirement. He was called by the monks to rule them as their abbot and by the Pope to help him (as his secretary) to rule the Church.

His principal task as secretary was to write to the bishops of Istria, who were in schism on account of the so-called *Three Chapters.* This complicated controversy, like all the other religious controversies of this period, had its origin in the East and in the Arian heresy. Nestorius, who, after he had been educated in the school of Antioch under Theodore of Mopsuestia, became patriarch of Constantinople in 428, taught that there were two separate and distinct persons in Our Lord, and that consequently Our Lady was not Mother of God but only mother of the man Christ, in whom "God dwelt as in a temple". He was supported in his errors by the able Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and by the writings of his master Theodore of Mopsuestia, by Ibas, of the great school of Edessa, who was afterwards bishop of that city, and many others. Nestorius was, however, condemned in the third ecumenical council of Ephesus (431). One of those who had been very active against Nestorius was the monk Eutyches. His zeal led him into the opposite error. He denied the two natures of Our Lord. "As", he said, "a drop of water let fall into the ocean is quickly absorbed and disappears in the vast expanse, so also the human element, being infinitely less than the divine, is entirely absorbed by the divinity". This 'Monophysite', or 'one nature' doctrine, was naturally opposed among others by Theodoret and Ibas. Eutyches was condemned in the fourth ecumenical council of Chalcedon (451). Sometime before this date Theodore of Mopsuestia had died in communion with the Church, and so a council held at Antioch about 440 refused to condemn his works. And as Theodoret and Ibas condemned Nestorius at Chalcedon,

that council did not condemn their works, as, by their own declaration, they did so sufficiently themselves. Though the Monophysites were condemned, they were not extinguished. However, like all heretics, they split up into endless parties, and the *Encyclicons, Henoticons* and other dogmatic interferences of the *Roman* emperors only made matters worse.

Under Justinian I (527-565) a new controversy arose which played into the hands of the Monophysites. Theodore Ascidas, metropolitan of Caesarea, to divert attention from certain heretical doctrines, ascribed to the great Origen, of which he was a supporter, turned the mind of the emperor, who was very fond of issuing dogmatic decrees, to the writings of Theodoret, etc. Justinian, very much exercised at the time with schemes for uniting the Acephali (a branch of the Monophysites) to the Church, was assured by Theodore that all he had to do was to anathematize Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings and those of Theodoret and the letter of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to the Persian Maris, *i.e.,* the so-called *Three Chapters.* The Council of Chalcedon, urged Ascidas, showed favor to Theodoret and Ibas. Condemn them and the Acephali will become reunited to the Church. Justinian accordingly issued an edict *(c.* 544) condemning the *Three Chapters,* and compelled Pope Vigilius, when at Constantinople, to do the same (548). The condemnation was reaffirmed by the fifth ecumenical council of Constantinople (553). The emperor did not succeed in his object. Though no opposition was raised to the decrees of the fifth council in the East, the Acephali were not gained. On the contrary, the Monophysites were delighted. The Council of Chalcedon had declared Theodoret and Ibas orthodox, and *therefore,* they insinuated, had approved their writings. Theodoret and Ibas condemned—the Council of Chalcedon was condemned. While the Monophysites were thus in high glee, the Catholics were placed in a dilemma. They could not accept the *Three Chapters* because they were heretical as a matter of fact; and if they anathematized them, the unlearned and unthinking many would suppose that the Council of Chalcedon, which declared the authors of the *Three Chapters* orthodox, was being anathematized. The latter was exactly what did take place in certain parts of the West. Doubtless partly because they would mistrust what had been done in the East under the personal influence of the emperor, and certainly partly because, more or less ignorant of the writings of Theodore, etc., they did not fully understand the decisions of the fifth council, some of the Western bishops formed a schism. Despite the express declaration of Justinian to the contrary, some of the Westerns persisted in maintaining that his edict and the decrees of the council of Constantinople were aimed at those of Chalcedon and were framed in the interests of the Monophysites. The schism, however, had duration only in the north-east of Italy, where the bishops of Venetia and Istria paid no heed to the admonitions of Pope Pelagius I, the successor of Vigilius; but under the influence of Paulinus of Aquileia (557-569), assembled in synod *(c.* 557) and condemned the fifth council. The 'barbarity of the Lombards' forced Paulinus to take the treasures of his Church and fly to the little island of Grado at the mouth of the Isongo, and near Trieste. Soon after this Paulinus died, and after the brief rule of Probinus, was succeeded by Elias (571-586). It was to this Elias and the other schismatical bishops of Istria that Pelagius II bade Gregory write (585-6). Though little or nothing seems to have been effected at the time by the three letters which Gregory wrote, he partially healed the schism when Pope. It was not, however, finally closed till about the year 700.

In the first of the three letters, the Pope assured the Istrian bishops and their metropolitan that it was the troubles of the times which had hindered him from writing to them before. Now that by the mercy of God, through the exertions of the exarch Smaragdus, they had obtained the blessings of peace, he hastened to beg them to cease rending the Church by schism. He wrote to them because the command of Christ was upon him, "to confirm the faith of his brethren" (St. Luke XXII, 31-32), and he bade them remember that the faith of Peter, to whom the Lord had given the commission to feed all the sheep and to whom He had entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven (St. Matthew XVI, 18), could not fail or be changed. He proceeded to tell them what that faith was, assured them that he received the Council of Chalcedon as he did the first three General Councils, and concluded by exhorting them most pathetically to unity, that there might be one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one Father of all.

The Istrian bishops made no attempt to reply to the Pope's contentions. They simply sent him a statement of their decisions. Accordingly in a second letter, Pelagius reminded them of the danger of keeping so long apart from the Universal Church, "for the sake of superfluous questions and of defending heretical chapters". To bring the trouble to an end, he begged them to send suitable persons to Rome, with whom the difficulties might be properly discussed; or, if they were afraid of distance and the quality of the times, he bade them hold a synod at Ravenna to which he would send those who would give them every satisfaction.

Having no case, the bishops in schism would do neither the one thing nor the other. Like children they would only reiterate with obstinacy what they had made up their minds about. In a third very long letter, to which Gregory is thought to allude, when in his letter to the bishops of Iberia he speaks of the "Book of Pope Pelagius on the Three Chapters", the Pope expresses his astonishment at their conduct, the more so on account of the mild manner in which he has treated with them. However, he must strive to bring them back to that unity which their schism is blurring. He goes on to show that what was done in the time of Justinian did not militate against the Council of Chalcedon; but that as the fifth council was merely concerned with persons, the Istrian bishops were simply seeking for a cause of quarrel under a show of peaceful words, and despising the authority of the Fathers, whilst pretending to follow it. "By your letter you contend that you were led by the Apostolic see itself not to consent to what was done under the Emperor Justinian, because in the beginning of the affair the Apostolic see, through Pope Vigilius, and all the heads of the Latin provinces, stoutly resisted the condemnation of the *Three Chapters.* We hence note that what ought to have won your consent has torn you from giving it. Latins, and inexperienced in Greek ways (Graecitas), whilst ignorant of the (Greek) language they learnt their mistakes slowly. The more readily, therefore, ought they to be believed after their acknowledgment, inasmuch as their firmness did not shrink from the contest until they learnt the truth" ... "If, then, in the matter of the *Three Chapters* one view was held whilst the truth was being sought, but another when the truth was discovered, why should a change of opinion be objected to this see as a fault, when a similar change in the person of its author (S. Peter) is humbly reverenced by the whole Church?" Gregory then proceeds to show by extracts from their works that Theodore, Ibas and Theodoret all, as a matter of fact, put forth heretical propositions, and therefore, of course, deserved to be

condemned. And he very pertinently remarked with regard to Theodoret: "How rash must he be who would defend the writings of Theodoret, when it is certain that Theodoret himself condemned them". He concludes by once again affirming that he receives the Council of Chalcedon as he receives the first three ecumenical councils; and assuring his correspondents that he looks to God to give effect to his words.

The zeal of the Pope, however, had but little effect, at least at the time. But the exarch Smaragdus, of opinion that a little force might succeed where words failed, seized Severus (586-606), the successor of Elias, and some others, and forced them by threats to communicate with the orthodox John of Ravenna (588). However, on his return to Grado, finding himself unpopular, Severus repudiated his submission. A fit of insanity prevented the exarch from renewing his violence. He was replaced by Romanus (589-597).

When he became Pope, Gregory continued to labor to put an end to the schism. A few months after his accession he wrote to blame Severus for his relapse, pointing out to him that it was a less evil not to know the truth than not to remain in it when learnt, and bidding him come to Rome with his adherents, in accordance with the will of the emperor, that their contentions might be examined in a synod. With this letter went a body of soldiers under the command of a tribune and an imperial life-guardsman. Alarmed at this strong action on the part of the Pope, the schismatics appealed to the emperor. One of their letters has come down to us. Following a very common precedent of ecclesiastics in trouble with their proper superiors, they offered to submit their case to the emperor himself as soon as the Lombards should be overcome and peace restored to Italy. And at the same time, to put pressure on the emperor, they declared that if force were employed against them, the metropolitan of Aquileia would soon lose his authority over his province, as his subjects would turn to the neighboring archbishops of Gaul. This representation, signed by ten bishops, produced its effect. Fearful of anything happening which might in any way lessen his hold on Istria, "the emperor Cesar Flavius Mauricius Tiberius, Faithful in Christ, the Peaceful, Mild, Mightiest, the Beneficent, Alamannicus", dispatched a letter "to the most holy Gregory, the most blessed archbishop of the fostering city of Rome and Patriarch". After informing Gregory of the letters and request he had received from the schismatics, and assuring him that he was well aware that the Pope correctly imparted the doctrine of the Catholic Church to all, the emperor continued: "Since therefore your Holiness is aware of the present confusion in Italian affairs, and knows that we must adapt ourselves to the times, we order your Holiness to give no further molestation to those bishops, but to allow them to live quietly, until, by the providence of God, the regions of Italy be in all other respects restored to peace, and the other bishops of Istria and Venetia be again brought back to the old order (viz., doubtless the political order). Then by the help of your prayers, all measures will be taken for the restoration of peace, and the removal of differences in doctrine".

As this whole question of the *Three Chapters* had been raised by one of the predecessors of Maurice, Gregory had certainly some reason to complain of such a mandate as this—a mandate he regarded as obtained surreptitiously. However, he did not cease to importune the emperor on the subject with the greatest zeal and freedom. He moreover encouraged those of the laity who were aiding him in the good work of

reconciliation. And he entered into correspondence with individual bishops among the schismatics, who had expressed a wish of discussing the situation with him. Certainly at first no striking results followed Gregory's work. In 593 we read of the return to Catholic unity of a deacon, and in 595 of a monk. But after the death of the exarch Romanus (596 or 597), an *impossible* man, at least to the Pope, we find Gregory commending to his successor, Callinicus, several people who have returned "to the solid rock of the Prince of the Apostles" (599). In the same year Gregory had the pleasure of receiving the adhesion of the inhabitants of the island of Caprea, "which appears to be the island in the lagunes at the mouth of the Piave, upon which was soon to arise the city of Heraclea, the precursor of Venice". And before he died, Gregory learnt that Firininus, Bishop of Trieste, had abandoned the schism. From what we know of the persecution that Firininus had to endure at the hands of his metropolitan Severus, and from the fact that many of those reconciled to the Church went to live at Constantinople and in Sicily, there can be no doubt that well-grounded fear of persecution at the hands of the remaining schismatics kept many from returning to the Church.

The schism was unfortunately not confined to Venetia and Istria. Three bishops cut themselves off from communion with Constantius of Milan (to whom Gregory had sent the pallium in September 593), who on account of the Lombards was residing at Genoa. And what was worse, they managed to seduce from her allegiance to the Church the Bavarian Catholic princess, Theodelinda, formerly the wife of Authari, but since 590 the wife of Agilulph. However, through the prudence of Constantius, and the words of Gregory, the disaffection of the Lombard Queen, who showed herself the Pope's faithful fellow-worker in all his efforts for the conversion of the Lombards, did not last long, Gregory impressed on her that the men who had led her astray neither read themselves nor believed those who did read. He made it plain to her that he received the Council of Chalcedon as he received the three General Councils, and that he condemned anyone who either added to or subtracted anything from the four Councils, especially that of Chalcedon about which there has arisen a question of faith in certain ignorant men. After this confession of faith on the part of the Pope, it is only right that the Queen should have no further mistrust of the Church of St. Peter. "Stand firm in the true faith, and fix your life in the rock of the Church, in the confession of the Prince of the Apostles, lest your tears and good works should avail naught, if not done in the true faith".

Gregory had to combat the schism even in Asiatic Iberia. But it is one man that *soweth* and another that *reapeth*. It was not till about a hundred years later, at the synod of Pavia in 698, that the schism of the *Three Chapters* was closed, that the harvest from the seed sown by Gregory I was gathered by Sergius I.

The one act which is recorded of Gregory as abbot took place in the year in which he was elected Pope, and shows him animated by the same ideas of discipline which filled the breast of the general who is said to have shot a soldier for stealing a turnip after he had issued special orders against looting. One of his monks, Justus by name, who had been a physician before he came to the monastery, and had been most attentive to Gregory himself in his frequent illnesses, confessed when dying to his brother Copiosus, also a doctor, that he had secreted three golden *solidi*. For a monk to possess money was of course against the rule of the Benedictine Order. The coins were

discovered among Justus' medicines, and the affair was reported to the abbot. Overwhelmed with grief, Gregory reflected on what he had best do "for the benefit of the dying man and for an example to his living brethren". He accordingly forbade the monks to visit the dying man, and told Copiosus to let Justus know that this was done on account of his breach of the rule. When the poor monk died, Gregory ordered his body to be cast into a ditch and the money to be thrown on the top of him, whilst all exclaimed, "Thy money perish with thee!" Gregory assures us that his conduct had the desired effect. The monk died in the greatest sorrow for his fault, and the rest of the community became extremely particular about the observance of their vow of poverty. However, after thirty days Gregory was touched at the thought of the sufferings the poor monk would be enduring in Purgatory, and accordingly gave orders for Mass to be offered up for him every day for a month. At the end of that period Justus appeared to his brother and assured him that his sufferings were over and that he had been received into Heaven.

DEATH OF POPE PELAGIUS II. POPE GREGORY THE FIRST

The time had now arrived when, in the designs of God, Gregory was to take on his own shoulders the cares he had helped Pope Pelagius to bear, and which his abilities, piety and experience fitted him to cope with. A moment's reflection will suffice to make it clear how deep and varied that experience was. The years that he had held the praefectship of the city had enabled him to gain a clear insight into the workings of its civil administration; and as one of the regionary deacons he had got in touch with its ecclesiastical government. Apocrisiarius at Constantinople, he must have learnt something of the relations between the East and West in matters affecting both the Church and State. As a monk and abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew he became acquainted with the monastic life and its needs.

The close of the year 589 saw the swift yellow Tiber in flood. Great portions of Rome were soon under water, many monuments of antiquity were undermined, and some thousands of bushels of grain, which were stored up in the granaries of the Church, were destroyed. A bubonic plague followed in the wake of the flood and Pope Pelagius was one of its first victims (February 7, 590). The plague waxed furious, and very many houses of the city were rendered tenantless. "But because the Church of God cannot be without a ruler, the whole people chose Gregory Pope".

Gregory's was the only dissentient voice. At a loss what to do to avoid the honor he dreaded, Gregory wrote to the Emperor Maurice and begged him not to confirm his election. Contested elections had furnished the State with an excuse for concerning itself with the elections of the popes. The disputed election of Boniface I (418-422) had given the Emperor Honorius an opportunity of intervening in the matter. When Italy fell under the sway of the Teutonic barbarian, still greater liberties were taken with the natural rights of the Church. And a council at Rome (502) had to condemn a decree of Basil, prefect of the praetorium for the Herulan Odoacer, which had forbidden a successor to Pope Simplicius (t483) to be chosen without the approval of the king. Troubled elections enabled Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, to go so far as actually to

nominate Felix IV (526-530). When by the valor and skill of Belisarius and Narses, Italy was recovered for the Empire, Justinian and his successors followed the lead of the barbarian and claimed the right of confirming the papal elections. In later times we shall see the popes justly struggling against this assumption.

Whilst the answer of the Emperor Maurice was awaited, the plague was raging in Rome. Gregory made use of the occasion to remind the people of the necessity of ever keeping before their minds the judgments of God, which they ought to have averted by a salutary fear of them. "See", he cried, "the whole people struck by the sword of God's anger, smitten down by sudden death. For death anticipates sickness. Men are dying, not one by one, but in groups". He therefore invited them to join in a Sevenfold Litany which was to be celebrated at dawn on the following Wednesday, and assigned the churches at which were to assemble the different groups, who were to join in the great procession to St. Mary Major's, (1) The clergy in general with the priests of the sixth region were to start from the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian by the Roman Forum; (2) The abbots and their monks with the priests of the fourth region from the Church of SS. Gervase and Protase on the Quirinal; (3) The abbesses and their nuns with the priests of the first region from the Church of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, not the one on the Via Labicana, two miles out of Rome, but the one described as 'juxta Lateranis', on the modern Via Merulana, and which figures as a titular church in a council held at Rome by Pope Gregory (595); (4) All the children with the priests of the second region from the Church of SS. John and Paul, near Gregory's home on the Coelian; (5) The laymen with the priests of the seventh region from the Church of St. Stefano (the protomartyr) Rotondo near the Lateran; (6) All the widows with the priests of the fifth region from the Church of St. Euphemia, now destroyed, but formerly near the Church of St. Pudentiana; (7) All the married women with the priests of the third region from the Church of St. Clement.

On the appointed day, whilst the people in their seven great companies walked to the basilica sadly chanting the *Kyrie Eleison,* so fiercely did the plague rage that in a single hour no less than eighty men fell to the earth and died during the procession. St. Gregory of Tours, from whom we have all these particulars, gathered them from one of the deacons of his church who was at Rome at the time. This penitential devotion of the *Sevenfold Litany* may have become annual. At any rate, it is plain from Gregory's register that it was repeated a few months (September 603) before he died. Possibly there may have been some pestilence then again devastating the city in connection with the famine, which we know was raging when Sabinian became Pope.

Just as round great warrior kings like Prince Arthur, our own Alfred and Charlemagne, legends of imaginary fights gather, so round Gregory, justly the admiration of after ages, accumulated many a pretty story. It came to be told how, when the great procession, on its way towards St. Peter's on the Vatican, crossed the Tiber by the bridge opposite the Mausoleum of Hadrian, the whole people, with trembling joy and gratitude, beheld the angel of wrath on top of the Mausoleum sheathing his deadly sword as a sign that the plague was at an end. From that hour the Mausoleum changed its name, and has been known ever since as the Angel's Castle (the Castle of Sant' Angelo).

At length the plague ceased, and a letter came from the emperor in which he expressed his pleasure that his friend had been raised to the honor of the Papacy, and giving the required consent for his consecration. For Maurice had received full information of what had been done at Rome from Germanus, the prefect of the city, who had caused Gregory's messenger to be seized and had opened all the letters of which he was bearer, substituting letters of his own. Disappointed in his hopes of the emperor's interference in his behalf, Gregory resolved to escape from the dreaded dignity by flight. But his movements were carefully watched; he was seized, hurried off to St. Peter's, and consecrated (September 3, 590).

Here again has legend been busy. According to it, Gregory contrived to get himself taken out of the city by some traders in a basket. For in fear lest by flight he might endeavor to escape the honor it was known that he dreaded, the gates of the city were all carefully watched. For three days Gregory managed to hide himself in caves, but at night on the third day, after many prayers and fasts on the part of the people, he was found by a column of light resting over the place where he was.

What, however, was the people's joy was Gregory's profound regret. "The congratulations of strangers", he wrote to Paul the Scholastic, "on the honor to which I have been raised do not weigh upon me. But I am distinctly grieved that you, who know my wishes so well, should felicitate me, as though I had received a promotion. The highest promotion for me would be to work my own will, which, as you well know, is to earn a wished-for retirement". To John the Faster, the famous patriarch of Constantinople (582-595, September 2), who was afterwards to come into collision with Gregory : "I know how earnestly you tried to escape the episcopal yoke yourself, and yet you did nothing to prevent the same burden being imposed upon me. Clearly you love not me as you love yourself. Since, weak and unworthy, I have taken in hand an old and much battered bark, into which the water pours in all parts and the rotten timbers of which, beaten daily by direful tempests, threaten shipwreck, I pray you for God's sake stretch out to me the helping hand of your prayers". To the emperor's sister Theoctista he writes in the same strain : "I have returned to the world, pretending that as a bishop I am leaving it. I am bound to greater cares than ever I was as a layman. I have lost the solid joys of retirement, and whilst externally seeming to rise, I have fallen internally. I grieve that I am driven from my Maker's face. The emperor has given orders for an ape to become a lion. He can doubtless cause the ape to be called a lion, but he cannot make it become one".

Gregory was not, however, the man to be content with sitting down and groaning under the burden which the will of God had placed upon him. He was resolved to carry the load as far forward as he could. Although the weakness of his stomach was always troubling him, and although especially during the last five or six years of his pontificate he was constantly suffering from gout, he managed to get through more work than any ten of the secular or ecclesiastical rulers of his age were capable of—to use the striking expression of Herder, in his *Thoughts on the History of Mankind*. "I am so oppressed with the pains of gout and with my troubles that life is most wearisome to me", is the constant burden of Gregory's letters.

After a word or two on Gregory's *synodical* letter, we will make a beginning of narrating his life as Pope by considering his work for his own home, so to speak, *i.e.,* for the city of Rome. In accordance with the custom of his age, a custom certainly in vogue in the days of Gelasius I, Gregory dispatched his synodical letter to John of Constantinople, Eulogius of Alexandria, Gregory of Antioch, John of Jerusalem, and Anastasius, ex-patriarch of Antioch. The first and longer portion of this epistle is taken up with unfolding, in the language of his *Regula Pastoralis,* what manner of man a bishop ought to be, in the course of which he incidentally reminds them of the supremacy of St. Peter in the Church. In conclusion he begs their prayers, placed as he is in the midst of daily troubles which threaten to overwhelm the mind and to kill the body. He will not fail to pray for them. Hence, helping one another by prayer, they will be like men walking along a slippery road holding one another by the hand. Each one can put his foot down more securely because he is supported by his neighbor. He declared that he received the four ecumenical councils as the four Gospels; "for in them as in faced stone the structure of the faith was built up"; and that he venerated in like manner the fifth council (of Constantinople, 553). Though Gregory himself vouches for the practice of this interchange of synodical letters between the great patriarchs on the occasion of the election of a new one, only a few of those of the popes have been preserved.

In Rome itself Gregory showed himself a true pastor indeed to his people. He broke to them the bread of life which nourishes the soul and that which nourishes the body. His mind and his money were ever at the service of the Roman people. He was practically their temporal ruler as well as their spiritual head. As their priest we find him going about from church to church preaching to them, and regulating their spiritual affairs by councils held in Rome and by decrees. To preach to them he made use of the ancient Roman practice (observed in a modified form to this day) of making *stations.* At a church previously marked out, the Pope, a body of the clergy and the people assembled, to walk thence in solemn procession to the church of the *station,* where the Pope delivered a homily, and solemn or High Mass was celebrated. The church of the *station* was sometimes the church where was buried or where was specially honored the saint whose glorious death (spoken of as his *birthday, dies natalis* or *nativitatis)* was being that day celebrated. Sometimes, on the occasion of some more solemn feast day or more special event, one of the greater basilicas was selected to serve as the church of the *station.*

And so of the forty homilies of Gregory on the Gospels, either preached by him or read in his presence by a *notary* to the people, some were delivered in churches in the city dedicated to different saints of lesser fame; one at least (the 28th) in the basilica of SS. Petronilla, Nereus and Achilleus in the cemetery or Catacomb of Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina; and several in the more important basilicas of St. Peter, St. John Lateran, St Mary Major, St. Clement, etc. "In the apse and behind the altar" of the basilica of St. Petronilla, just mentioned, "stood the marble episcopal chair from which St. Gregory read his 28th Homily; it was removed by Leo III in the eighth century to the church of SS. Nereus and Achilleus. Near the niche (in the apse) a curious *graffito* is preserved on the wall, representing a priest, dressed in the *casula* (the prototype of the modern chasuble), preaching to the people, a record of St, Gregory's sermon". And it is

interesting to English Catholics to know that the Church of St. Silvester *in Capite*, given to them by Leo XIII in 1890, once echoed to the voice of the Apostle of Our Nation. In it he delivered his 9th Homily. That our readers may form for themselves an idea of the discourses delivered by Gregory to the people at the *stations*, discourses which from their practical character deservedly earned for themselves a great reputation in the Middle Ages, this very 9th Homily may well be given here.

"The Gospel of today, my dearest brethren, earnestly bids us beware lest we who have received more than others in this world be hence more heavily judged. The more has been given to us, the greater the account we shall have to render. Hence he ought to be the more humble and the more ready to serve God, who sees that he will have a greater account to render. The man who went abroad calls his servants and gives them talents to trade with. After a long time he returns to demand an account as to how they have been used. Those who bring him gain he rewards; but he condemns the unprofitable servant. Now who is that man who went into a far country but Our Redeemer who went to Heaven with the flesh he had assumed? For the natural place for the flesh is the earth, which is, as it were, taken to a foreign land when by Our Redeemer it is transported to Heaven. But when going abroad that man gave of his goods to his servants, inasmuch as he gave spiritual gifts to the faithful. To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one. The five talents are the five bodily senses—*viz*., the senses of sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch. The two represent intellect and will. The one signifies intellect. Now the one who received five talents gained other five. For there are some who, although they know not how to penetrate the internal and the mystical, still, with minds fixed on Heaven, teach truth to whomsoever they can, and from the external gifts they have received double their talents. And whilst they restrain themselves from the waywardness of the flesh, from seeking after earthly things and from taking sinful pleasure in what they see around them, by their warnings they keep others from the same evil courses. And there are some, too, who, endowed as it were with two talents, have received intellect and will, and comprehend the subtleties of internal things and in externals work wonders. And so preaching to others by their understanding and their works, they also from their trading, as it were, gain a twofold profit. Well is it said that both the five and the two talents reap profit, because whilst to both sexes the preaching is addressed, the talents received are, as it were, doubled. But the man who received the one talent went his way and hid his lord's money. To hide one's talent in the earth is to bury oneself in the things of this world, not to seek spiritual profit, and never to raise one's heart from earthly thoughts. For there are some who have intelligence but are only wise in what concerns the flesh. And when the lord returns, the servant who has doubled what was entrusted to him is praised, and to him the lord says, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful over a few things I will place thee over many: enter thou into the joy of thy lord". For few indeed are all the goods of this present life, though they may seem to be many, in comparison with an eternal reward. But the servant who would not employ his talent approached his lord with words of excuse: "Lord, I know that thou art a hard man, thou reapest where thou hast not sown, and gatherest where thou hast not strewed. And being afraid I went and hid thy talent in the earth; behold here thou hast that which is thine". The unprofitable servant says he feared to put out his talent to interest, whereas he ought only to have been afraid of returning it to his lord without interest. There are

many in the Church who are like this servant. They fear to tread the way of a better life, but do not fear to lie in sloth. Hence the lord replied to the idle servant, "Wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sow not, thou oughtest therefore to have committed my money to the bankers, and at my coming I should have received my own with usury". To commit money to the bankers is to preach to those who can put the preaching into practice. But, as you see our danger if we hold the lord's money, so my dearest brethren earnestly think of your own; for an account will be demanded of you of what you are now hearing. But let us hear the sentence passed on the unprofitable servant: 'Take away, therefore, the talent from him and give it to him that hath ten talents'. With reason is the one talent given to the servant that had the five rather than to the one that had the two. For the one that had the five was really the poorer, as he had only external gifts. Finally there is added : 'To everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall abound, but from him that hath not that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away'. Yes! for who hath charity hath every gift, and who hath it not, loses the gifts which he seemed to have acquired. Hence, my brethren, in all that you do see that you guard charity. And true charity is to love your friends in God and your enemies for God". In conclusion Gregory urges that there is no one but has received at least one *talent,* and he points out that he must use that talent for the honor of God and the good of his neighbor. If a man's *talent* be merely that he has a rich friend, he may well fear that he may be condemned for not employing his talent, if, when opportunity offers, he does not intercede with him in behalf of the poor. Let this much of this homily suffice to show the character of Gregory's addresses to the people. That they teem with allegory does not render them unpractical.

These forty homilies on the Gospels were dedicated by Gregory to his friend Secundinus, Bishop of Taormina, on the east coast of Sicily, and sent to him in 593. He complains that many of them had got into circulation without receiving his corrections. They had been taken down when he delivered them; and he likens those who did so to starving men who will not wait for the food to be cooked, but eat it half raw. He tells Secundinus that he has arranged the homilies in two volumes. In the first were the twenty which his weak health had forced him to get read by his notaries; in the second those he had preached himself. That there might be a standard text by which any copy might be corrected, Gregory assured his friend that he had deposited a complete collection of the homilies in the *scrinium* (or archives) of the Roman Church.

Gregory also preached to the people, but not at the *stations,* a number of homilies on Ezechiel. These, interrupted in their delivery by the siege of Rome (593), and corrected eight years after as best he could in the midst of his troubles, Gregory sent, at his request, to Marinianus, Archbishop of Ravenna. In sending them he remarked that he was aware that Marinianus was in the habit of drinking deep of the works of Ambrose and Augustine. And he added that with that knowledge he would not have forwarded his own homilies, was he not convinced that the occasional use of a little coarser food made one turn again with greater avidity to the more refined.

To improve the people, Gregory knew it was necessary to improve the priest. And so, from the very beginning of his pontificate, he issued a variety of decrees for the reformation of various blameworthy customs which had sprung up in the Roman Church. As many at least of these decrees were confirmed in the synod held by

Gregory, July 5, 595, the enumeration of those issued by it will show the nature of the reforms which he was striving to introduce. The decrees of the synod, signed by twenty-three bishops and thirty-five priests of titular churches, related to six subjects,

(1) By the first, the ordaining of deacons merely with the view of utilizing their voices for singing is strictly forbidden for the future. The deacons have to preach and look after the poor. The Gospel in the Mass must be sung by them, but everything else must be chanted by the inferior clergy.

(2) Henceforth the personal needs of the Pope must be attended to not by lay servants, but by clerics or monks, that they may be witnesses of his private life.

(3) The rectors of the patrimony of the Church are not to act like the officers of the public revenue and place 'titles' (boards bearing the name of the owner of the property) on lands which they imagine to belong to the Church. Such conduct implies defence of the goods of the Church by force and not by right.

(4) In honoring us the intention of the faithful is to honor St. Peter. But it behoves our infirmity ever to recognize itself and to decline honors. From love of the rulers of this See an undesirable custom has arisen. When their bodies are carried forth for burial, the faithful cover them with dalmatics, and then, tearing these to shreds, they keep the pieces as relics. They are eager to take from the bodies of sinners, but never think of taking a portion of the cloths that enwrap the bodies of the saints. For the future these coverings must never again be placed on the bodies of the deceased pontiffs.

(5) Following the old regulation of the fathers, it is strictly forbidden to any cleric to exact money for the conferring of *orders,* the pallium or the necessary documents relating thereto. A present in every way freely offered may be accepted.

(6) With regard to such slaves belonging to the Church as wish to become monks, they must be thoroughly tested before being received into a monastery, otherwise there would soon be no slaves left.

Besides these decrees for the salvation of the Romans, Gregory found it necessary, in order to counteract the doctrine of certain puritanical people in Rome, to inform "his most beloved children, the citizens of Rome", that the laws regarding the observance of the Sabbath were not to be rigidly stretched, and that of course they might wash themselves on Sunday! It was high time that such an instruction was given to the "Pope's children". For it will scarcely be believed, though it is nevertheless a fact, that a simple Irish saint (S. Conall, who died before 594), on a visit to Rome at this period, and zealous about everything *Roman,* thought these puritanical habits were approved at Rome, and introduced them into Ireland when he returned home. O'Curry tells us of a Law of Sunday, not indeed a general law enacted at Tara, "but simply a rule brought from Rome (by S. Conall) for the observance of Sunday as a day totally free from labor, with certain unavoidable exceptions. (But) ... No out or indoor labor ... no shaving ... no washing the face or hands!"

We might have been sure that when Gregory became Pope he would not have forgotten his monastery on the Coelian. Not only did he make of its abbots and monks his confidants, not only did he send them as bishops to various parts of the world, but he was at pains to secure their possessions and privileges. Some six hundred years after the

death of Gregory another abbot of St. Andrew's came (1240) before another Pope Gregory—the Ninth—and showed him a sheet of papyrus almost dropping to pieces with age. However, the writing on it could still just be read, and showed that it was 'a charter of privilege' which Gregory I had granted to the abbot Maximus or Maximianus just 650 years before! The said abbot begged the Pope to have an authentic copy of the ancient papyrus made, and then to ratify it under his seal. This Gregory IX consented to do, and it is through his bull of 1240 that we have the 'privilege' of 590 and learn these interesting particulars. The charter 2 is addressed by Gregory, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, to his most beloved son Maximus, and sets forth that the Pope owes a debt of gratitude to the monastery of St. Andrew, because it was there that he took the habit of a monk and began a new life. He therefore confirms to it for ever, and forbids anyone, even a Pope, to alienate from it the property which he and others have made over to it. Gregory in this document specifies property which he made over to the monastery three years before. Now it happens that the very deed making over that property has been preserved. The deed is dated December 28, 587. In it Gregory, "an unworthy deacon of the Apostolic See" and "Servant of the Servants of God", makes over to the abbot Maximianus, and through him to the monastery of St Andrew, certain farm properties, with their slaves, serfs, and their appurtenances of all kinds, which had been left to Gregory by a certain Desiderius, *vir clarissimus.*

The deed, as full of redundant phraseology as any modern legal document of a similar nature, is signed by Gregory, and witnessed by a *vir clarissimus*, a *vir honestus* (burgher) and notary public *(tabellaritis)* of the city of Rome, and a *reader (lector)* of the title of St. Mary. Gregory's interest in his own monastery is only a sample of his interest in the monastic order in general. But of that more will be said in another place.

Before turning to narrate deeds which show Gregory in light of Head of the Church, or of a temporal ruler and landlord, we may pass from considering him as Bishop of Rome to treat of his conduct as Metropolitan of Italy and Patriarch of the West. The Pope's metropolitical jurisdiction in Italy extended over all Italy (with the exception of the archdioceses of Ravenna, Aquileia, and Milan), Sicily and Corsica. And consequently his relations with those parts were more close than even with the rest of the West. To him pertained directly the government, through bishops approved by him personally, of the Church in that wide district. What that rule meant may be gathered from his own words: "When in the monastery I was able to restrain my tongue from useless words, and to keep my mind almost continually intent on prayer. But after I placed the pastoral burden on the shoulders of my heart, the soul could not concentrate itself, because it wandered over many things. For I am compelled to examine into cases, sometimes of churches, sometimes of monasteries, and often to deliberate upon the lives and actions of individuals. Sometimes I have to take up the affairs of the citizens, sometimes to groan under the invading swords of the barbarians, sometimes to fear the wolves that steal in to the flock committed to my care. Sometimes I have to take charge of affairs lest help be wanting to those on whom the rule of discipline is binding; sometimes to endure plunderers with equanimity, sometimes to resist them for the sake of preserving charity". Of Gregory's over eight hundred extant letters by far the greater number, as might be expected, are taken up with the business of his metropolitical

duties. And how numerous those were we may judge not merely from the general terms of the extract just quoted, but from such a fact as this—that in "the first year of his pontificate, in spite of the difficulties and complications attending removal or erection of Sees, he dealt with no less than fifteen deserted churches". The terrible campaigns of Belisarius, Narses and Alboin had played dreadful havoc not only with Christian discipline but with the ecclesiastical organization of Italy. And so "the necessities of the times urge us and the decay of the population compels us to spend anxious thought on the best way of helping destitute churches".

SICILY

Of Sicily Gregory took especial care. There had the Sicily, greater part of his ancestral estates been situated, there were the most valuable patrimonies of the Church, and thence came most of the grain for the support of the people of Rome. The very first letter in Gregory's *Register* is addressed to "the Bishops of Sicily". In it he informs them that he has sent one of his subdeacons to represent him throughout the province of Sicily, and that to him he has entrusted the management of the whole patrimony of the Roman Church. This subdeacon was Peter, with whom Gregory had been on terms of intimate friendship from his youth, and who is the same as the Peter whom he addresses in his *Dialogues.* With him the Pope bids the Sicilian bishops hold a council once a year at Syracuse or Catania to regulate what pertains to the good of the province and of the churches, to the succor of the poor and the oppressed, and to the correction of abuses. And, having in view the tendency of the Sicilians to quarrel and to the *vendetta*, he concludes by exhorting them to show by their harmonious action that their meetings are those of bishops, and to keep far away from them "hatred, the source of crimes, and jealousy, the internal, most abominable decay of souls". But if Gregory increased the burdens of the bishops of Sicily in one direction, he lightened them in another. According to ancient custom they were bound to present themselves in Rome every three years. Gregory extended the term to five years. Further, to prevent constant appeals to Rome "on small matters", and thus to facilitate the transaction of business, he appointed (October 591) Maximianus, Bishop of Syracuse, his vicar, so that there would be an authority on the island itself for the settling of any but very important affairs, the so-called *causas majores.* The civil governor, Justin, the praetor of Sicily, is also written to and exhorted to keep the peace with the bishops, having God ever before his eyes, and on no account to fail in dispensing just judgment. Among the other commissions given to Peter, was to bring back under control the monks of the city of Taurus, then situated somewhat to the north of Reggio, in the province of Bruttium, and now no longer in existence. Dispersed apparently by some inroad of the Lombards, they were wandering about all over Sicily. This incident is worth recording, as it sheds light, a wild light certainly, on the state of the times.

The Sicilian *patrimonies* will be discussed when we depict Gregory as a landlord.

Heartbroken at the devastation which he saw the Lombards everywhere inflicting on Italy, Gregory's distress was rendered still keener when the rumor reached him that they were planning a descent on Sicily. Pointing out to the bishops of Sicily what they

would have to expect if the Lombards landed in Sicily, he exhorts them to try and turn away the anger of God by ordering litanies, and by all leading a better life. “For prayer is offered to no purpose where conduct is bad”

CORSICA

From Gregory’s letters dealing with Corsica many interesting particulars may be gathered. There, as everywhere, matters, civil and religious, were in dire confusion. Harried, at least by the Lombards, the unfortunate inhabitants were so taxed by their rulers that they were reduced to selling their children to pay the tribute which was wrung from them, and at last to take refuge with the *unspeakable* Lombards themselves. For, as Gregory might well ask in his letter to the empress in behalf of the oppressed islanders, “How could they suffer more cruelly at the hands of the barbarians than to be so oppressed as to be forced to sell their children?” Hence he never ceased trying to get officials of the right stamp sent to the island. And of course he did not fail to look after their religious welfare. He encouraged the bishops who were successfully laboring to bring, or to bring back, to Christianity the still numerous idolaters; and for the spiritual benefit of the island sent there a body of monks under the abbot Orosius. And that they might not be easily scattered by marauding Lombards, as other monks before them had been who dwelt in a monastery in the open country, he directed his agent or *defensor* in Corsica to sail round the island with Orosius and pick out a spot near the sea which was either naturally strong or could be easily fortified. A sign of the times indeed!

SARDINIA

Gregory’s relations with Sardinia and with the archdioceses of Ravenna, Aquileia and Milan were the same as with Spain, Gaul and Illyricum; that is to say, his ecclesiastical dealings with all those parts were in the main conducted through the metropolitans of the various districts of those countries.

Passing easily from Corsica to Sardinia, the letters in Gregory’s *Register* reveal the same corruption among the imperial officials, the same oppression of the poor as in Corsica. The venality of the judges greatly interfered with the Pope’s efforts for the conversion of the many pagans who were still to be found in the island, especially among the rural population. For not only did they accept money from the heathens that they might be allowed to go on offering their idolatrous sacrifices, but they continued to wring the same money from them even after they had been baptized and had given up idolatry.

When called to task for such base rapacity, the judges replied that they had promised such fees *(suffragium)* for their positions that unless they got money, even by such methods, they could not fulfill their undertakings. Corruption, therefore, was seated in high places. This offering of money to obtain appointments had been forbidden by Justinian. But it went on, to the increasing misery of the provincials.

Nothing daunted by the difficulties which cropped up to prevent Gregory from accomplishing this good work of the conversion of the rustic pagan islanders (against the performance of what great act do they not spring up?), he labored on. He begged the co-operation of the landlords, and conjured the bishops of the island to stir themselves up if they would avoid his displeasure. And considering that the heathens, "living like beasts, were utterly ignorant of God", and were steeped in all kinds of degrading superstitions, he thought it well to put a little pressure on them to bring them to the truth. He accordingly ordered that such of them as were on Church lands and remained obstinate in their paganism should have their taxes raised, that the inconvenience hence arising might bring them to the truth. Later on (July 599) he advises that severer measures (stripes and imprisonment) be employed, at least against certain classes of the pagans, probably against such as practiced what was cruel or seductively injurious to the simple. If these methods may seem to some those of a tyrannical proselytizer, it must never be forgotten that the savagely cruel and the wildly licentious are inseparably connected with paganism. The first principles of humanity and civilization imperatively demand that the ferocious and outrageously licentious elements of heathenism be put down if necessary by force. And hence we see our own government, in the different countries where it comes in contact with paganism, suppressing many heathen customs, such as *suttees, witch-finding,* etc., by main force.

In Sardinia, as elsewhere, the Jews, who were there very numerous, found in Gregory a merciful defender of their just rights.

But the imperial officials on the island, mere self-seekers, showed themselves as incompetent as they were unjust. Repeatedly warned by the Pope to prepare to repel a descent of the Lombards, they allowed themselves and the island to be caught unprepared. Gregory had therefore good reason to write to Januarius (October 598): "If proper notice had been taken of the warning letters I wrote both to you and to Gennadius (the exarch of Africa), the enemy would either not have made any descent upon you at all, or if they had they would have suffered the losses they have been able to inflict". And although negotiations for peace between Agilulph and the exarch Callinicus were then on the point of being definitely concluded, Gregory exhorted Januarius to see that the walls were ceaselessly guarded till the treaty of peace was finally signed. The treaty was apparently duly sealed, but it was only for a short truce; and some nine months after the last letter (*viz*, in July 599) Gregory wrote to advise Januarius that he did not think Agilulph would renew the treaty of peace, and that, therefore, whilst there was still time, he should look to the victualling and fortifying of his own metropolitical city, Caralis (Cagliari), and other places. Truly the temporal as well as the spiritual ruler of the world at that time was Gregory the Great.

This same Januarius of Cagliari gave Gregory a great deal of trouble. A well-meaning, simple-minded man, he was incapable of displaying energy in either spiritual or temporal matters. And when, galvanized by Gregory's letters or from some other cause, he did launch forth, it was generally in the wrong direction. One Sunday before Mass he went and ploughed up a neighbor's harvest, and after Mass had his boundary stones dug up! For such vagaries, for exacting funeral fees, and for general torpor, Januarius was in constant receipt of authoritative letters from Gregory, who, considering the aged metropolitan's simplicity, old age and ill-health, was most considerate to him.

However, through Vitalis, the rector of the patrimony, he excommunicated for two months the advisers of Januarius in the matter of the harvest.

JOHN OF RAVENNA

A different character was John of Ravenna. A Roman, and, like Gregory himself, brought up in the bosom of the Holy Roman Church, he was sent by the Holy See to Ravenna, after being consecrated bishop in 578. To him, as one of his special friends, Gregory dedicated his *Pastoral Care* and expressed his great grief at his death (January 11, 595). To him also Gregory committed the care of certain of the bishops who belonged to the Pope's jurisdiction as metropolitan, because the interposition of the enemy prevented them from coming to Rome. Correspondence between them was frequent. Gregory had, however, occasion to write to him letters of expostulation and reprimand. Whether from hereditary Roman pride and haughtiness, or from undue elation at being the archbishop of the city which boasted the residence of the emperor's representative, the exarch, and which was consequently the centre of the civil and military administration of imperial Italy, John began to arrogate to himself various privileges which were not his due. Word soon reached Gregory that John was doing various things that were opposed to both the custom of the Church and to Christian humility, "which", as the Pope neatly puts it, "is the priest's only proper pride". Among other points urged against John was that of wearing the pallium at forbidden times. To Gregory's remonstrance, John replied warmly, in a letter now lost, citing as an excuse for his conduct a privilege which John III had granted (September 569) to a former archbishop of Ravenna. In reply, after reminding him that it was contrary to ecclesiastical custom for him not to have submitted with patience to his correction even had it been unjust, Gregory shows the archbishop that the custom everywhere was that the pallium had only to be worn during Mass, and that he had failed to prove any exceptional privilege. He must therefore conform to the general custom. However, to do honor to John, and despite the opposition of the Roman clergy, the Pope concedes the use of 'mappulae' (ornamental vestments worn only by the Roman clergy) to his 'first deacons'. In acknowledging the receipt of this letter, "a compound of honey and vinegar", as he calls it, John asked whether it was likely he could have wished to go against that most Holy See, which gives its laws to the universal Church, and to preserve the authority of which he had incurred much hostility. Conscious to himself that he had done nothing but what had been done before him, he is consoled in the midst of his trouble by the reflexion that sometimes fathers chastise their children to make them purer, and that "after this devotion and satisfaction you may not only preserve the old privileges of the holy Church of Ravenna, which is yours in a very special way, but may grant it new ones". John concludes by begging the Pope not to diminish the privileges which the Church of Ravenna has hitherto enjoyed, and assuring him of his obedience meanwhile. Somewhat over a year later (October 594) Gregory granted the archbishop leave to wear the pallium four times a year during the solemn litanies, till such times as the ancient custom of the Church of Ravenna could be thoroughly examined. For this concession Gregory discovered that he received fair words from

John in his letters, but that the archbishop let his tongue loose against him at home. His duplicity and pride were severely reprimanded by Gregory; for, as he said, he could not tolerate any arrogant assumption of rights. And he took care to let John know that he had instructed his apocrisiarius (Sabinian) at Constantinople to find out from the leading bishops (*i.e.*, the eastern patriarchs, etc.), who had from 300 to 400 bishops under them, what was the custom with them as to the times of wearing the pallium. Most touching, however, was the conclusion of the letter: "Be straightforward with your brethren. Do not say one thing and have another in your heart. Seek not to seem greater than you are, that you may be greater than you seem. Believe me, when I reached my present position I was animated with such feelings of love towards you, that had you been willing to reciprocate them, you would never have found one who would have loved you better or served you with more zeal. But I must confess that when I learnt your words and conduct I shrank back. I beg you, therefore, by Almighty God, to amend what I have pointed out, especially the vice of duplicity. Permit me to love you. For it will be for your benefit both in this life and the next to be loved by your brethren. To all this reply not in words but by your conduct"

To change his conduct not much time was allowed to John. He died very shortly after (January 11, 595) the receipt of the last-mentioned letter. His successor, Marinianus, was also a Roman. He had been one of Gregory's friends in the monastery, and was asked for by the Ravennese when Gregory had rejected the two candidates they had chosen. Marinianus seems to have proved rather a small-minded man, whom Gregory had to admonish that "Our Redeemer expects from a priest not gold but souls". Marinianus imagined that he was doing good if he looked after the temporalities of his See in a close-fisted manner and continued to live like a monk. Gregory, however, did not. He wrote to one of his friends at Ravenna to rouse up the archbishop, to tell him that with his position he must change his mind, that he must not think that prayer and study were enough for him, and that if he does not want to carry in vain the name of bishop he must act. Narrow-mindedness, however, was the worst fault of Marinianus. He was free from the ambition which besmirched the character of his predecessor, and, as we shall see, of many of his successors. He never lost the friendship of Gregory. To him the Pope dedicated his homilies on Ezechiel; and when he was ill nothing could exceed Gregory's kindness to him. He consulted the most learned physicians in Rome on his case, sent him their opinions, and though at the time like to die himself, he begged the archbishop to come to Rome, so that he might take care of him.

After premising that sufficient has been said of Gregory's relations with the metropolitan of Aquileia in schism, and that, in connection with the same schism of the *Three Chapters,* Milan, which figured as a metropolitan See as early as the fourth century, has been also treated of, we may pass on to some of the important metropolitan Sees of Illyricum. In the division of the empire made by Constantine, Illyricum was divided into Western and Eastern. Western Illyricum embraced the Roman province of Illyricum (which stretched from the rivers Arsia and Dravus to the Drilo, and was bounded by Macedonia and Moesia Superior), Illyricum Proper, *i.e.*, most of modern Albania (from the Drilo to the Ceraunian Mountains, and bounded on the east by Macedonia), Pannonia and Noricum. Eastern Illyricum included Dacia, Moesia, Macedonia, and Thrace, all south of the Danube. These two *Illyricums (less*

Thrace), which were comprehended in the later *Dioceses* of Illyricum, Dacia, Macedonia, and Thrace, were subject to the Pope as Patriarch of the West. And so in his letter to the Emperor Michael (September 25, 860), Nicholas I, in substantial accord with Innocent I (402-17), averred that of old were subject to the Roman Church the Old and New Epirus, Illyricum, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Dacia Ripensis, Dacia Mediterranea, Moesia, Dardania, and Praevalis, *i.e.,* all the country south of the Danube to the sea, with the exception of Thrace. Now in Eastern Illyricum Gregory had two vicars. One resided at Prima Justiniana, anciently Scupi, and now Scopia or Uskup, on the Axius (now Vardar), the principal river in Macedonia, and his powers extended over the Latin portion of Eastern Illyricum, over the civil diocese or government of Dacia. The other was the bishop of Thessalonica, whose metropolitan jurisdiction extended over Greece and the Greek portion of Eastern Illyricum, over the civil diocese of Macedonia. The apostolic vicariate of Thessalonica, established by Pope Damasus or his successor, originally embraced the whole of Eastern Illyricum, *i.e.,* the civil dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia. But Justinian, anxious to glorify his birthplace (Scupi), founded there a fine city, gave to it his name (Justiniana Prima), transferred to it the residence of the Praetorian Prefect of Illyricum, and made it a metropolitan See over the bishops of Dacia. At the same time Pope Vigilius declared the new metropolitan his vicar.

Gregory's extant correspondence shows that he was in constant communication as a ruler with Illyricum, both western and eastern, with its vicars, its metropolitans and its bishops. Acting in conjunction with the imperial authority, Gregory directed a letter to "all the bishops throughout Illyricum" (May 591), on the subject of providing means of livelihood for those bishops who had been driven from their Sees by the incursions of the dreaded Avars with their subject Slavonic tribes. The Avars, a Turanian people, of the same stock as the Huns before them, and the Hungarians after them, invaded the Roman Empire towards the close of the reign of Justinian, settled on the Middle Danube, soon founded a large loosely-jointed empire of marauders which they almost as soon lost at the hands of the Slavs (early part of seventh century), and were finally crushed by Charlemagne. Whilst Gregory was Pope their wild ravages did a great deal of damage in Illyricum. The Avars and Slavs were one of the troubles of Gregory's life. And if at one time he is elated with news of their defeat, at another he is depressed by their success. "Concerning the Slavs, who are so seriously threatening you", writes Gregory to Maximus, Bishop of Salona, the metropolitan See of Dalmatia, "I am very much afflicted and grieved. I am afflicted by what I suffer in you, I am grieved because through Istria they have begun to find a way into Italy". One of the results of the Avar incursions was that through the destruction of their episcopal cities many of the Illyrian bishops were rendered destitute. Maurice, who was very much disposed to take the initiative in matters ecclesiastical, wrote to Jobinus, the prefect of the praetorium of Illyricum, ordering that the bishops whose Sees were yet intact should support those who had lost theirs, and instructing Jobinus to inform the Pope of the arrangement he had made. In his letter to the Illyrian bishops, Gregory added his injunction to that of the emperor. He reminded them that over and above the command of an earthly sovereign there was that of the Eternal King by which we have to help in their bodily necessities even those who have caused us trouble, not to say our brethren

and bishops. He concluded his letter by assuring the bishops whom he wished to give hospitality that he did not give their destitute brethren any authority in their dioceses.

We have various other authoritative communications of Gregory to bishops both of Western and Eastern Illyricum. Just before the dispatch of the last-mentioned letter, he had sent (March 591) off another to one of the Dalmatian bishops, Malchas, in which he commissioned him to compel Stephen, bishop of the important city of Scodra (Scutari), on the Barbana, to submit a dispute he had with one of the court of the prefect of the praetorium of Italy to arbitration. Malchas had also to see that the award was put into effect.

In connection with Eastern Illyricum there is a letter of Gregory to Felix, Bishop of Sardica, now the capital of Bulgaria, Sophia, and then in the province of Dacia Mediterranea, reminding Felix that from what he himself expects from his own subjects he ought to understand what obedience requires. Gregory expresses the sorrow he felt when he was informed by John of Prima Justiniana of the way in which he (Felix) set at nought the commands of his metropolitan. Gregory impresses on the recalcitrant bishop that he will have to obey; but in one of his happy phrases adds: “But you will do well if you will let your mature reflexion make you what canon law will force you to become”. John had himself just received the pallium and had been recognized as papal vicar by Gregory. Informed by the bishops of Eastern Illyricum that their unanimous choice and the consent of the Emperor Maurice had fallen on John, and in response to their request, Gregory authoritatively ratified their choice, recognized his consecration, sent him the pallium, and nominated him his vicar, according to custom. The subject of this letter was probably not the same man as the John of P. Justiniana with whom Gregory had the difficulty concerning Adrian, Bishop of Thebes, in 592. But if Gregory concurred with the emperor’s choice in the matter of John’s consecration, he would not have him deposed in accordance with the emperor’s wishes. Maurice wanted his deposition on the ground of his ill-health, and that the times required that the cities should not be without the care of their bishops lest “they might be destroyed by the enemy”. Evidently in the days of Gregory he was not the only bishop who was as much the military or civil governor as the ecclesiastical superior of his See. He pointed out to the emperor that it was against the canons that a bishop should be deposed on account of sickness. “Depose him I cannot, lest I defile my soul with sin”. The Pope, however, instructed his apocrisiarius at Constantinople to suggest that an auxiliary might be given him who would do all the active work. John was not deposed. Gregory was still in correspondence with him in March 602.

Despite the accession of authority which the will of Justinian had brought to the bishop of his new city, Gregory made it plain that the first bishop of Eastern Illyricum was still the bishop of Thessalonica. In his *Register* there are two letters of the Pope to various metropolitans mentioned by name. In each case it is Eusebius of Thessalonica who occupies the first place. Of course Eusebius was one of the many with whom Gregory corresponded. At one time the Pope is bidding him examine certain clergy suspected of heresy, at another he is warning him that his (Gregory’s) letters had been corrupted by their bearer, and, on the other hand, defending Alcison, Bishop of Corcyra, from oppression at the hands of his metropolitan’s officials.

Other events, which we prefer to relate in illustration of Gregory's dealings with the emperor, will also avail to further elucidate his action in Illyricum,

AFRICA

The famous sixth canon of the first council of Nice Africa, recognized as belonging to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Alexandria, Egypt and Libya, which latter included the Pentapolis "and the parts of Libya about Cyrene" (Acts II. 10). Our present concern is with the remaining portion of North Africa. The Church in North Africa was for many ages in a most flourishing condition. It had produced such men as Tertullian, St. Cyprian and St. Augustin. But before the middle of the fifth century it had been rudely shattered by the savage Vandals from Spain. Their rule, or rather misrule, though never to be forgotten for its ferocity, did not last long. In 535 Africa was re-added to the *Roman* Empire by the genius of Belisarius. However, some twelve years before the coming of Belisarius, the persecution of the Catholics had ceased with the advent to the throne of Hilderic (523). Efforts were at once made to reorganize the Church. Councils were held (525 and 535) and Rome consulted. At Gregory's accession Africa was divided into six provinces, presided over, like the various provinces in Italy, by an exarch. Counting westwards from Libya, the provinces were Tripolis (the country of the *Three Cities,* Sabrata, or Abrotonum, Oea and Leptis Magna), Byzacium or Byzacene, Proconsular Africa, Numidia, Mauritania Sitifensis and Mauritania Caesariensis.

With regard to the ecclesiastical organization of these provinces, it may be safely stated that it was exceptional, but not so safely what it actually was. The most important bishop in Northern Africa was the bishop who had his episcopal throne at Carthage, and who exercised the rights of a metropolitan over all the provinces. Constantine the Great wrote to him in connection with Numidia and Mauritania as well as with proconsular Africa, and speaks of him as the head of, or as the one who presides over, the latter Church. And the great council of Hippo-Regius (393) recognized the position of the bishop of Carthage when it decreed (can. 1 and 4) that certain matters of interest for all the African provinces had to be settled by him. The bishop of Carthage then was not only the metropolitan, as the African title had it, of his own province of proconsular Africa, but was the metropolitan of the remaining provinces. In these latter, neither the first of the subordinate archbishops or primates (again called the *bishop of the first See),* nor, presumably, the subordinate primates themselves, had their episcopal thrones in any fixed city. They succeeded to their position as primate, and ultimately as *first primate,* by some automatic arrangement agreed to among themselves. The consequence was that the See of the *first primate* was often to be found in some very second-rate town. The *classical* authority for this statement seems to be a letter of Gregory, in which he asked the exarch of Africa to cause the bishops to be admonished: "Not to make their primate from the order of his position, setting aside merit; since before God it is not a more elevated station that wins approval, but a better conducted life. And let the primate himself reside, not, as the custom is, here and there in different towns, but in one city, according to his election". Following in the wake of St. Leo IX (1049-1055), it has been

generally agreed among historians that it was *length or duration of episcopal consecration* which settled the acquisition of primatial dignity. In his note to this letter, however, Ewald not unnaturally fails to see how *number of years of ordination* can be got out of the words, *ex ordine loci*. Doubtless not directly; but, though automatic arrangements, by which ecclesiastical preeminence in a province might be settled other than that of seniority may be imagined, promotion by age must be acknowledged to be in every way the most likely. If this be conceded, Ewald's difficulty would be solved, and the explanation of Leo IX stands good. For age would settle the position *(ordo)* of the primates among themselves, and then the senior amongst them would become the primate of the first See.

It remains to be settled what was the relation of the Pope to the Church in Africa. Did he treat with the Bishop of Carthage as with one of the great patriarchs, or as with one of the great metropolitans of the West? That is, did he deal with the African Church as Patriarch of the West, or only as head of the whole Church? A letter of Pope Siricius to the African bishops (ad. an. 386) is sometimes quoted as deciding the matter in favor of the former supposition, viz., that the Pope ruled Africa as patriarch. In the letter in question, Siricius inserted the canons of a council just held in Rome. By the first of these, the ordination of a bishop "without the knowledge of the Apostolic See, *i.e.,* of the primate", was forbidden. But it is pointed out that this was an encyclical letter, and would have to be interpreted according to the custom in vogue in the different parts to which it was sent. Hence in Africa it might simply mean that no bishop must be consecrated without the knowledge of the primate (of the province). There is no doubt that, although the bishop of Carthage never had the power of the patriarchs of Antioch or Alexandria, he may very well have had a more independent jurisdiction than, say, the Bishop of Thessalonica. But as the African Church owed its origin to the See of Rome, and as Gregory exercised very direct control over the African Church, it may well be treated of when that Pope is being considered as Patriarch of the West. Because men are very prone to prefer their long-accustomed *mumpsimus,* the bishops of Africa were probably not at all pleased when Gregory's wishes in connection with their mode of electing their primate by seniority instead of by merit were made known to them. For it is certain that they had petitioned Gregory's predecessor for the confirmation of their ancient customs, "which long usage had preserved up till then from the time of their first conversion from Rome", or, keeping closer to the original, "from the beginning of their orders (received from) Bl. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles". It fell to Gregory to reply to the petition of the Numidian bishops. But though he might express a wish that they should themselves alter their customs, with the conservative spirit which has generally animated the popes of not interfering with established custom, Gregory consented to allow their customs, "whether for constituting their primates or other matters", to remain inviolate, as it was at least clear that they were not "opposed to Catholic faith". However, he would not permit that anyone, who had formerly been a Donatist and had afterwards become a bishop, should ever become a primate, even if their position, (*ordo*, obtained, as we have said, by seniority), entitled them to the rank.

Next it is the primate of Africa, Dominicus of Carthage, who asks Gregory for the confirmation of his privileges. "Lay aside all anxiety on that matter", replied Gregory, "and let your fraternity hold to the ecclesiastical privileges concerning which you write.

For as we defend our own rights we preserve those of all the other churches. For favor I will not grant to anyone more than he deserves, nor at the suggestion of ambition will I take away from anyone what is his due. For in all things am I anxious to honor my brethren and to advance them as far as possible without detriment to the rights of others".

We have now to turn to another of the African provinces, to Byzacium, and to the judging of its primate by the Pope. Crementius, thought by Hartmann to be the same as Clementius, Primate of Byzacium, had been accused of some crime (what, is not stated), a notice of which had been brought before the emperor. "In accordance with the canons", he referred the matter to the Pope. At first Crementius was able to set everybody at defiance. He had no difficulty in buying the support of an important imperial official for forty pounds of gold. Then, finding that the emperor was urgent in pressing the Pope to move in the matter, and that his fellow-bishops were contriving to make things objectionable for him, Crementius appealed to Rome, declaring that he was subject to the Apostolic See. Though Gregory doubted the sincerity of his appeal, he took occasion therefrom to remark to John of Syracuse, into whose hands he was entrusting the investigation of the case, that "Where there was question of fault among bishops, he did not know what bishop was not subject to it". Nearly four years after the bishop of Carthage was still unjudged. Various affairs, but most of all "the enemies that rage on all sides of us", the Lombards, had prevented the Pope from pushing on the case. In March 602, in a letter "to all the bishops of the province (council as it was called) of Byzacium", Gregory entrusted the task of examining the charges against their primate to the bishops of his province, that if proved they might be canonically amended, and if shown to be false an innocent brother might be freed from galling accusations". He begged them not to be influenced by blandishments of any kind, but "to gird themselves up to find out the truth, for God's sake, like true priests".

Not only this case of Crementius, of whom no more is known, but divers others show Gregory's supreme authority in Africa. Now he is defending a priest or deacon against a bishop, and now ordering the trial of bishops charged with beating their clergy and with simony or with encroaching on the diocese of another. Then there are letters to the primates exhorting them to be careful in the matter of those they raise to sacred orders, and not to confer them on boys or for gold; and to the civil authorities, asking them to co-operate with the bishops in efforts to restore discipline, naturally much upset by the rapid rise and fall of the rule of the Arian Vandals, and to repress the avarice of their own subordinates. We shall return to Africa when we come to tell of Gregory's efforts to heal the schism of the Donatists.

SPAIN

The course of our investigations leads us now to the country whence came (about 427) the Vandals to Africa, *viz.*, to Spain. Of all the provinces of the Roman Empire, Spain had been one of the finest. To the imperial throne it had given perhaps the greatest number of those who had been any ornament to it—Trajan, Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius. Pagan literature had been ennobled by the writings of the Spanish

Seneca, Christian beautified by the poems of Prudentius. In the Chair of Peter had sat Damasus, and in place of Peter's successor at the first ecumenical council had figured in deserved honor Hosius of Cordova. But in Spain, as in the other provinces of the empire, a disease, which even Christianity could not arrest, was eating its way. The corruption of the heart of the empire spread to its members. An earnest of what worse was to come, a horde of Suevi and other barbarians, crossed the Pyrenees (about 260), and for some twelve years laid waste the land by fire and sword. This storm then passed away, but in the beginning of the fifth century burst another which was to devastate the whole country. First came Alans, Suevi and Vandals, and divided the country between them, only to have to fight for it against the Visigoths. The Alans were annihilated, the Suevi driven into the fastnesses of the North-West; the Vandals left Spain *(c.* 427) for Africa. But this did not mean peace for the wretched Spaniards or their country. Not only were the Suevi constantly descending in arms from their mountains, but the *Romans,* who had never lost their hold on the sea-coast towns, especially in the South-East, were ever pushing forward from the latter quarter by fomenting any disturbance that might arise. And with Arian Visigoth persecuting Catholic Spaniard, with raiding Frank and Suevi, and with one Visigothic king ascending the throne over his assassinated predecessor, there were disturbances enough. However, when Gregory came to have spiritual authority over Spain, whether as Patriarch of the West or as Head of the Universal Church, matters had taken a turn for the better. The Suevi had been finally subdued under Leovigild (570-587); and the Arian persecution (of which more later) terminated by the conversion of his son Recared to Catholicity. Thus, with the exception of the South-East portion, still belonging to the Roman Empire, Spain was ruled in the year 590 by a Catholic sovereign of the nation of the Visigoths, Recared (587-601).

There is no need, however, to be told that religion, learning and morality were not in a satisfactory state in Spain in the year 590. Here we shall merely pause to note in this connection an interesting letter addressed to "the most Blessed Lord Pope Gregory" in the early years of his pontificate by Licinianus, Bishop of Carthagena. In the course of passing a most favorable judgment on the Pope's *Pastoral Rule,* and asking that his other works might be sent to him, he gives an indication of the decay of learning in Spain. "Necessity", writes the bishop, "compels us to do what you say ought not to be done. For if no duly instructed person can be found who can be advanced to sacred orders, what is left to be done but to ordain some ill-instructed person like myself? You say that the uninstructed must not be ordained. But let your prudence consider whether to know Jesus Christ and Him Crucified may not be enough. If it is not, no one here can be said to be instructed. And we shall have no priests if we are only to have duly qualified ones ... I know your precepts must be obeyed, that only such be ordained as apostolic authority orders. But such are not to be found ... We are therefore left in this difficulty. Either those must be ordained who ought not to be, or there will be no one to celebrate the sacred mysteries".

His friendship with St. Leander of Seville would have been quite enough to turn Gregory's thoughts towards Spain. A regular correspondence was kept up between the two; and in August 599 Gregory sent the pallium to his friend "only to be used during the celebration of mass. Whilst sending it, I ought also to send you word how you

should live. I do not, however, because your virtuous life has anticipated my words. How far I am overcome by work and weakness you may estimate from this short letter, in which even to him whom I greatly love I say little". It would seem that by sending him the pallium Gregory made Leander his vicar in Spain, *i.e.*, in the Visigothic portion of it.

Of the five provinces into which Constantine divided Spain itself, while three, Lusitania, Galicia, Tarragona, were wholly in the hands of the Visigoths, part of Baetica and Carthagena were still, as we have said, in the hands of the *Romans.* Had this portion been administered in the interests of its inhabitants, a course which would also have been in the interest of the empire, instead of remaining Roman till only about the year 616, it would have served as a base from which the rest of the peninsula might have been won back to the obedience of the Caesars. But like Africa and the parts of Italy still under the *Romans,* it was administered solely in the interests of the greedy imperial officials who ruled it. Of Gregory's further relations with Spain, apart from correspondence in connection with the conversion of the Visigoths (which will be spoken of in another place), but very little is known. However, towards the close of his pontificate he seems to have come into collision in Roman Spain with one of the avaricious and insolent governors just alluded to. In 603 Roman Spain was apparently under the rule of the 'glorious' Comitiolus. If it be lawful to draw conclusions, from the one-sided account of the affair which has reached us, this 'glorious' official behaved in the most high-handed manner with regard to two bishops, Januarius of Malaga and a certain Stephen. On the pretext that they had entered into a treasonable correspondence with the enemies of the empire, he had contrived to get some other bishops to pass sentence of deposition against them and ordain others in their stead. He then expelled them from their Sees by force, though they claimed the benefit of *sanctuary,* and plundered their property. The ill-treated bishops at once appealed to Rome. Gregory took up their case, in the justice of which, from the cast of the documents he drew up for their cause, he evidently believed. And he dispatched the *defensor* John to Spain (August 603) to thoroughly investigate the affair on the spot. It is from the papers with which the Pope furnished him on that occasion that all our acquaintance with the affair is derived. They were three in number. The first, called a *capitulare,* gave the *defensor* the most elaborate instructions as to how he was to conduct his investigations and enquire into the validity of all the proceedings which had been taken against the bishops. These instructions show at once Gregory's knowledge of the processes of law and the practical, painstaking care with which he himself examined the cases which came before him. John was directed to examine, with regard to the trial to which the bishops, or at least Bishop Stephen, had been subjected, whether it had been conducted in accordance with the prescribed forms, of law, and whether the accusers and witnesses were distinct persons. He was to examine into the gravity of the case and see whether it was deserving of exile or of deprivation, then whether the testimony had been given on oath, in presence of the accused, or had been committed to writing, and whether the accused had had permission to reply and defend himself. John was further ordered to look into the characters of the accusers and witnesses and see whether they were needy, and so more naturally open to be bribed, or whether they had any enmity against the accused. He had also to enquire whether their evidence was mere hearsay or whether they spoke from their own knowledge and so forth. The second instrument with

which John was furnished was a list of the laws of the State against which, if the case as put by the exiled bishop were true, their opponents had run counter, or which were likely to be involved in the reopening of the affair. This list of imperial enactments serves to illustrate the fact (otherwise well known) that the ideas of Christianity and the laws of the Church had so deeply influenced the Christian emperors that their laws were largely framed in accordance with those views. Among the laws cited by Gregory were acts decreeing the punishment of death against those who violated the rights of *sanctuary,* or inflicted any injury on a bishop in church. Deprivation of office and a heavy fine was the punishment decreed against the secular official who caused a bishop to be dragged before him without an imperial commission. For it was the law of the empire that bishops had to be tried by their metropolitans. And if, adds Gregory, it be urged that the said bishop Stephen had no metropolitan or patriarch, the cause ought to have been brought for settlement before the apostolic See, which is the head of all the churches, a course which the bishop, who regarded the bishops of the neighboring province as prejudiced, is known to have desired.

John was also furnished with a copy of a formula, according to which he was to pronounce sentence, if Januarius proved to be innocent; and with a commission, to visit, on his way to Spain, the Island of Capria (Cabrera, near Majorca), and reform, if necessary, the discipline of a body of monks there. Whether or not the papal *defensor* carried out these injunctions is not known; but "obvious", as the non-Catholic authors of the *Histoire Universelle* now in course of publication, note, is the effective supremacy of the Bishop of Rome in Spain. This authority was exercised over the whole of Spain, till its subjugation by the Moors in 711. For that Witiza (701-709), the last but one of the Visigothic kings of Spain, bad as he may have been, prohibited his subjects under pain of death from corresponding with or yielding obedience to the popes is the most baseless of assertions.

THE LAND OF THE FRANKS

Crossing the Pyrenees and avoiding a narrow strip of land *(Septimania)* touching the Gulf of Lyons, which was in the hands of the Visigoths, we enter the country of the Franks. Of all the Germanic tribes who won for themselves a home in the Roman Empire, the Franks were the noblest. Soon after the beginning of their conquests, salted with Catholicity, they formed an enduring kingdom. The Ostrogoths of Italy, the Visigoths of Spain, the Vandals of Africa passed away and left little or no trace behind them. But the Franks gave their name to a land famous to this day in the annals of the world's history. And it would never do for a Catholic historian not to treat of France, a country that has never ceased to be Catholic, and a country at all times great, even from time to time in its crimes; and which, while never mean, hypocritical or sordid, has often been the wonder and admiration of the civilized world for its deeds of startling glory.

The name and fame of the Franks was made by Clovis. This chieftain led his wild warriors from their homes about the lower Rhine into Gaul, broke to pieces the last remnant of the Roman power there, overran the whole of it, and died (511) master of most of it. Some twenty years after his death (534) almost the whole of the present

France, and a considerable portion of the modern Germany, had been completely subjugated by the Franks. But for several centuries no strong kingdom arose out of the ashes which they made. At the root of the trouble during those ages was the unfortunate custom which prevailed (a custom in the matter of private property fatally reintroduced into modern France) of kings dividing their territories among all their sons. Hence endless plots, counterplots and civil wars, and the constant aggrandizement of turbulent nobles at the expense of king and people alike. To these potent causes of fearful disorder among the Franks in Church and State, was added the large proportion of incompetent rulers among the descendants of Clovis. The disease, viz., excess, which always with fatally degenerating effects attacks more or less barbaric races brought into contact with a high state of material civilization, did not fail to assail the Franks. Excess begot monsters and imbeciles. And so Gregory of Tours can only describe the character of Chilperic of Neustria (*d.* 584), by calling him "the Herod and Nero of our times". His queen Fredegonda (Fredegundis, *d.* 597), in every way infamously worthy of her spouse, and Brunichildis (Brunhild, Brunehaut, *d.* 613), the wife of Sigebert of Austrasia, goaded to desires of vengeance by the crimes of Fredegonda, kept all the Frankish kingdoms in a wild turmoil for thirty years.

When St. Gregory became Pope, all *Gaul*, not for the first time in its history, was divided politically into three parts—Neustria (though this name did not come into use till later), Austrasia and Burgundy. Neustria (between the Loire and the Meuse—the western kingdom) was then ruled by Clotaire II (584-628); Austrasia by Childebert II (Hildebert), 575-596, and Burgundy by Guntram (561-593). Austrasia, the eastern kingdom, may be said to have stretched from the Meuse to the Rhine, and even down to the Danube. Burgundy was more or less the valley of the Rhone. Childebert II, who was the son of Brunichildis, became the lord of Burgundy and Aquitaine on the death of Guntram (593). Clotaire II lived to be sole king of the Franks (613-628).

When it is remembered that in addition to the causes of disorder just specified, ecclesiastical positions were, through the interference of kings, one and all to be got for money; that *neophytes* laymen unprepared for the clerical state, were consecrated bishops, and that mad tyrants like Chilperic, who published verses, "in which there was not a trace of metre", and added Greek letters to the Roman alphabet (ordering that his new characters should be taught in the schools and that old parchments should be cleaned with pumice stone and rewritten with his letters), took to legislating on the Blessed Trinity—when these additional facts are borne in mind, it will be easy to conclude that the task Gregory had before him to effect a reformation of manners in Frank-land was greater than one man could accomplish. Things were so bad that the very nobles themselves thus complained to Guntram of Burgundy. "The whole people is sunk in vice. Everyone takes pleasure in doing what is wicked. No one fears the king or respects the nobility. If anyone attempts to remedy the evils, there is straightway a tumult among the people. No ruler is safe who has not learnt to hold his tongue".

Among the Franks, indeed, there was no wholesale conversion from paganism or from error to be effected. For had not Clovis been baptized (496) some hundred years before Gregory became Pope, and had not the Franks followed his example? But in a hundred years the Franks, as we have seen, had not quite changed the color of their skin or lost their spots! Their worship of brute force had not been eradicated, and so their

Christianity was still of the muscular type. The line of demarcation between might and right was not broad to them. Much had yet to be done ere the Franks could be got to adopt the moral obligations which follow from the acceptance of the Christian faith. In the days of Gregory not only were simony and the intrusion of laymen into episcopal sees rampant among the Franks, but their kings were disposed to regard the bishops merely as a class or division of their lay nobility, and the property of their sees as crown lands, only crown lands which could be more easily confiscated and disposed of at their will than those in the hands of their more warlike nobles. Gregory tried to give true freedom to the bishops of the Franks, by striving to unite them more closely with one another and with the See of Rome. The history of the Christian world has shown plainly that when in full communication and dependence on the popes, then are the bishops truly free in the exercise of their spiritual duties and respected by men who do not wish to have their beliefs as well as their civil duties regulated by *Caesar*. The Liberties of the Gallican Church in later ages made the bishops of France mere tools of the king and justly, at length, hateful to their flocks. Throwing off the yoke of Rome has made the present Anglican bishops subject to a woman and her mixed lay tribunals. Separation from Rome has placed the bishops of Eastern Europe and the East under a Russian despot or a Turkish Sultan. For the spiritual freedom of themselves and their people it is an evil day when bishops cut themselves adrift from the bark of Peter.

To unite the bishops of the Franks to the Holy See, Gregory acceded to the united request of Childebert II and Virgilius, Bishop of Arles, and made the latter his vicar in the kingdom of Childebert, which then embraced Austrasia, Burgundy and Aquitaine, and sent him the much-coveted pallium (August 12, 595). The letters which the Pope dispatched on that occasion to Virgilius, to Childebert and to the bishops of his kingdom are models of the way in which unpalatable truths may be presented so as to be accepted by the one who hears them. As regards Virgilius himself, he (the Pope) has heard of his great charity and never imagines that in asking for the pallium and to be the Pope's vicar Virgilius is merely thinking of external honor and glory. He is rather as a good child turning to his mother. Hence as he (the Pope) cheerfully grants what has been asked of him, he confidently looks for greater episcopal zeal in one who has received increased honor. He has heard that in Gaul and Germany simony and the ordination of neophytes is extensively practiced. Virgilius will doubtless put them down. "If men in building are careful to have the walls properly dried before they put weight upon them, and the sap out of the wood before they fix it in its place, why should we have unprepared men in the Church?". Gregory concludes his letter by definitely naming Virgilius his vicar, and sending him the pallium. Bishops are not to go away any distance without the authority of the new vicar, who, if any more difficult question concerning the faith or any other important question arises, is to try and settle the matter in a synod of twelve bishops. If it cannot be there decided, it must be referred to the Pope. Gregory makes all these arrangements *in accordance with ancient custom*. The giving of the pallium to the bishops of Arles can be traced back to Pope Symmachus, who, in 513, gave it St. Cesarius of Arles. And some hundred years before that (viz., in 417) Pope Zosimus is known to have made Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, his vicar, and to have decided that the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonensis Prima and Secunda, were to be consecrated by the Archbishop of Arles; that from all Gaul questions were to be referred to Arles for answer, unless the importance of the subject

required the Pope's investigation, and that bishops were not to go any distance without 'litterae formatae' from the metropolitan of Arles.

In writing to inform Childebert that, in accordance with his wishes, he has named Virgilius, whom he elsewhere calls *metropolitan of the Gauls,* his vicar, he says: "Certain matters have come to our knowledge which grievously offend Almighty God and inflict the greatest possible harm on the honor and reverence due to the priesthood. Hence we beg that with the co-operation of your power these matters may be thoroughly corrected, lest whilst things go on which are opposed to your devotion, either your kingdom or your soul may suffer through the fault of others". Needless to say, the things which Gregory thereupon proceeded to denounce were simony and the ordination of neophytes. The king would not put an untried general at the head of his armies; let him then see to it that untried men be not made leaders of souls.

With the same ends in view, *viz.*, to promote episcopal unity and to improve the state of the clergy in the different kingdoms of the Franks, Gregory listened to the request of Brunichildis that the pallium might be conferred on Syagrius of Autun. After the death of Childebert II (596), Brunichildis became regent to her two grandsons Theoderic (Thierry) and Theodobert. Gregory was willing to grant the favor because he knew that Syagrius was in the good graces of Brunichildis, and he trusted that by his influence a council might be got together and the evils that choked the Church among the Franks lessened. For some cause or other in this particular instance Gregory consulted the Emperor Maurice about the bestowal of the pallium. However, despite the combined desire of Brunichildis and the emperor, Gregory only granted it on certain conditions.

He expresses himself as pleased with all he has heard about Syagrius, and especially with what he did to help forward the mission of St. Augustine to England. But two points have delayed the transmission of the pallium, he says. The first was the fact that the queen's messenger who had come for the pallium was infected with the schism of the *Three Chapters.* Before leaving the messenger and going to the second point, his answer to Gregory's question, "Why he was separated from the Universal Church", is so typical of what so many who are today in error and schism might truly say, that it cannot be passed over. He declared that he knew not. He understood neither what he said nor what he heard. The second point was that Syagrius had not himself asked for the pallium. And in accordance with ancient custom it was only bestowed on those who made a formal request for it. However, to oblige the queen, Gregory sent the pallium to Candidus, the *rector* of the patrimony of the Roman Church in Gaul, on the understanding that if Syagrius and some of his suffragans presented a petition for it, it would be granted to him. Of course the Pope in return for his acquiescence to her wishes begs Brunichildis to repress simony, lest, as he wisely adds, it may sap the strength of your kingdom; not to suffer laymen to be consecrated bishops, to try to bring back to the unity of the faith those who have gone astray on the *Three Chapters,* since not reason but malicious ignorance has caused them to fly from the Universal Church and the four patriarchs, and to put down the remains of idolatry, the worship of trees or the heads of animals. The Pope exhorts her to do all this, lest God inflict on her people the scourge of perfidious nations (apparently the Avars), with which he has chastised many.

When Syagrius had complied with Gregory's requirements, the pallium was duly conferred upon him, and by virtue "of a concession of our authority", the Pope decided that "proper regard being paid to the rights of metropolitans", the See of Autun was in future to rank after that of Lyons. The letter by which the grant of these privileges was conveyed to Syagrius closed with an exhortation on the subject of the holding of a synod. Gregory was thoroughly convinced that if the bishops of the Franks could be drawn together in council the evils under which the Church among the Franks was groaning would be lessened, if not eradicated. Syagrius must therefore use his influence "with our most excellent sons, the kings of the Franks", and strike with all his power that the Pope's orders concerning the gathering of a council be put into effect.

To bring together the Frankish bishops had been an object for which Gregory had already worked for years. The evils which clamored for immediate remedy had been pointed out to the kings, and the bishops had been warned not to presume to disobey the Archbishop of Arles when he called them together.

Further enlightened as to the wretched state of the Church in the land of the Franks by a visit to Rome of Aregius, Bishop of Gap, Gregory made a determined effort in the July of 599 to get the bishops together under the presidency or direction of, or in the presence of his envoys Aregius and the abbot Cyriacus, a friend of the Pope frequently employed by him on important business. Brunichildis, Theoderic and Theodobert, her grandsons, and the metropolitans Syagrius of Autun, Etherius of Lyons, Virgilius of Arles, Desiderius of Vienne were all alike called upon to promote the synod which the Pope had ordered. The deaths of Cyriacus and Syagrius may have had something to do with the failure of this effort of Gregory. The principal cause was the supineness of the bishops. Undaunted by failure, Gregory returned to the charge about two years after (June 601). Brunichildis was reminded, "Bad priests are the ruin of the people. Who can intercede for the sins of the people, if the sins of the priests who ought to pray for men are greater? But since neither interest to look into nor zeal to punish the evils which exist moves those whose business it is to bestir themselves in these matters, I direct my letters to you, and if you give the word I will send, with the consent of your authority, one who with other bishops will look into and amend these things". And this time not only are the kings of the east and the south, Theodoric and Theodobert, appealed to again to hold a synod, but the same request is addressed to Clotaire of Neustria. Some success seems to have attended this last effort of Gregory for the reformation of manners among the Franks. According to an old biographer of St. Betharius, Bishop of Chartres, a council was held at Sens this year (601) to put down the abuses complained of by the Pope. But if this council was not very influential, Clotaire did not forget the wishes of Gregory. After he became sole ruler of the Franks, he assembled their bishops to the number of 69 at Paris in 614 or 615. Important decrees were passed relative to the freedom of election of bishops, to simony, to the immunity of the clergy (except with leave of the bishop) from secular judges, to the inviolability of ecclesiastical property, etc. These decrees were accepted and confirmed by the king. But though most useful in themselves and published with the fullest ecclesiastical and civil authority, it is to be feared that they did not effect any great reformation. Political events were setting too strongly towards general confusion and disorder to admit of any particular decrease in the vices against which Gregory worked so untiringly. Owing

either to the disordered state of civil affairs in Italy and *Frank-land* having actually prevented intercourse, or to the paucity of historical documents of the seventh century having failed to inform us of it, that age will not be found to be conspicuous for numerous relations between the Popes and the Franks.

For the flattering terms in which he often spoke of Brunichildis in his correspondence with her, Gregory is frequently blamed. But it must not be forgotten that she had helped forward the mission for the conversion of England, a work which the Pope had so greatly at heart. And there is a very natural tendency in everyone to speak of others as he finds them, in his own case. And while it is agreed that "her really atrocious crimes were, I think we can safely say, all committed after the death of Gregory", it yet remains to be proved that she was as black as she is painted. It has been asserted that the darkest lines in her character were drawn by an author who did not write until a hundred years after her death. It may, indeed, be further contended that Gregory's letters to Brunichildis are only a sample of very many of the others, and that they are all too courtly, not direct enough. But Gregory's style of writing was, in that respect at least, in accord with that of the great ones of the empire in his time. Besides, his whole conduct furnishes proof enough that he invariably acted on the principle enunciated by St. Francis of Sales, when he said that more flies are caught by a spoonful of honey than by a whole barrel of vinegar. And the man, who, situated as Gregory was, only having at his command moral forces but imperfectly comprehended and so but little dreaded by Brunichildis, should have taken in hand to drive the beautiful but semi-barbaric Austrasian queen, would not have had the common sense possessed by the Apostle of our nation.

Gregory did not, however, fail to put their duties in a quiet way both before the son and the mother. To Childebert he wrote: "Inasmuch as the royal dignity excels that of other men, so surely does the glory of your kingdom exceed the kingdoms of other nations. In the midst of kings it is not exceptional to be a king, but to be a Catholic, when others have not merited it, is glory enough. As the splendor of a great lamp illuminates the darkness of the night by the brightness of its light, so does the brightness of your faith shine and gleam in the dark perfidy of other nations. Whatever glory other kings have you have; but in this they are completely overshadowed, since they have not the greatest of all gifts, which you have. In order that they may be eclipsed in *deeds* as they are in faith, let your Excellency always show yourself merciful to your subjects; and if anything should offend you, do not punish it uninvestigated. Then truly will you best please the King of kings, Almighty God, when, by restraining your power, you think less is lawful to you than you are able to command". To Brunichildis herself he often tendered lessons similar to those he gave her son. To quote one instance, when exhorting her to call together a synod, he wrote : "When you have subdued the enemy you have within you, then offer sacrifice to God that with His help you may conquer your external foes; and with what zeal you contend against His enemies, you will find Him helping you. But believe me, as I have learnt after much experience, what is gathered together by sin, is soon expended to our own loss. If you do not want to lose anything through injustice, take care to acquire nothing with injustice. For with regard to the goods of this world, sin is the cause of loss".

Whatever may have been her faults, it is allowed that Brunichildis was a great queen, and Gregory co-operated with her as far as he could. And so, at her request, he endeavored to negotiate a peace between her and what he called the republic, *i.e.,* the empire. And at her request also he issued a decree forbidding anyone—king, bishop or anybody else—to tamper with the possessions of a hospital which had been built by Bishop Syagrius and the queen; and denouncing deprivation of his *dignity* and of the "Body and Blood of Our Divine Redeemer" against anyone who knowingly contravened his decree. "A charter", notes Montalembert, "in which, for the first time, the direct subordination of temporal power to spiritual is clearly set forth and *recognized".* And, indeed, to such as rightly spurn the doctrine of the right divine of kings to govern wrong, and believe that Christ submitted all men to his Church in the matter of moral right and wrong, it can only be regarded as natural that wrongdoing kings should be as subject to the Church's censure as wrongdoing beggars.

Besides these efforts to build up the Frankish Church on correct principles, Gregory was equally solicitous over individual cases of injustice or ecclesiastical discipline. To the instances hereupon cited by Abbot Snow, from whom this quotation is taken, the following will serve to bring out Gregory's care for the honor of his brethren in the episcopate as well as his love of justice. Etherius of Lyons wished to deprive of his diocese a poor bishop who had lost his reason. This the Pope will not allow. A bishop may be degraded for a crime, but not for illness. If, in a lucid interval, decided Gregory, he chooses to resign, another may then be consecrated in his stead. Otherwise a vicar must be appointed to manage the affairs of the diocese. If he survive the present afflicted bishop, he should be consecrated in his stead.

When Gregory's work for the conversion of England has been chronicled, the reader will have seen the immense influence exercised by Gregory throughout the entire West, whether as its Patriarch or as Head of the Universal Church.

THE LOMBARDS

What gave a special color to the life of Pope Gregory were his dealings with the fierce Lombards. He was in close contact with them one way or another from the time he began his public life till his death. They were his chief trouble, his lifelong cross. Naturally did he exert himself to the utmost to check their advance. As he was a man of great unselfish virtue, so was he of course a man of great patriotism. And to a Roman of the Romans, such as Gregory was, what could be more abhorrent than the triumphs of savage Lombards over Italians. Some authors go out of their way to find reasons for Gregory's regarding the Lombards with such hostility, for their ever being to him both in his mind and in his speech most objectionable, unspeakable *(nefandissimi).* With some it is because he was ambitious, with others because the Lombards were Arians or pagans. The fact is that Gregory loved his country, of which the Lombards were barbaric foes. Something has already been said of them, from which an idea of their barbarity may be gathered. A special student of their history, Dr. Hodgkin, thus writes of them:

"Everything about them (the Lombards), even for many years after they have entered on the sacred soil of Italy, speaks of mere savage delight in bloodshed and the rudest forms of sensual indulgence; they are the anarchists of the *Volkerwanderung* whose delight is only in destruction, and who seem incapable of culture". On their *unteachableness*, and on the length of time required to civilize them, Gregorovius also insists. "This rude people ... was incapable of receiving the ancient civilization which it found in Italy, otherwise than through the instrumentality of the Church ... More than 150 years were, however, required before the work of Lombard civilization was accomplished, and this interval constituted one of the most terrible periods in the history of Italy ... The Goths had protected Latin civilization, the Lombards destroyed it".

Bursting through the Predil Pass (568), when Gregory was a young man of about thirty years of age, and when Italy was only just beginning to breathe again after the campaigns which had destroyed the Ostrogothic kingdom, a motley crowd of Lombards, Saxons and other Teutonic tribes inundated Northern Italy. Before the death of John III (561-574) they had encircled the walls of Rome. "Like a sword from its sheath the wild hordes of the Lombards flashed upon us; our multitudinous people withered before them. Cities were depopulated, strong places thrown down, churches burnt, monasteries of men and women destroyed, estates desolated, and the land cleared of its owners. Where before there were crowds of men, there now roam the beasts of the field". And again, on the death of John's successor, Benedict I (579) we are told that after him Pelagius II was consecrated at once without waiting for the consent of the emperor, "because the Lombards were so closely investing Rome that no one could leave it". On both occasions its walls or the gold of the Church, or both, saved the city and caused the encircling Lombards to turn to easier conquests.

Either because they despised them, or because the Persians in the East, and the Avars and Slavs in Europe, occupied all their attention, the emperors of Constantinople did nothing to oppose the progress of the Lombards in their fair province of Italy. Their representative at Ravenna in the year 590, the exarch Romanus, would neither fight them nor let the Pope make peace with them. Gregory understood that if the Lombards were to be resisted successfully, it could only be by his own exertions. He would have to try all the resources of his energy, his diplomatic skill and his spiritual authority. He put them all in operation and saved Rome. He looked to the city defenses, to the posting of sentries. He raised and paid troops, he sent forth generals to cities in danger of capture. He exhorted the ecclesiastical authorities everywhere always to see to the political safety of their cities, and he directed generals in the field. Writing on the 27th September 591, he thus addresses Velox, a general stationed on the Flaminian road to watch the movements of Ariulf, the second duke of Spoleto: "I told your Glory some time ago that I had soldiers to come to you at your present quarters; but as your letter informed me that the enemy were assembled and were making inroads in this direction, I decided to keep them back. Now, however, it seems expedient to send some of them to you, praying your Glory to give them suitable exhortations, that they may be ready to undertake the labor which falls upon them. And do you, finding a convenient opportunity, have a conference with our glorious sons Martius (or Maurice?) and Vitalian; and whatever, by God's help, you shall jointly decide on for the benefit of the

Republic, that do. And if you shall discover that the unutterable Ariulf is breaking forth either towards Ravenna or in our direction, do you fall upon his rear and exert yourselves as becomes brave men". At another time other commanders are advised to effect a diversion by raiding the enemies' country should Ariulf advance on Rome. All this anxiety on account of the Lombards it was which caused Gregory to call himself rather bishop of the Lombards than the Romans. But withal he would only employ against them means that were scrupulously fair and open. He would not employ his diplomatic skill to destroy the Lombards by intriguing with their different dukes and playing off one against the other. "Briefly point out to our most serene lords", wrote Gregory to his apocrisiarius, Sabinian (afterwards Pope), at Constantinople, "that if I their servant had wished to mix myself up with the death of the Lombards, that people would today have neither king, nor dukes, nor counts, but would have been split up in the utmost confusion. But because I fear God, I dread being concerned in the death of any man". In the midst of all these troubles what most afflicted Gregory was that those who ought to have been a source of strength and comfort to him only gave him additional worry. And the bitter cry escaped him that worse than the swords of the Lombards was the mutinous spirit of what ill-paid troops the emperor left in Rome and the malicious jealousy of the exarch, the lord Romanus.

After this general sketch of Gregory's dealings with the Lombards, we may now more usefully discuss them in chronological order. Authari, who died a few days after Gregory's consecration, was succeeded by the warlike Agilulph (Free-helper), Duke of Turin, sometimes spoken of by the shorter form of his name, Ago. For to him the Catholic Bavarian princess Theodelinda, the widow of Authari, had given her hand. After the three years' peace (585-8) concluded between the exarch Smaragdus and Authari had expired, hostilities, of course, broke out again. And in 590, the first year with which we are directly concerned, the Lombard dukes, Ariulf of Spoleto and Arichis (or Arogis) of Benevento, were engaged in cutting off communication between Ravenna and Rome, by subduing the fortified cities which commanded it, and in seizing other cities by force or treachery within fifty miles of Rome itself. Rome was, of course, the goal which was aimed at by Ariulf. To do what he could to stop his advance, Gregory dispatched a governor to Nepi, endeavored to stir up and guide the energy of the generals in the field, and to counteract the treasonable influences at work in Suana (now Sovana). In vain. Ariulf appeared (July 592) before the walls of Rome; while Naples, to which Gregory had dispatched as military commander the *magnificent* tribune Constantius, was being beset by Arichis. Worried by the inaction of the exarch Romanus, and by the lack of spirit of the Theodosiac legion whom want of pay rendered loth to man the walls; distressed by the sight of men killed or mutilated by Ariulf, no wonder that Gregory fell ill, and in his abandonment by all resolved to make peace with Ariulf on his own authority. This he seems to have done; and the Duke of Spoleto, prevailed upon by Gregory's eloquence, spiritual power or gold, drew off his troops (before the end of July 592) and left Rome in peace. Whether indignant at this independent action on the part of the Pope, or simply because he was now ready, Romanus at length marched to Rome. What he did there, except take more troops away, is not known. However, a peace which he could not make he was able to break. He retook Sutrium (Sutri), Polimartium (Bomarzo), Hortae (Orte), Tuder (Todi), Ameria (Amelia), Luceoli (Ponte Riccioli, near Cantiano) and certain other cities, thus

again opening up communication between Ravenna and Rome and separating the two Southern Lombard dukes from their king. But "while the king was yet a great way off, he had not sat down to consider whether with one thousand men he was able to meet him who was coming against him with ten thousand". His precipitate and ill-considered action only raised a greater storm. It brought down Agilulph from Pavia in a fury. The important stronghold of Perugia was soon in his hands again, and he marched on Rome (593). From the city walls "the heartbroken Pontiff saw Romans, with ropes round their necks like dogs, being led away to be sold as slaves in Frank-land (Francia)".

When the news of Agilulph's advance reached Rome, Gregory was engaged in expounding to the people the prophet Ezechiel. He had already delivered twelve homilies, when word was brought to him "that Agilulph had crossed the Po and was hastening to besiege Rome". Well might he go on to ask how a mind full of fear and apprehension could penetrate the mystic sense of the prophet. However, for a time he persevered in addressing the people on the prophet's visions. But now the lurid light of blazing cities is reflected in his discourses. "Everywhere", sighs Gregory, "do our eyes behold sorrow; at all times are our ears assailed with groans. Cities are destroyed, ... the country turned into a desert ... Of the people, some we see led into captivity, some maimed, some slain ... Rome herself, once the mistress of the world, in what a state is it now! Beaten to the ground on all sides by its ever-increasing woes, by the desolation of its citizens, and by the attacks of the enemy ... Where is the senate, where the people? ... We few who remain are daily exposed to the sword ... The very buildings we behold crumbling around us".

The wild warriors of Agilulph draw nearer to Rome. The homilies are stopped. "No one will reproach me if after this my lips are silent ... On all sides are we surrounded by the sword ... Some come back to us with their hands cut off, others we hear are captured, others killed. I am forced to cease from continuing my exposition: 'for my soul is weary of my life' (Job x. 1)".

Gregory, however, did not expend all his energies merely in talking. He was essentially one of those men "who pray as if everything, depended on God, and work as if everything depended on their own exertions". Despite the efforts to prepare for a siege which had been made by the military men, Gregory saw that if Rome, with its weak walls, and want of men and corn, was to be saved, it must be by his exertions. And as Leo the Great went forth to meet Attila, so Gregory the Great went forth to meet Agilulph. On the steps of St. Peter's, which was then outside the walls, the barbarian king and the Christian bishop met. And so "overcome was the king by the prayers, so affected by the wisdom and religious gravity of so great a man, that he broke up the siege of the city and returned north (594)"—to quote the exact words of the writer, who in Northern Italy, about the year 649, continued the Chronicle of Prosper,

By his character as a priest and a man Gregory had indeed once again saved Rome, and removed the horrors of war from its neighborhood. But with this partial success he was not satisfied. He would obtain for all Italy the so much needed blessing of peace. Before, however, showing what efforts he made to accomplish this end, clearness of narrative will be better served if we relate how his saving Rome brought him as sole reward from his civil superiors a sharp letter from the Emperor Maurice. It

would seem that Romanus, to explain away his abortive expedition which had only resulted in endangering the city of Rome, suggested to the emperor that he had put his troops in motion to effect a diversion, because, despite Gregory's assurance to the contrary, it was certain that Ariulf had no real intention of making peace. At any rate, Maurice, thus perhaps partly deceived, wrote a very hot letter (now lost) to the Pope, in which the latter was made out to be a fool and blamed for what he had done. In this the emperor showed himself very like his subordinate Romanus. Unable to do anything himself, he could only blame or mar what had been done by another. In his reply (January 595), respectful but firm, Gregory says that the emperor in practically calling him a fool is not mistaken. "If I had not been a fool, I should never have borne what I have done here amidst the swords of the Lombards. In not believing what I stated, that Ariulf was sincerely ready to make peace with the Republic (the empire of course), you set me down as a liar ... If the captivity of my country did not daily extend, I would gladly hold my tongue on the subject of insults and derision directed against myself. But while I am called a liar, Italy is being still further dragged under the yoke of the Lombards. Believe if you will all evil of me; but in the cause of Italy, give not readily your ear to everybody, but trust facts rather than words". He exhorted the emperor not to be quick in anger with bishops, but like the great Constantine to reverence them on account of their Master. In fine, after reviewing the course of events, he unselfishly defends the conduct of the military leaders in Rome during the siege, "for I am ready to suffer any adversity"; and concludes: "Sinful and unworthy though I be I trust more in the mercy of Jesus than in the justice of your piety".

Notwithstanding the ungrateful treatment he received at the hands of the emperor and his representative in Italy, Gregory still toiled on to bring about a general peace.

The great difficulty in the way was the exarch Romanus, a man typical of the empire itself at this period, weak but pretentious. Safe himself behind the walls and marshes round Ravenna, he would not condescend to treat with Agilulph, who was really master of the situation, either before or after the siege of Rome. Gregory tried to move him through the influence of a mutual friend. "Know then", wrote Gregory to their common friend, "that Agilulph, the Lombard king, is prepared to make a general peace (or truce rather) if my lord, the patrician, will submit to arbitration ... You know well how absolutely necessary for all of us such a peace is. Exert yourself, therefore, with your wonted wisdom, that the *most excellent* exarch agree to this without delay, lest the peace negotiations should appear to come to naught through him, which is anything but desirable. If the exarch will not come to terms, the king again promises to make a special peace with me. But we know that in that case several islands and other places will certainly be lost. Let, then, the exarch think over these matters, and hasten to make peace, that at least we may have an interval of rest during which the forces of the empire may, with God's help, be the better prepared for resistance". Gregory, then, did not want peace because he was a coward who wanted "peace at any price"; but because he had sense enough to see that the empire, at that time, could not fight.

Romanus, however, would not incline to peace or war; and Gregory could only beg his friends to pray that God would free him "from the body of this death", as he cannot express what he has to suffer from the Lord Romanus, whose malice towards him, he complains, is worse than the swords of the Lombards. And yet the swords of the

Lombards were at this time cutting his heart to pieces. For his country, “given over to the swords of the barbarians, had scarce an inhabitant, and yet saw men daily die”. And so, on through the years 596, 597, and into 598, it is the Lombards, the Lombards! But in 597 hope began to dawn to the afflicted Pontiff. “Romanus the exarch died, and was succeeded by Gallinicus (properly Callinicus), who entered into negotiations for peace with Agilulph”. These events took place probably in 597; and, though in the beginning of the following year Gregory found it necessary to insist that no one in Terracina should be excused from taking his share of sentry duty, he was able to announce in October, that through the exertions of his envoy the preliminaries of peace had at length been agreed to. The shifty conduct of Ariulf, who at first would not act in harmony with his king' on the matter, kept back the definite signing of the peace for a time. Letters of thanks, however, addressed before the close of the year to the Lombard king for granting the peace, and to his queen, Theodelinda, for forwarding it, would seem to show that hostilities had definitely ceased before the advent of 599. The peace or truce was to last till March 601. In his letter of thanks to the king, Gregory deemed it necessary to beg him to command the different dukes to keep the peace strictly, as he knew but too well how much they were disposed to act on their own account.

We can imagine with what fervor Gregory returned thanks to God and St. Peter (to whose intercession he attributed the safety of Rome), that at length there was a respite in the shedding of the blood of the wretched peasantry, to which he touchingly turns in his letter to Agilulph just quoted. “Hitherto war had been the normal relation between the empire and the Lombard invaders: henceforward peace, though doubtless a turbulent and often interrupted peace, prevailed”—is the rather rosy reflection of Dr. Hodgkin on what he justly describes as the Papal Peace. But Gregory had an eye to the future. During the period of repose he issued his warnings to prepare again for war, as he felt grave doubts whether the truce would be renewed.

His surmises proved to be well grounded. An act of treachery on the part of Callinicus caused war to break out (601) with greater fury than ever. The Lombards secured the co-operation of the fierce Avars, subdued Padua and other places which had hitherto defied their power, and defeated the exarch beneath the walls of Ravenna (601-3). Callinicus was accordingly recalled, and Smaragdus, for the second time, became exarch of Ravenna (602). Still the war went on; and again are the letters of Gregory ringing with the cries which the thought of the slaughter of men drew from him. But Smaragdus was a much more capable man than his predecessors. He realized that he could not cope with the Lombards. He accordingly first secured a short truce of thirty days, and then in September (603) a longer one, which was to last till April 1, 605. Gregory, then, was to die while peace smiled upon the land he loved so well. And he was to die working for its continuance. Among his last half dozen letters, when he could scarcely speak for pain, and the cold hand of death was upon him, there is a letter of his (December 603) to Theodelinda, in which he begs her to thank her husband for the peace, and, as was her wont, to influence his mind in the direction of peace for the future. Gregory must indeed have been a child of God, for he was certainly a peacemaker.

This sketch of our saint’s dealings with the Lombards will at least show what a trial they were to him. Truly it may be said that day and night throughout his long

pontificate they were never absent from his mind. In his letters, in which that mind is seen so clearly, it is often the gout that is troubling him, sometimes the Lombards and the gout together, but always the Lombards. “My tongue as well as my pen fails me in any effort to tell what I have to suffer from the swords of the Lombards, from the iniquities of the judges (the imperial officials), from the pressing importunity of business, from the care of those subject to me, and the pain of my body”, is Gregory0s lament to Anastasius of Antioch. He was ever in fear of them because they could never be trusted, the more so as it made no matter to many of the dukes what their king bound himself to do. As we have seen, they made war or peace pretty much as they listed and whenever a suitable opportunity presented itself. Seeing then that, unaided, Gregory kept Rome from being crushed, Gibbon had good reason to note that it would have become a mere pile of ruins like Babylon and Carthage had it not had in the popes a vital principle which sustained it under the blows of the barbarians; that Gregory might justly be called “the Father of his country”; and that in the attachment of a grateful people he found the best right of a sovereign.

Moreover it must never be forgotten that in preserving the political independence of Rome, Gregory prevented the whole of Italy, and through it the whole of Europe, from being absolutely lost in intellectual darkness. If the Lombards were distinguished for anything, it was for their ignorance. On this point both the great historian of Italian literature, Tiraboschi, and that distinguished authority on Italy’s political history, Muratori, are agreed. Tiraboschi says that there is not a title of evidence that any of the Lombards either cultivated literature themselves or gave their protection or patronage to it. In all their laws, he adds, no mention is made of any kind of literary pursuit whatsoever. And Muratori reckons, as by no means the least of the evils wrought by the invasion of the Lombards, the introduction of a ferocious ignorance—and this with all his Lombard prepossessions. These barbarians only esteemed arms. And the Italians, apart from their want of good masters, had plenty to do amidst the rumors and horrors of war without devoting themselves to the study of letters. By keeping Rome free from Lombard rule, therefore, Gregory preserved it from complete intellectual decay under the shadow of Lombard ignorance, and through it not only Italy, but to a great extent Europe also. By thus preserving the sacred tradition of learning in Rome, he merited on this second and higher title that temporal power which his political action induced the people to yield to him. Even the cynical Milman could not but point out: “In the person of Gregory, the Bishop of Rome first became, in act and influence, if not in avowed authority, a temporal sovereign. Nor were his acts the ambitious encroachments of ecclesiastical usurpation on the civil power. They were forced upon him ... The virtual sovereignty fell to him as abdicated by the neglect or powerlessness of its rightful owners”. It is to be hoped that the reader will bear in mind the reflections of this paragraph on Pope and Lombard when the efforts of the popes to stave off Lombard domination by the sword of the Frank come to be told.

THE EMPEROR

The *Lombard question* has shown us Gregory in contact with the emperor at Constantinople. Elaborating the relations between them will only serve to show that the contact referred to was quite typical of their mutual dealings, which brought little else to Gregory but vexation of spirit. However, just as in the matter of making peace with the Lombards, his diplomatic caution and prudence, joined to a quiet firmness and pertinacity, generally enabled him in the end to get his own way in the questions in which their views differed.

In theory, at least, after their conversion to Christianity, the Roman emperors, renouncing the title of Pontifex Maximus, gave up all claims to interfere in matters of the soul and conscience. These matters were to be left to the decision of God's representatives on earth, the bishops. In practice, however, like all other absolute monarchs since, masters of men's bodies, they could not refrain from looking on themselves as masters of their souls too. And by their edicts they were ever placing themselves in opposition to that fundamental doctrine of Revelation (whether it be question of the Old or New Testament) that there are things of Cesar's indeed which must be rendered to him, but that there are also things of God which have to be rendered to Him. Christians, with St. Paul, honor the King, but they fear God. And because they would not have their consciences regulated for them by Roman emperors, Christians had in the days of persecution offered their lives to the executioner in thousands and tens of thousands. They were often called upon to do the same, when the Roman emperors, who called themselves Christians, following in the footsteps of their pagan predecessors, issued dogmatic edicts. But with the empire proclaimed Christian, and with the principles of Christianity recognized by the State, the Christian Roman emperors were not permitted to act with the same impunity as their pagan predecessors. Their interference in matters of religion was resisted in the name of a Higher Power. And there was always one voice at least raised to remind them of their duty as Christians. That monitor was the Bishop of Rome. And so some hundred years before Gregory took up the same role, Gelasius plainly told (494) the dogmatizing emperor Anastasius: "On two hinges turns the ruling of men. One of these is the holy authority of the priesthood, the other the secular power of princes ... In questions of doctrine the emperor is dependent on the decision of the Church, and has no right to force the faithful to follow his opinions".

What, then, had been the mind of the children of God in the city of God from the very beginning of the human race was, of course, the mind of Gregory. And he frequently gave that mind a voice. In his own domain or province Caesar must be obeyed. But if he steps outside it, he must be resisted; for decrees of emperors against the laws and canons of the Church are vain.

Men's best interests are no doubt best served when the Church and *Caesar* work in harmony, just as in each man it is best when nature and grace work together. Where, however, there is friction, it is essential for man's happiness that recalcitrant nature should be subdued by grace. In the same way, where the State, acting outside its legitimate sphere, comes into adverse contact with the Church, the former must give place. And that the two should come into collision from time to time is only in accordance with the nature of things. For even given the best of intentions on the part of the representatives of both Church and State, it is only natural that they should

sometimes disagree as to what in any given case were their particular rights. But just as in man himself the struggle between nature and grace is greater at one time than another, so the struggle between Church and State has varied at different periods. During the reign of Maurice it cannot be said to have been at all acute.

Gregory's great desire was to have the One Church and the One Empire in harmony for man's spiritual and temporal welfare. And so in the letter soon to be discussed, and to which all this argument is a sort of introduction, Gregory tells Maurice: "Power over men has been given by God to the Piety of my Lords, that those who aspire after good may be helped, that the way to heaven may become more easy to find, (in a word) that this world's kingdom may serve that of the next". To the emperor's representative, the exarch Callinicus, he wrote (May 599) in the same strain: "You will the more readily be victorious over your foes, if you bring back under the yoke of the true God those whom you know to be His enemies, and in proportion as you attend with a sincere and earnest will to the interests of God, in that proportion will you forward your own interests among men".

With such convictions, it will not surprise anyone that when Maurice took to legislating as to what men should do or what they should not do in working out their salvation, if not the servile patriarch of Constantinople, at least Gregory should offer resistance to him. The more so that it was the Pope's noble contention that "the emperor of the Romans was the lord of free men".

In the course of the year 592 the emperor issued a decree that no one who was actually engaged in any public office should embrace the ecclesiastical state, *i.e.* etc., join the ranks of the secular clergy; and he made it illegal for such a one or for a soldier to enter a monastery until the period of his service was over. With his wars in Europe against the Avars and Slavs, and in Asia against the Persians, and with his greed for gold, Maurice was in want of all the soldiers and money he could get. Hence he did not wish that his soldiers should become monks, and still less that the *curiales*, who were responsible for the revenue in the various provinces, should shirk their onerous duties. The first part of the law, which only reaffirmed a decree of Constantine, and which had been approved by some of his predecessors, Gregory had no difficulty in tolerating himself. For he argued that it was only too likely that those civil servants who wanted to became secular priests really only wanted to change one occupation in the busy world for another which would be less burdensome to their private fortunes. But because he believed that some men could only save their souls if "they sold all they had and followed Jesus" by that road, he felt it was his duty to oppose the latter portion of the decree, as an undue interference with the liberty which was each man's right. He was unwell when the ordinance reached him. But a protest was needed, and as soon as he was able he indited a letter to the emperor, beginning with the words : "He is criminal in the sight of Almighty God, who is not straightforward in all His dealings with the most serene Lords". Hence he could not give his sanction to that part of the law which prohibited civil servants and soldiers entering a monastery. He pointed out that the monastery which received such persons and their effects would be responsible for their debts. "I am in dread of this constitution because by it the way to heaven is barred to many ... Many can lead a good life in the world, but many cannot be saved unless they leave all things. Although I am but dust before my Lords, I cannot keep silence before

them, because I think this decree is against God, the Author of all things. Power over all men has been given from heaven to the piety of my Lords to help the good towards heaven. And now a decree has been made that a man cannot become a soldier of Jesus Christ unless he has completed his term of earthly military service or become disabled. Lo! thus to thee, through me the lowest of His and thy servants, Christ makes answer saying, 'From a notary I made thee Captain of the Guard; from Captain of the Guard, Caesar; from Caesar, Emperor, and not only that, but father of Emperors yet to be. I have committed My priests to thy keeping, and wouldst thou withdraw thy soldiers from My service?' Most pious Lord! I pray thee answer thy servant. What reply wilt thou make to thy Lord, when He comes and says these things to thee at the judgment?

"But perhaps you think that there is no such thing as the honest conversion of a soldier to the monastic life. I, your unworthy servant, know how many converted soldiers in my days have wrought miracles in the monasteries which they have entered. But by this law not even one such soldier is to be allowed the privilege of conversion.

"Let my Lord inquire who first issued such a law (the allusion is to Julian, the Apostate), and let him then more carefully consider if this one ought to be made. Let him consider this also, that he is hereby forbidding men to renounce the world at the very time that the world's own end is drawing near ... May your piety mitigate the severity of this law ... To obey you, I have sent the law all over the world, and, on the other hand, because the law is not in accordance with the interests of God, I send you this letter".

Gregory, however, did not send it direct to Maurice. He enclosed it in one to his friend, the physician Theodore, begging him to present it to the emperor on some favorable occasion. The precise effect of this spirited protest is not known, but it was not without fruit. For in a letter addressed to the various metropolitans, Eusebius of Thessalonica, etc. (November 597), in which he again sends them notice of the law, Gregory bids them not to allow civil servants to enter monasteries till they have cleared themselves of their obligations to the state, nor soldiers till after a three years' probation. He concludes by assuring them that such a course has received the emperor's approval. Whilst negotiations with the imperial court on this subject were proceeding, Gregory caused a similar regulation to be issued with regard to the slaves of the Church who wished to become monks *i.e.*, they were to be well tried in the lay dress. No doubt this decree served as the basis on which Gregory came to terms with the emperor on the matter.

THE BISHOPRIC OF SALONA

Another affair which brought the Pope more or less in opposition with the emperor was the case of Maximus of Salona, a case which dragged on for six years (593599). If Maurice did not overtly favor Maximus, nay, if in words he supported Gregory, he not only allowed himself to intercede for Maximus, but certainly did nothing to check the open and violent advocacy of the claims of the usurper by his officials.

Natalis, Bishop of Salona, near Spalatro, the capital city of Dalmatia, had given both Gregory and his predecessor some trouble on account of the laxity of his life in the matter of the pleasures of the table, and on account of harsh treatment of his archdeacon, Honoratus, who had opposed his excesses. After having had to threaten (592) to deprive Natalis of the use of the pallium and of Holy Communion, Gregory had the happiness of seeing him return to his duty. On the death of Natalis, he wrote (March 593) to the subdeacon Antonius, the manager of the patrimony of the Roman Church in Dalmatia, bidding him to see to the prompt and canonical election of a successor to Natalis, and to the sending of the decree of election to him (Gregory), that, as in past times, the elect might be consecrated with his consent. Much to the Pope's pleasure, who respected the man for his virtue, the clergy elected the above-mentioned archdeacon Honoratus. But the bishops of Dalmatia, worldly-minded men, objected to the choice of Honoratus. Their conduct brought down upon them a sharp letter from the Pope, who "by the authority of Blessed Peter", forbade them "to impose their hands" on anyone for the vacant bishopric without his permission. However, if Honoratus were proved to be unworthy of the dignity, they might consecrate anyone upon whom the unanimous free choice of all might fall, with the exception of Maximus, of whom he has had a very sinister account (November 593).

The next thing that Gregory heard was that there had been a great commotion in Salona. Word was brought to him that many of the supporters of Honoratus had been treated with the greatest cruelty; that his *rector* had barely escaped with his life, and that with the aid of the bought troops of the exarch Romanus and under cover of a filched or forged mandate of the emperor, no other than Maximus had been consecrated. Though conscious that Maximus dared not have defied him had he not felt that he had material force at his back, still Gregory would not allow the fear of this world to interfere with his duty. He at once (April 594) wrote to Maximus, the presumptuous intruder into the See of Salona. Gregory let him know that he was convinced that the *mandate (jussio)* he (Maximus) had produced was not genuine, because he knew that it was the intention of the emperor not to meddle with the causes of bishops, and concluded by forbidding him, and those who had consecrated him, to perform any episcopal function or to celebrate Mass until he had been assured by letters from the emperor or his own apocrisiarius that he (Maximus) had procured a real *jussio* from the emperor. "And if you dare to act against this injunction, anathema to you from God and St. Peter, so that the sight of the punishment which has been meted out to you may serve as an example to the whole Catholic Church". Unread, Maximus had this letter publicly torn up. He then devoted himself to trying to obtain the countenance of the emperor and to blacken the character of the Pope. Gregory thereupon wrote to his apocrisiarius Sabinian to meet the charges of Maximus, making it quite plain to the deacon that he was determined not to put up with the bishop's insolence. "I am prepared to suffer death rather than allow the Church of Blessed Peter to be degraded in any way in my time. You know my disposition. I bear for a long time. But when once I have made up my mind to bear no longer, I cheerfully face every difficulty".

Gregory had need of all his firmness. Maximus so far prevailed upon the emperor that the latter expressed a wish that the Pope should recognize him as bishop, and receive him with honor when he came to Rome. In writing to the empress (June 1, 595)

Gregory declared he would fall in with the emperor's wishes to the extent of passing over the fact of the ordination of Maximus without his consent. He could not, however, leave unexamined the charges brought against him of being elected by simony and of having said Mass after he had been excommunicated; nor was it right that, with such charges urged against him, and unanswered, he should be received with honor. "If the causes of bishops who are entrusted to me are through the patronage of others settled by our most pious Lords, what is left for unfortunate me to do in this See? I assign to my sins that my bishops take no heed of me, and against my authority betake themselves to secular judges ... I will await his coming (to Rome) for a brief space, but if he puts it off long, I will not put off striking, him with canonical punishment".

Peremptorily summoned to come to Rome within thirty-days, Maximus failed to put in an appearance; and when some of the clergy, true at length to the call of duty, fell away from him, he took to persecuting them. At last, however, whether because he found it hard to go on "kicking against the goad", or because, touched by grace and the forbearance of Gregory, he was really moved to penitence, Maximus began to make serious efforts to get reconciled to the Pope. He succeeded in inducing the exarch Callinicus, who was on good terms with the Pope, to use his influence with him to allow his case to be tried at Ravenna. Overcome by the exarch's importunity, as he says himself, Gregory at length consented; and commissioned the archbishop of Ravenna, Marinianus, to examine whether the election of Maximus was simoniacal, and whether he was aware that he was excommunicated when he said Mass. And in case Maximus regarded Marinianus as prejudiced against him, the Pope named Constantius of Milan as joint judge.

A contemporary document, inserted in Gregory's register, tells us how Maximus came to Ravenna, and, casting himself on the ground before all the people, cried out: "I have sinned against God and the Most Blessed Pope, Gregory". In this position he remained for three hours; and then before the tomb of St. Apollinaris he swore that he had not been guilty of simony or breach of his vow of chastity. After the Pope had received full information as to the satisfaction which Maximus had offered, moved to compassion, he sent him the pallium in token of reconciliation (599). Next year Gregory is sympathizing with Maximus on the incursions of the Slavs as though nothing had happened between them. His firmness and kindness had overcome the powers of this world and saved a soul.

602, USURPATION OF PHOCAS

Of all Gregory's dealings with the Eastern emperors, the one most discussed is his attitude towards the usurper Phocas. Most non-Catholic and some Catholic writers seem to have little hesitation in condemning the Pope of a display of revengeful cruelty in the congratulatory letters he wrote to Phocas and his empress on the occasion of the former's seizure of the imperial throne and his subsequent murder of Maurice and his family.

But to one who has followed the career of the saint up to this epoch, and who has noted his invariable extreme charity when dealing with those who have opposed him, but who is himself *previously* acquainted with the cruelty of Phocas to Maurice, these letters, especially on first reading, bring such a shock that an explanation is instinctively looked for. The question at once arises to the mind of such a reader—Can *Gregory* have known all the circumstances attending the usurpation of Phocas when he wrote these letters? And to one who believes in the 'law of continuity', to anyone who holds that a good man does not suddenly become bad, or a kind and forgiving man harsh and revengeful, the answer *No* will come at once. Mature reflection, too, and study of the affair will, we venture to think, compel the endorsement of the spontaneous negative. A preliminary examination of the facts of the case certainly proves that there is no evidence that Gregory was assuredly in possession of the knowledge of the 'ins and outs' of the affair. Nay, it does more, it furnishes us with solid grounds for believing that he was utterly ignorant of the details of the revolution when in the month of May 603 he penned the documents in question.

First for the facts of the case. As his reign progressed, the Emperor Maurice stained an otherwise fairly estimable character by avarice. This vice led him to try to shear a rather dangerous ram, the army. The result was that a mutiny, by no means the first in his reign, broke out among the soldiers. Phocas, a simple centurion, was proclaimed emperor, and was duly crowned by the patriarch Cyriacus (November 23, 602). One of his first acts, on being told by one of the factions in the city, "Begone! Reflect how matters stand! Maurice still lives!" was to cause Maurice and his sons to be put to death (November 27).

Then on April 25th (603) there came to Rome the *icona* (images) of the Emperor Phocas and his wife Leontia. They were received with the (customary) acclamations in the basilica *Julii* of the Lateran (palace) by all the clergy and *senate*: "Graciously hear us, O Christ! Long life to the emperor and empress Phocas and Leontia!" Then the most blessed and apostolic Lord Pope, Gregory, ordered the images to be placed (as usual) in the oratory of S. Cesarius in the palace (on the Palatine)". To this official account, prefixed to the thirteenth book of Gregory's letters, John the Deacon adds that favorable letters from both the new emperor and empress were also brought for the Pope along with the images. To these friendly advances Gregory sent three letters in answer, two to Phocas himself (one certainly in the month of May), and one to Leontia. The first letter to Phocas is one of congratulation on his accession, and runs thus: "Glory be to God in the Highest, who, as it is written, 'changeth times and taketh away kingdoms' (Dan. II, 21); and who maketh known to all what He hath deigned to say by His prophet: 'The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and He will give it to whomsoever it shall please Him' *(ib.* IV. 14). In the incomprehensible dispensation of Almighty God, His methods of governing our lives vary. Sometimes when the sins of many must be punished, a man is raised up by whose severity the necks of those subject to him are oppressed by the yoke of tribulation, which in our own sad case we have long experienced. Sometimes, however, when the God of mercy has decreed to comfort with His own consolation the hearts of the sorrowing multitude, He raises to the supreme power one through whose merciful disposition He pours out upon all the grace of His own blessed happiness. We believe that we *shall* be speedily refreshed with this

happiness in abundance, we who rejoice that the benignity of your piety has reached the summit of imperial greatness. 'Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad' (Ps. xcv. 2), and *may* the whole republic, till now in grievous affliction, rejoice at your kindly deeds. *May* the haughty minds of our enemies be subdued beneath the yoke of your power. And (on the other hand) *may* the broken and depressed spirits of your subjects be encouraged by your pity. *May* the power of heaven's grace make you terrible to your enemies, and *may* paternal affection make you beneficent to your subjects. *May* the whole republic, dislocated under the pretext of law, which is destroying peace, have rest in your most prosperous times. *May* exactions under the cover of sham wills and donations have an end. *May* each one enter into the secure possession of his own, so that he may joyfully hold without fear what he has acquired without fraud. Under your paternal rule *may* each one's liberty be renewed. For there is this difference between the kings of the nations and the emperors of the republic, viz., that the kings of the nations are the lords of slaves, but the emperors of the republic are the rulers of freemen. But we can say all this better by prayer than by expressing hopes. *May* Almighty God in all your thoughts and deeds hold the heart of your piety in the hand of His grace, and *may* the Holy Ghost dwelling in your breast mercifully guide all that has to be done with justice and pity, so that from this earthly kingdom your clemency *may* after many years reach the kingdom of Heaven".

The second letter to Phocas, the new emperor, is taken up with the business of sending a papal apocrisiarius to Constantinople. Phocas in his favorable letters had evidently expressed his regret that he had not found, on his accession, a representative of the Pope in the imperial city. Gregory replied that the reason of it was that, owing to the unsettled and difficult nature of the times, the Roman ecclesiastics looked forward with dread to being sent to reside in the imperial palace, and he had not been willing to put pressure upon them. However, after it had become known that he (Phocas) had mounted the imperial throne, there had been a change of feeling, and he had ordained deacon the bearer of these presents (Boniface), for the purpose of sending him to Constantinople.

The letter to Leontia is practically the same in sentiment and expression as the first to Phocas. Gregory would have her show herself another Pulcheria, who was herself a new Helena, and love the church of St. Peter. These last two letters are set down in the register as belonging to the month of July 603. But as it cannot be doubted that the letter to Leontia would be written and dispatched at the same time as the letter to her husband, it may be safely concluded that they also were written in May; but, as not unfrequently happened, were not entered into the register till later. Boniface, too, would doubtless accompany the imperial envoys on their return journey.

Still keeping to the domain of *facts*, it is certain that in the days of Gregory, and long after, news often travelled very slowly. This, too, not only during the winter, when there was no communication by sea, but even during the rest of the year,—what with the lack of letter carriers, of which Gregory often complains, the incursions of barbarians, etc. If the statement of Agnellus of Ravenna, that it took more than three months to go to Constantinople and back from Ravenna, is to be understood as applying generally to all seasons of the year, it will help one to understand more definitely how slowly news then travelled. Further, in connection with the overland route between Italy

and Constantinople, we have the positive assurance of Priscus, in the fourth volume of Muller's *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.*, that for a fast traveler it took no less than thirteen days to get from Constantinople only as far as Sardica. And in the present case it is allowed that as late as February 603, when Gregory addressed a letter to his friend Rusticiana at Constantinople, he was still ignorant there had been any change in the government. Hence it must be regarded as *highly probable* that the first full account he had received of the downfall of Maurice, and the elevation of Phocas, was from the ambassadors of the latter. And we may be sure that their story would not put their master's share in the revolution in any but a more or less innocent light. This they could the more easily do, because, as Gregory had no apocrisiarius at Constantinople, he could not check their story with authentic information received from another *reliable* source. Finally a word or two must be said about the personal relations between Gregory and Maurice. At first they were very cordial. As apocrisiarius, Gregory had stood godfather to Maurice's son, Theodosius (585). The conduct of Maurice, however, whether in church or state, could not fail, as time went on, to cause the intercourse between them to become less friendly. His decree with regard to soldiers not entering monasteries showed that Maurice was as ready to interfere in ecclesiastical matters as any other *Roman* emperor. And to this conclusion from that decree Domitian, the metropolitan of Armenia, and a respected relative of the emperor, drew Gregory's attention. In writing back to him Gregory, quoting a proverb, observed; "With regard to Maurice you say well that in his (recent) action, *I should judge of his stature by his shadow, i.e.,* in the lesser things that he does I should see indications of greater things". More momentous interference was not long in coming. As we shall see, Maurice supported the ambition of his patriarch John, the Faster, when he assumed the title of *ecumenical patriarch.* The emperor's action in State affairs, too, was as distasteful to Gregory as his policy in Church matters. He could not keep patient under the irritating line of conduct which Maurice suffered Romanus to pursue in his dealings with the Lombards, and his heart was wrung, as we have seen, with the tales of bitter oppression of the provincials which reached him from all sides, and which Maurice not only allowed to go unpunished, but to a certain extent imitated himself. However, the Pope and emperor never openly quarreled. The emperor sends the Pope money for the poor, and the Pope insists on prayer for the imperial family.

After this brief statement of the facts of the case, it may be asked what sort of a letter should we naturally expect a Pope to write on hearing no more than that an emperor, who had once been his friend, but who had by ways direct and indirect caused him much annoyance and trouble, had been deposed by the army for avaricious conduct, and that he had been replaced by one who was an utter stranger to the Pope? He would doubtless write as diplomatic a letter as he could, saying as little as possible in condemnation of the late emperor or in praise of his successor. He might further, while carefully refraining from uselessly offending the sovereign now in power, strive to teach him his duty by expressing wishes as to what he would like to see done better in the future. Now such exactly are the letters of Gregory to Phocas. He only indirectly refers to Maurice, observing, what is undoubtedly certain, that through him he has been under the yoke of tribulation. In one short sentence only does he congratulate Phocas on his accession. But *not one word* does he say in his praise. For if he use the terms "your piety", etc., of Phocas, everybody knows that, in the high-flown mode of address then in

vogue at the court of Constantinople, such titles were the official due of the emperors, just as "your glory" was the right of a *magister militum.* In a word, the letters to Phocas are one long *wish,* and to this attention has been directed in the letter cited above by the use of italics to show where in the original a wish is expressed by the use of the subjunctive mood. In fine, had Gregory written the letters in question with full knowledge of all that had been done by Phocas, it would still, it would seem, be certain that it would be altogether incorrect to say that he indulged in either "virulent abuse" or "fulsome flattery". The remarks of John the Deacon on these letters, though not altogether on the right lines, for Gregory did not praise Phocas, are interesting as bringing out the idea of the Pope with regard to the style of expression he adopted in many of his letters. "By these praises Gregory either so soothed the new rulers that, hearing what they ought to be, they might become milder than Maurice had been, whose disorders they knew had upset the times; or because he thought they would not become tyrants since he saw them so devoted to himself and the Church. For as he would freely condemn the vices of any, and would never permit anyone to act against the canons and ancient customs, so he would not altogether deny to anyone what was of custom". As Gregory died well within the year after the dispatch of these letters, and as no more of his letters to Phocas are known, there is no means of deciding as to what was his opinion of Phocas when the truth about his character began gradually to come to his knowledge.

But it was not only the civil powers at Constantinople Gregory which gave Gregory trouble. He had also to come into title of adverse contact with its spiritual ruler, with its patriarch. This was in connection with the high-sounding title of *ecumenical patriarch* assumed by the patriarch John, the Faster. It is important that a correct idea of this controversy should be formed, as all manner of false conclusions have been drawn from an erroneous view of it.

THE QUESTION OF THE PRIMACY.

Before, however, the details of the controversy are narrated, the position of Gregory with regard to that of the four other patriarchs and the other bishops of the Christian world should be put in a clear light. Into the question as to the origin of the papal primacy, its duration and *title deeds,* so to speak, it is no part of the biographer of Gregory to enter. To elucidate the point in hand, it will be enough to state that the popes were unquestionably the rulers of the Universal Church, at least, when the seat of empire was transferred by Constantine from Old Rome, as it then came to be called, by the Tiber, to New Rome, by the Bosphorus—that is to say, before there was even a bishop of Constantinople, much less a great patriarch. When Byzantium was transformed into New Rome and renamed Constantinople, to use the words of a non-Catholic writer, "Ecclesiastically Old Rome maintained the primacy. It was more apparently to have been called the city of St. Peter, than to have been the city of the Caesars". Certainly Gregory maintained that he was the head and ruler of the whole Catholic Church, and so he was regarded by the whole Catholic world, whether in East or West, whether by clergy or by laity. Hence Gregory reminds John, the Faster, of the

time when he (the Pope) was called upon to undertake *government of the Church;* or, as he elsewhere expresses it, when he took upon himself the cultivation of the Lord's land. To him, therefore, the Apostolic See is the "head of the faith", while the other churches are its members, or it is simply "the head of all the Churches". And it is so, because its ruler "holds the place of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles". Consequently he who does not obey the Pope's injunctions "is separated from the peace of Blessed Peter". The decrees of councils have binding force only if they receive the assent of the Apostolic See. So that if a body of bishops in synod are subject to the See of Rome, still more so individual bishops. "If there be a question of fault in a bishop", *i.e.* if there be a matter calling for the exercise of jurisdiction, "I know not what bishop is not subject to the Apostolic See". And this applied in the mind of the Pope not only to the rank and file, as it were, among the bishops, but to their superiors the patriarchs. The dependence of all the four patriarchs (viz. Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem) is touched on in one letter; and in another that of the patriarch of Constantinople in particular. "As regards what is said of the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See?"—asks Gregory in a letter to John, Bishop of Syracuse. It is to be observed that, throughout, Gregory attributes the pre-eminence of his See, of the Roman Church, not to any temporal cause, as, for instance, because Rome used to be the "mistress of the world", but solely to the will of God.

And this position which Gregory claims for himself and his See was acknowledged to be his by the whole Christian world in his time both in theory and practice, both in words and in deeds, and by clergy and laity alike. Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, declared that Peter still occupied his chair in the person of his successors, and John of Ravenna would not dare to oppose that "most holy See which gives laws to the Universal Church". The dependence of the Church of Constantinople, in particular, was assiduously professed by both the Emperor Maurice and the patriarch Cyriacus. What was "professed" by Maurice had been the subject of a decree of the Emperor Justinian, and was to be of another by the Emperor Phocas. And what was equally professed by Cyriacus had been acknowledged in practice by his predecessor John the Faster himself, as the appeals from John to the Pope (to be discussed hereafter) show. As an evidence of the feeling of the laity, even in the East, with regard to the authoritative position of the bishop of Rome in matters of religion, a fact (not often quoted) which occurred in the early years of the same half of the century in which Gregory was born may be quoted. It is recorded by John of Antioch, who is supposed to be the same writer as John Malalas, and to have lived about *AD* 700, in one of the fragments of his history which have been preserved. The ambition of a commander and the discontent brought about by the injudicious treatment of a large number of soldiers on the part of the Emperor Anastasius I, as well as the latter's monophysitic beliefs, caused a rebellion. In 514, 50,000 men marched from Moesia on Constantinople. Anastasius only saved his position by promising the malcontents that they should have their dues, and that the Church of *Old Rome* should be permitted to settle the religious matters in dispute.

But while bent on asserting his position in the Church, Gregory made it plain that it was the authority of a father he wished to exercise and not that of a tyrant. He called himself and proved himself "Servant of the Servants of God", and gave it as a rule to his

friend the subdeacon Peter, the rector of the papal patrimony in Sicily, that "the more reverence is shown to the apostolic See by the other churches, the more solicitous does it become it to be in watching over them". To the Bishop of Carthage he wrote: "As I defend my own rights, so am I careful to preserve to the different churches their rights".

Such being Gregory's position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and such his views on that position, it was only natural, nay, it was only right and proper, that he should resist any attempted encroachment on it. And it was only to be expected that he should watch with the greatest jealousy any move in that direction made at Constantinople. It was matter of history that the bishop of Constantinople had at first been merely a suffragan of the metropolitan of Heraclea. Gregory saw him a patriarch, and had himself practically acknowledged him to rank before the other patriarchs. Knowing, as he had good reason to, the tendencies of the emperors of Constantinople to interfere in matters of religion, the Pope understood too that any increase in power and influence required by the patriarch of Constantinople meant a further step forward in the enslavement of the Church by the State. For the patriarchs of Constantinople were mere creatures, mere tools of their emperors.

Accordingly when Gregory found that John the Faster was bent on retaining his hold of a comparatively new title, that of' Ecumenical bishop or patriarch, he determined to oppose its assumption with all his power. As far as the patriarchs of Constantinople were concerned the title was, as has been said, comparatively new. It seems to have been given to them for the first time by the Emperor Justinian, when in an edict he styled Epiphanius "ecumenical patriarch".

But, as Hartmann, in a note to one of Gregory's letters on this subject, observes, the title of *universal* or *ecumenical* had been already given to the popes Hormisdas, Agapetus and Boniface II, by the clergy of the East, though the popes had never used it themselves. And indeed there was a sense in which the title could be applied to the popes and to the popes only, and it was the signification given to it when it was later on assumed by them, or rather when they allowed it to be given them. Presuming the title to designate the "bishop of bishops" or "the overseer of all the bishops of the Christian world", it then belonged to the bishop of Rome and to him alone. If it be used of a partial jurisdiction, to signify that one has ecclesiastical control over a *part* of the Christian world, then the title of ecumenical could be bestowed on any bishop, and especially on any metropolitan. And at least later on, and when the protests of the popes had made an impression, it was in that sense that the Greeks maintained that the title was used by them. In the preface to his translation of the Acts of the 7th General Council (the second of Nice, 787), which he dedicated to John VIII, that most remarkable of ninth-century ecclesiastics, Anastasius, the librarian, who, according to many, was both an antipope and the friend of popes, a man of learning and a man of action, assures us that when at Constantinople he took the Greeks to task for their use of the title, they replied: "That they did not call their patriarch ecumenical (which many have interpreted, universal) because he held the primacy of the whole world, but because he ruled a certain portion of the world *inhabited* by Christians. For", continues Anastasius, "the Greek work *oikomene* may mean in Latin not merely *the world,* from the universality of which the word comes to mean *universal,* but also a habitation, or a habitable place". Finally the title of *ecumenical* or *universal bishop* may be understood

in a sense in which it would be wrong, according to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, to apply it even to the Pope. It may mean that the *ecumenical bishop* is the *sole* bishop of the world, that the world is his diocese, and that others who may bear the name of bishops are merely his agents and have no rights of their own. Whereas it is, of course, Catholic doctrine that a Catholic bishop exercises the ordinary acts of his office by virtue of his own powers. It was in this last sense that Gregory chose to understand the meaning of the title. Hence his deduction: "If there be one universal bishop, then you (the various metropolitans to whom the letter was addressed) are not bishops".

In either of the more obvious significations of the title, ecumenical, viz. the first and last, it is plain that the patriarch of Constantinople could have no lawful claim to it. And in attaching the meaning he did to it, Gregory showed how far it was capable of being pushed by ambitious men. He was therefore bound to oppose its assumption as well to protect his own position, which under the aegis of such a title could be the better assailed, as to restrain the unbridled ambition of the patriarchs of Constantinople. The selection of a title capable of such indefinite extension was certainly not made at random. Without doubt the aims of the patriarchs of Constantinople were to be furthered under its cover. What those aims were may be preferably stated in the words of a non-Catholic writer: "It was the aim of the patriarchs of Constantinople to hold the same position in Eastern Christendom that the bishop of Rome was acknowledged to hold in Universal Christendom. In order to accomplish this aim they had two problems to solve. One problem was to reduce the large independent Sees of the East—Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem—under the jurisdiction of Byzantium; the other problem was to prevent the interference of the Pope in the affairs of the East, and thereby induce him to acknowledge the patriarch of Constantinople as a pontiff of ecumenical position like his own. The first of these objects was directly aimed at, as we are expressly told, in the persecutions organized by John of Sirimis (patriarch of Constantinople under Justin II); the second was essayed by John, the Faster, who assumed the title of Ecumenical bishop. So Mr. Bury, in his useful and most scholarly work, often already cited.

To turn to the historical details of the controversy, at a council held in 588 at Constantinople, in connection with another matter, John the Faster assumed the title of *Universal*. Pope Pelagius II, however, annulled the acts of the synod and forbade his apocrisiarius to communicate *in sacris* with John. When Gregory succeeded Pelagius, he tried to induce John to renounce the title by representations made to him through his apocrisiarius. Gregory had become acquainted with John when he had himself been an apocrisiarius, and the austerities of the man had won Gregory's respect for him. But when he found that, like the Pharisee of old, John could fast, give alms and pray long prayers, and yet be full of pride and "love ... the first chair in the synagogue" (St. Matt. c. XXIII), he saw it was necessary to denounce him. Even in a letter to the Pope concerning an appeal to him from a priest under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, John "styled himself universal Patriarch almost in every line". Gregory now took up the matter in earnest. Sabinian was instructed not to communicate with John *in sacris*, unless he renounced the title; and in the first half of the year 595, in June, or from January to June, he dispatched letters on the subject to the emperor and empress, to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, to John himself, and to the apocrisiarius

Sabinian. The letter to the emperor is the first that we meet with in the register, is perhaps the most important of them, and may be given at greater length as a sample of the others. It is a letter at once respectful but bold, argumentative and eloquent. It opens with praise for the emperor, who, among his other cares, has found time to labor to promote sacerdotal harmony, inasmuch as he realized that "the peace of the empire was bound up with the peace of the universal church. For what human power, my most serene lord, or what stout arm would dare to raise its impious hands against your most Christian empire, if, with one accord, both by their prayers and by a good life, the priests were to invoke the Redeemer for you? Or what barbaric sword would so cruelly smite the faithful, if the lives of us who are called bishops, but are not, were not loaded with evil deeds? But when we leave what is really ours and seek after what is not ours, we make our sins help the swords of the barbarians. Our faults sharpen the weapons of the foe and depress the power of the empire. For what excuse shall we make .... we who by our deeds teach evil and only by words inculcate what is good? Our flesh is worn away with our fastings but our minds are puffed up with pride. Our body is covered with worthless raiment, but in conceit of heart we surpass those clad in purple. We lie on ashes, and yearn for what is above us. Teachers of humility, but leaders of pride, we hide the teeth of a wolf behind the face of a sheep. With all this we may indeed impose upon men, but we are still known to God". If he would be successful in his wars, Maurice is urged to apply a remedy to this case and thus bring peace into the Church, which is being disturbed by the introduction of pompous and inflated titles. "To all who know the Gospel it is clear that by the words of Our Lord the care of the whole Church was committed to Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. ... Yet he was not the *universal Apostle.* But that most holy man, my fellow-bishop John, would be called *universal bishop ... 0 tempera! 0 mores!"*

"Europe is in the hands of the barbarian .... and yet priests who ought to be lying weeping in ashes on the ground hunt after titles of vanity and take delight in new and impious names".

All this is, of course, aimed at John, the Faster.

After pointing out that many of the patriarchs of Constantinople had not only been heretics, but even heresiarchs *(e.g.* Nestorius and Macedonius), Gregory infers: "If anyone in that Church arrogates to himself that title, then the whole Church falls with the fall of the one who has the name of universal".

The popes have never assumed this title, though it has been given them, "lest all the bishops be deprived of their due meed of honor whilst some special honor be conceded to one".

It is for the emperor to curb one who contemns the canons, and by this title even dims the honor due to himself. "I am the servant of all bishops as long as they live like bishops. But he who proudly raises himself up against Almighty God and the decrees of the Fathers, will, I trust to God, never be able to bend me, no, not even with the sword".

In a letter to the empress, very similar in line of thought to the above, Gregory thanks her for the part she has taken "in the cause of Blessed Peter against the *proudly humble".* After speaking of the twenty-seven years of trouble the Church has experienced at the hands of the Lombards (568-595), he says: "And still this Church (of

Rome), which at one and the same time for the clergy, for monasteries, for the poor, for the people, and, moreover, for the Lombards, is ceaselessly spending so much money, is moreover burdened with the trouble of all the churches which are grievously afflicted by this pride of one man, although they do not venture to speak out openly on the matter".

The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch are exhorted not to concede the obnoxious title, as, if one man be called Universal patriarch, the rights of the other patriarchs are outraged. If John does not abate his pride, the Pope will have to seriously consider what steps must be taken against him.

Writing to John, in the same tone of authority in which he wrote to other Eastern patriarchs, in order to induce him to lay aside his usurped title, Gregory expresses his astonishment that one who had professed himself unworthy to be called a bishop at all should now despise his brethren and aspire to be called *sole* bishop. The whole letter to John is an exhortation to humility. "My dearest brother, love humility with all your heart, humility by which harmony among all the brethren and unity in the whole Church can be preserved". After a lengthy exhortation to this virtue, Gregory concludes: "If thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between him and thee alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shall gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican (S. Matt, XVIII). I have endeavored with lowly words once and twice by my apocrisiarii to correct an offence against the whole church, and now by my own writing. Whatever humility would dictate to me to do, I have done. But if I am set at naught in my correction, I must employ the Church".

In connection with the preceding letters, the Pope sent another to his apocrisiarius Sabinian, giving him instruction as to his conduct in the matter. To please the emperor he must hand the last-cited letter to the patriarch. If that should not prove effective, he (Gregory) would send another which would not be gratifying to the pride of the *ecumenical patriarch.* "But I hope to Almighty God that his hypocrisy will soon be brought to naught by the Supernal Majesty. I marvel, however, that he should have been able so to deceive you, dear friend, that you should allow our lord the emperor to be persuaded to write admonishing me to live in peace with the patriarch. If he would act justly, he should rather admonish him to give up that proud title, and then there would be peace between us at once. You little thought, I can see, how craftily this was managed by our aforesaid brother John. Evidently he did it to put me in this dilemma. Either I must listen to our lord the emperor, and so confirm the patriarch in his vanity, or not listen, and so rouse the imperial mind against me".

"But we shall steer a straight course in this matter, fearing none save God Almighty. Wherefore, dear friend, tremble before no man; for the truth's sake despise all you may see exalting themselves against the truth in this world; confide in the favor of Almighty God and the help of the Blessed Peter; remember the voice of truth, which says: 'Greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world' (1 John IV. 4), and do with fullest authority, as from us, whatever has to be done in this affair".

"For after we have found that we can in no way be defended (by the Greeks) from the swords of our enemies, after we have lost, for our devotion to the Republic, silver, gold, slaves and raiment, it is too disgraceful that we should, through them, lose our faith also. But to consent to that wicked word is nothing else than to lose our faith. Wherefore, as I have written to you in previous letters, you must never presume to communicate with him".

Not long after the arrival of these letters in Constantinople, the Faster was called upon (September 2, 595) to give an account of his stewardship to the sovereign Master of us all. After the death of John, the emperor made every effort to allay the heat of the controversy, without, however, insisting on the surrender of the disputed title. He took a long time in nominating a successor to John, and when one was named it was a friend of Gregory, one whom he had known as apocrisiarius, and one whom he thought very suitable for the position. Maurice also urged the Pope to receive graciously the envoys *(responsales)* of Cyriacus, who were bringing to Rome the synodical letter of the new patriarch. He furthered endeavored to persuade the Pope that there was no cause for making trouble in a mere idle name, such as was "ecumenical". This point was also put forward, possibly on the emperor's initiative, by Anastasius of Antioch.

Though his heart was wounded "by the assumption of" the proud and profane title Gregory received the envoys and synodical letter of Cyriacus, because, as he said himself to the emperor, he knew what was due "to the unity of the faith and ecclesiastical harmony" (VII. 30), and that in itself, of course, the title did not necessarily imply any heresy. Nay, to promote good feeling he bestowed "more than the customary honor" on the envoys, and caused them to assist him when saying Mass. For there was no reason, he said, why the envoys from Constantinople should not assist him, who, by the mercy of God, had not fallen into any error of pride, though his own apocrisiarius was not to assist at Mass one who had either himself committed a fault of elation or had not corrected it when committed by others.

But while congratulating Cyriacus on his new dignity, Gregory bade him take away all occasion of scandal' and in replying to his synodical letter, plainly told him that he could only have true peace with him (the Pope) when he had given up "the pride of the profane name". And both Anastasius of Antioch and the emperor were told plainly that the title was not a mere idle word but a dangerous novelty. "I would beg your Imperial piety to reflect that some idle (or frivolous) things are perfectly innocuous, but others highly injurious. Certainly when Antichrist shall come and shall call himself God, will not that be very silly, but yet very pernicious at the same time? If we merely look at the size of the word, it has but two syllables, but if we look at the (implied) weight of wickedness, there is a whole world of mischief. Hence I confidently assert that, whoever calls himself, or would be called by others, universal bishop, is, in his pride, a forerunner of Antichrist, because in his pride he sets himself above all others".

Hoping that a mild answer would turn away wrath, Cyriacus wrote to the Pope and told him of his love for him. But Gregory promptly told him to show that love by taking away the cause of disagreement between them. As this was not done, Gregory could not be induced to allow his apocrisiarius to communicate with Cyriacus. And while he would not allow Eulogius of Antioch to give him the title, he forbade the

metropolitans of Illyricum, Eusebius of Thessalonica, etc., who were subject to his jurisdiction as patriarch, when invited to a synod at Constantinople, to concede it to Cyriacus. For although it is true that "without the authority and consent of the apostolic See, whatever may be enacted there can have no force, still in God's name I warn you not to allow assent (to the assumption of the title) to be wrung from you by persuasion, or by blandishment, by rewards or punishments".

Though only a few months before he died Gregory once again exhorted Cyriacus to lay aside the obnoxious title (July 603), his tender words were powerless against the conceit of the puppet patriarch of Constantinople.

Whilst the brute force of Phocas was exerted during the pontificate of Boniface III, who had apparently been the bearer of the last-mentioned letter, the patriarchs of the imperial city dropped their "universal". It was, however, resumed by them on the first opportunity. After that period, when the title was given to the popes, as it often was, especially by the Easterners, they ceased to protest against its application to themselves. Because in its most obvious and orthodox sense of overseer of all the bishops of the world, it really belonged to them. "To whom", wrote Leo IX to the patriarch Michael Cerularius, "after Jesus Christ could this title be more suitably applied than to the successors of St. Peter?" However, as the same pontiff notes in the same passage, "it is certain that it has not been assumed, up to this, by any of his (St. Leo I) successors".

Though the patriarchs of Constantinople thus assumed a title which, taken in most of its possible senses, was an attack on the Pope's right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole Christian world, in the days of Gregory they had not, in either theory or practice, thrown off the spiritual submission due from them to the bishop of Rome. To cite an appeal case or two from the jurisdiction of Constantinople to that of Rome, will be to throw out this truth in bold relief.

There appeared in Rome, about the same time (593), it would seem, a certain John, a priest of Chalcedon; and, from a monastery situated amid the mountain fastnesses of far Isauria, a monk named Athanasius, also a priest. Both assured the Pope that, despite their assertions to the contrary, they had been condemned of heresy by their patriarch, John the Faster. And with a severity as notoriously hard upon others as upon himself—an infallible proof that his sanctity was not real—John had even had the poor monk scourged in the church of St. Sophia. The two priests appealed to the Pope for justice. After several letters from him requiring that the particulars of these affairs should be sent to him, a letter came to Rome from Constantinople pretending ignorance of the whole matter. Though it bore the patriarch's name, Gregory in his reply to it said that if it was in truth John's letter, then, though so called, he (the Pope) was not really observant, as he had formed a very different opinion of John to what he found him in fact to be. If the patriarch was in truth ignorant of what had been done, how shameful that such things should happen at his door, and he not know! But if he really did know and said he did not, then it would be far better that food should go into his mouth, rather than untruth fall from it. Gregory, however, goes on to declare his belief that the letter was not written by the patriarch himself, but by a certain young man of the world, a favorite of John. For, as so often happens with men of weak character, the Faster had, it appears, fallen under the influence of a youth, who in the words of Gregory "neither

feared God nor regarded man". The Pope goes on to declare that his desire is to live at peace with all men, especially with John, "whom I truly love, if indeed you are still the man I once knew. For if you do not observe the canons, and are striving to overturn the decrees of the Fathers, I know not who you are". Had he not had every reason to fear the evil influence exerted over John by the young man he had just spoken about, he (Gregory) would not have availed himself of the powers which the canons gave him, but would have sent back the appellants to John, Even as it is, John may either restore the two priests to their offices and leave them in peace, or he may himself try them again, if he carefully observe the canons. But if he will not do either of these things, he (Gregory), though not anxious to quarrel with the patriarch, will receive the appeal made to him.

Gregory concludes this strong letter of reprimand to John by severely animadverting on his treatment of the monk. "What the canons say of bishops who would win respect for themselves by the use of the scourge, your fraternity knows well. We have been made pastors, not persecutors. The great preacher (St. Paul) says: "Reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine" (2 Tim. IV. 2). It is a new and unheard-of style of preaching which would exact faith by the aid of the rod". But with characteristic kindness he adds: "If you are not determined to quarrel with me, you will find him ready to go to all reasonable lengths". The *him* was the apocrisiarius Sabinian. Gregory, however, made it very plain to his friend Narses at Constantinople that he was determined at all costs to make John do what was right and obey the decrees of the apostolic See, if need should arise.

Seeing that the Pope was not going to be trifled with, John duly dispatched to Rome—and this while the *Universal* controversy was well under way—deputies with the minutes of the proceedings taken against the two priests in the East. For some time "the swords of the barbarians" gave Gregory so much anxiety that he had no leisure to devote to examining into the charges. About a month, however, after he had thus given John notice of the cause which had delayed the investigation of the appeal, the Pope examined the case of John of Chalcedon in the synod of July 5, 595. John was accused of being a Marcianist, an accusation which, by the way, was brought against the Emperor Maurice at the time of his downfall. According to Simocatta, Maurice's biographer, *Marcianism* was a farcical kind of heresy. On careful examination, the case against John broke down completely. The Faster's deputies knew no more about what was understood by *Marcianism* than we do. Though apparently spitefully anxious to prove John a heretic, they were utterly unable to do so. Consequently, Gregory quashed the previous decision against him and "by our verdict declare him a Catholic, and free from every stain of heresy". In informing the emperor and the Faster of his decision, Gregory begged them to receive John kindly. He was not molested.

The case of Athanasius dragged on longer. He was charged with having in his possession a book full of heretical propositions. This fact seems to have represented all that could be urged against the unfortunate priest. The examination of the suspected volume necessitated an inspection of the decrees of the council of Ephesus. Gregory accordingly wrote to his friend Count Narses to get him an old copy of the acts—an old one, because he suspects the latter ones. The Pope of course had copies of the acts of the council; but, under the circumstances, he wanted a copy such as was in circulation

among the Greeks. “Though”, as he said, “the Roman codices are much more authentic than the Greek, because, if we lack your quickness, we have not your deceit”.

The volume was at length found to be heretical; but, as Athanasius averred, he had read it in all simplicity, and as he tendered the Pope an entirely orthodox profession of faith. Gregory, after forbidding him to read the book again, declared that he was a true Catholic and gave him full permission to return to his monastery and to his former position. A month or two later Cyriacus was duly informed by the Pope of the decision he had come to, both with regard to John and to Athanasius.

These two cases, if not very interesting in themselves, are, it must be repeated, very instructive, as they prove that the Patriarch of Constantinople, and, *a fortiori,* the other patriarchs, were in Gregory’s time subject to the See of Peter. Even Fleury felt himself compelled to take notice that the patriarch submitted to the jurisdiction of the Pope, as he sent his deputies with letters and with summaries of the trials that had already been held concerning these cases in the East. In the days of the first Gregory there was only one Roman Empire and one Christian Church. The Emperor at Constantinople was the head of the one, the Pope at Rome the head of the other.

THE CONVERSION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS

That we may not suppose that Gregory’s life was one solid bitter struggle, without one grain of alloy of comfort, we must not lose sight of the joy which he experienced from the conversion of nations, and notably of the Anglo-Saxon race. We shall see that in the case of Gregory, as in that of all men, the sweet and the bitter are mingled together in life, and that, if it must ever be the lot of the popes, as the spiritual representatives of God's truth on earth, to bear the brunt of the attacks of the powers of falsehood and darkness, it will be always theirs to enjoy in an especial manner, as the head of the Christian army, the triumphs of religion.

In the middle of the fifth century (449) there landed on these shores, never again to leave them, Angles and Saxons. These Teutonic tribes, who came from the lands between the Elbe and the Rhine, fierce heathen pirates, were accounted by the Romans the most dangerous of their enemies. Bishop Sidonius, who was alive when they landed in Britain, tells us how they despised danger if they won booty, how they laughed at the tempest and cared not for shipwreck. The storm was their refuge in retreat and their cosign of vantage in attack. Their best loved was the god of War. The steed consecrated to the god was well-nigh as sacred to them as the god himself. And if they were freemen and the sons of the free, they were cruel as the sea they loved so well.

The resistance offered by the Britons to these fiercest foes of the Roman Empire in the West was of the stubbornest. Nowhere would the Briton live side by side with the Saxon. But the numbers or the fighting powers of the native were not equal to those of the invader. In about a hundred years the Angles and Saxons had stamped out the British and their Christianity from all parts of Great Britain, except Wales, Cornwall and the hilly north-west of what is now called England, and from the Highlands of Scotland.

Mention has already been made of what is said to have first caused Gregory to take an interest in the Anglo-Saxon people, some fifty years after they had been in possession of most of our island. The incident was his meeting with slave children of that race in the forum, and the impression that their blue eyes and golden hair made upon his imagination. The traditionary story of his conduct on that occasion, which the early Anglo-Saxon biographer of Gregory calls "narratio fidelium", has been told how often? To be told once again will but prove its simple charm. Struck with the beauty of the slave-dealer's *wares,* Gregory questioned the man about them. Understanding they were heathens, he cried out: "Alas! that the author of darkness should have such fair faces, and that such beautiful forms should have no inward grace". He asked the dealer : "Of what nation are they?". "Angles", was the answer. "Angels, rather", said the Saint. To the further statements that they came from the province of *Deira,* and that their king's name was Aella, he replied: "Of a truth they are *de ira,* plucked from wrath, and called to the mercy of Christ". And alluding to the king's name, he concluded: "Alleluia! the praises of God must be sung in those parts".

This simple play upon words, quite in Gregory's style, shows at least the cheerful hope of the conversion of the Angles which at once took possession of the Saint's mind. He at once betook himself to the Pope, begged him to send missionaries to England, and offered himself as one. After much persuasion Pelagius II consented to let him go. Gregory made his preparations as secretly and as quickly as he could, and was soon on his way. The fact of his departure, however, soon transpired. Quite in their wonted manner the Roman populace worked themselves into a *furore* immediately. They beset the Pope with loud cries that by letting Gregory go he had offended St. Peter and destroyed Rome. Pelagius had to yield to their clamors, and horsemen were dispatched posthaste to order Gregory to return.

It may be gathered from the chronicle of the Anglo-Saxon noble Ethelwerd that Gregory bought the slaves he found in the market. It is certain, at any rate, that to forward the work of England's conversion, which he ardently longed for, and carefully thought about from his first sight of its people, he commissioned the steward of the patrimony of the Roman Church in Gaul to buy English slave boys of seventeen or eighteen years of age to be trained for God in monasteries.

At length, in the sixth year of his pontificate, the time seemed to Gregory to have come to make the attempt to convert his "Angels of the North". He had himself acquired considerable influence in Gaul, through which his missionaries would have to pass, and he had prepared the monks of his monastery on the Coelian for the great work. He had heard of the great power possessed by Ethelbert of Kent. It had been told him that he had even taken to himself a Catholic wife. Bertha, the daughter of Charibert I, king of Paris, and it was even rumored that the fierce Angles were wishful to have the truths of Christianity preached to them. Accordingly, in the early summer of 596 he dispatched to bring the light of Christianity to cloudy England, not one or two preachers, but the prior of his monastery, Augustine, and a whole community of monks. As Dom. Leveque has pointed out, he imitated the political action of the ancient Romans. To subject a country they established colonies in it. So Gregory, to bring the English beneath the sweet yoke of Christ, sent forth a spiritual colony as it were.

But at the very outset it looked as if the hopes of the pontiff were to be dashed to the ground. When the little band of monks landed in France they were met by a number of timid souls, who drew out for them in blackest colors the difficulties of their enterprise. They were going to men who were more ferocious than the beasts of the forest. Discouraged by all they heard, they sent Augustine back to report to the Pope "on the hardships of the journey, and the disheartening intelligence" which had come to their ears. Their envoy, however, soon returned, bringing letters of encouragement from Gregory. He reminded them it was better not to begin good works than to give them up when begun. He bade them not to lose heart, but to persevere for the sake of the eternal reward they would reap for their toils. He regretted he could not have his wish and share their labors. He also wrote to Virgilius of Arles and other bishops, to Brunichildis and other secular rulers among the Franks, exhorting them to do all they could to help and encourage the missionaries he is sending to the Angles. Reinspirited by this prompt action of the pontiff, the devoted band, strengthened in number by some Frankish priests, to act as interpreters, continued their journey and landed at Ebbsfleet (or Richborough, perhaps) in the spring of 597. "Blest was the unconscious shore on which they trod".

This is not the place to enter into the details of the work of St. Augustine. Suffice it to say here that Ethelbert of Kent, the king in whose dominions they landed, was baptized (June 2, 597), and thousands of his subjects after him, influenced by the sublime doctrines which were taught by the saint and his companions, but still more by the winning beauty of their lives and their miracles. For, as seems always to happen on the first preaching of Christianity to a people, its truth was confirmed to the English by the wonders wrought by God through his servant Augustine.

Before the close of the eventful year 597, in accordance with the commands he had received from the Pope, Augustine crossed over to France and was consecrated bishop by Virgilius of Arles, the Pope's vicar in Gaul (December 5, 597). On his return to England, he at once sent messengers to Gregory to tell him of the progress the faith had made among the Angles and of his own consecration, and to ask for information on some dozen questions which he submitted to the Pope. The good news of the spread of the faith cheered Gregory in his illness. But his sickness and his difficulties in connection with making peace with the Lombards prevented him from replying to Augustine's queries till the middle of 601.

Then, during that little respite of his cruel agony, he resumed his wonted activity. On the 1st of June he wrote to Augustine, the bishop of the Angles: "Glory be to God in the highest, who has caused the grain of wheat which has fallen to the ground to die (St. Luke II. 14) and to bring forth fruit in abundance, that He might not reign alone in heaven whose death is our life, whose weakness is our strength ... and whose love sends us to seek even in the island of Britain for brothers whom we knew not ... Who can express the joy of all faithful hearts that the English nation, through the grace of God and thy brotherly labor, is illumined by the light of the holy faith". Then follows a long exhortation to Augustine to be on his guard lest the miracles, which God has deigned to work through him for the benefit of the English, should cause him to entertain proud thoughts and thus lose his soul. "Very great restraint, then, must be put upon the mind in the midst of signs and miracles, lest perchance a man seek his own glory in these things,

and rejoice with a merely private joy at the greatness of his exaltation. Signs are given for the gaining of souls, and towards His glory by whose power signs are wrought ... If there is joy in heaven on one sinner doing penance, what joy must there not have been on the conversion of a whole people".

But Gregory did not content himself with simply sending a letter to Augustine. In accordance with the latter's request, he sent him a fresh company of monastic laborers, and he provided them with a supply of everything necessary for divine worship and with "very many books". "Many of these were works of great beauty: mediaeval pilgrims who visited the abbey (at Canterbury) saw there the *Biblia Gregoriana*, written upon rose-colored leaves, showing strange reflections in the light. On a shelf above and behind the high altar, surrounded by reliquaries of every shape, were placed psalters, acts of the martyrs and books of the gospels, bound in chased silver and mounted with beryls and crystals—all presents from the great pope. It is possible that these books—these *primitiae librorum*—even survived till the (so-called) Reformation. The library of Corpus Christi at Cambridge and the Bodleian at Oxford possess two ancient books of the gospels said to have formed part of St. Gregory's gift". Father Bron, from whose work this passage has been taken, says, however, that experts seem now to be agreed that neither of these MSS. can date back to the days of Gregory; whereas Grisar, who calls special attention to the beautiful miniatures with which the Cambridge MS. is adorned, is of opinion that they (the miniatures and hence the MS.) might belong to a period much before Gregory, and that if they were executed in his pontificate, they are *certainly* copies of more ancient models.

Gregory also wrote out letters of recommendation for his new missionaries to eleven bishops, three kings and one queen of the Franks, so that they might everywhere on their journey meet with kindness and hospitality. He tells his episcopal correspondents that he knew that their zeal would naturally have moved them to accord help to men who were laboring for souls; but that as the glow of a fire is intensified by blowing upon it, so their zeal would be quickened by his words.

Mellitus and his companions were, moreover, bearers of a 'pallium' for Augustine and of a letter for him, in connection with it, in which the Pope tells him that he grants him the use of it during Mass time and "to ordain twelve bishops in different places, who are to be subject to your jurisdiction ... To the city of York we wish you to send a bishop ... who may also ordain twelve bishops and enjoy the rank of a metropolitan". Augustine was, however, to retain the primacy over the whole Church in England during his lifetime. Various other regulations were laid down by the Pope for the future government of the church of the Angles, which it is the less necessary to set down as the force of circumstances—pagan reactions, etc.—rendered the carrying of them out unpractical. The letter closed thus: "Your fraternity is to have, subject to you, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, not only those bishops whom you shall have ordained yourself or who shall have been consecrated by the bishop of York, but also all the bishops of Britain, so that from the words and life of your holiness they may receive the rule of the true faith and a good life". Gregory had, it may be noted in passing, clearly no doubt that spiritual jurisdiction over the Britons in Wales, etc., who were already Christians of a sort, was as much acknowledged to be his as that over the new converts.

Naturally the Catholic queen, Bertha, and her newly converted husband were not left unhonored by papal letters. The queen is thanked in glowing terms for what she has done to help Augustine, and congratulated on the share she has had in converting her husband and the people. But she is earnestly exhorted to strengthen the king's mind in the love of the Christian faith and of God, so that he may be anxious for the complete conversion of his people; and assured that the good she is doing is being talked of not only at Rome but everywhere, and has even reached the ears of the emperor at Constantinople. Evidently the good Pope thoroughly understood that a word to a woman about the good opinion the world had of her would not be thrown away. And he could not do more in that direction than mention the emperor. For to the barbarians there was no higher embodiment of the power and greatness of this world than "the most serene prince at Constantinople".

In his letter to Ethelbert, that king is urged to guard with care the deposit of faith he has received, to spread the knowledge of it among his people, to overthrow the temples of the idols (advice afterwards recalled)—to be, in short, another Constantine—and to hearken to the voice of Augustine.

To this latter the Pope sent long answers to the questions the archbishop had asked of him. These replies formed a document which was to become "the rule and code of Christian missions". Some few have indeed called the authenticity of it in question. But while Grisar goes so far as to allow that it represents what was taken down from Gregory's verbal exposition, its authenticity may safely be admitted with Hartmann, Haddan and Stubbs, etc.

In response to direct queries, Gregory laid it down that the diocesan revenues were to be divided into four parts, one for the bishop and his household for their support, and to enable the bishop to exercise hospitality; the second for the clergy; the third for the poor, and the fourth for the repair of churches. But he advised Augustine, inasmuch as he had been brought up under monastic discipline, to live with his brethren and have all things in common with them.

For a liturgy for the new church the Pope, in a most broad-minded spirit, bade Augustine, whilst bearing in mind that of Rome to which he had been accustomed, choose what he found appropriate in any church and fix that as the liturgy for England.

On the principle that the Church of the Angles was in its infancy, and therefore to be indulged, Gregory for the time being relaxed to some extent the discipline of the Church, which in those days most wisely prohibited marriages between those related to one another even in the seventh degree. He also gave various other important decisions relative to the married life which have more in common with moral theology than papal biography. However, in view of modern customs with a certain section of society, it may be useful to note how severely he animadverted on the 'depraved custom' of mothers handing over their children to be suckled by other women.

The last act of Gregory for his beloved Angles of which we have any knowledge was the dispatch of a letter he addressed to Mellitus after he had set out with the documents already mentioned. By this he recalled, after much thought, the advice he had given to Ethelbert to destroy the temples of the gods. They must not be destroyed, is his final decision to Mellitus. The idols in them must be destroyed; but they are

themselves to be purified by the sprinkling of holy water, and must have altars and relics placed in them. The people will be more easily drawn to places to which they have become accustomed.

Gregory's labor for the conversion of England was now over. He had brought our country within the pale of civilization and put it on a fair way to becoming Catholic. He had accomplished a work which, though grievously shaken in the sixteenth century, we may hope will never be undone. The torch of Catholic truth he lit in our land has never been quite extinguished. It is now beginning again to burn brightly. May its luster ever go on increasing and never again be diminished!

What had been accomplished in England Gregory had himself poetically described even in the midst of his commentary on Job, so full was he of the good work that had been wrought. "By the shining miracles of his preachers has God brought to the faith even the extremities of the earth ... In one faith has he linked the boundaries of the East and the West. Lo! the tongue of Britain, which before could only utter barbarous sounds, has lately learned to make the *alleluia* of the Hebrews resound in praise of God. Lo! the ocean, formerly so turbulent, lies calm and submissive at the feet of the saints, and its wild movements, which earthly princes could not control by the sword, are spellbound with the fear of God by a few simple words from the mouth of priests; and he who, when an unbeliever, never dreaded troops of fighting men, now that he believes fears the tongues of the meek. For by the words he has heard from heaven, and the miracles which shine round him, he receives the strength of the knowledge of God, so that he is afraid to do wrong and yearns with his whole heart to come to the grace of eternity".

In all the work of Gregory for the conversion of our country, we see combined the zeal for souls which we look for in a saint and the practical, and withal kindly, common sense which has always distinguished Englishmen in dealing either with business affairs or with their fellow-men. But if Gregory worked hard and well for England, he did not labor for men who had no gratitude. His name was always breathed with love in Catholic England. He was to the English their *apostle,* as our first historian, the Venerable Bede, takes notice. In the century following his death it was decreed, by the council of Clovesho or Cliff in 747, that his feast, the feast of' our father Gregory, should be kept as a holiday of obligation through England; and we find this decree renewed at the council of Oxford in 1222. And whenever Catholic Englishmen at least praise "the men of old", their apostle and father Gregory will not be absent from their thoughts. Of him in especial will they think when they say with Ecclesiasticus *(c.* 44), "Let us now praise men of high renown, and our fathers in their generation ... such as have borne rule in their dominions, men of great power and endued with their wisdom, ... and ruling over the present people and by the strength of wisdom instructing the people in most holy words".

THE CONVERSION OF THE ARIAN VISIGOTHS

Another event, which in his own words brought "unspeakable joy" to the heart of Gregory, was the conversion of Recared, the Visigothic ruler of Spain, and his people. The details of the affair were sent to the Pope by his friend Leander, Bishop of Seville, whom he had met at Constantinople. The bishop's object in visiting the imperial city was to obtain help for the Catholic Hermenigild, who was in arms against his father, the Arian Leovigild. For in the breakup of the Roman Empire in the West, the Visigoths, who seized the Iberian Peninsula, were, like the rest of the Teutonic barbarians who called themselves Christians at all, Arians. And Leovigild (572-586), one of the greatest of the Visigothic kings, though (as very often happens in the case of such rulers who would have no other will but their own on every subject) a most tyrannical one, endeavored by persecution to force his Catholic subjects to become Arians. This tyranny resulted in the rebellion (580) of his son Hermenigild, whom he had associated with himself in the government of the realm, but who had become a Catholic through the exertions of his uncle St. Leander and through the influence of a Catholic wife, a Frankish princess.

"Hermenigild, not knowing", says the good old bishop, Gregory of Tours, "that the judgment of heaven was pressing on him, inasmuch as he had devised such measures against a father, even though he was a heretic", failing to obtain any substantial aid from the Romans, whose power in Spain Leovigild had broken, fell into the hands of his father. Finding that exile could not force his son to deny his faith, Leovigild permitted or ordered a certain Sisebert to put him to death in prison (Easter 585 or 586). By his death, as even Gibbon observes, Hermenigild atoned for any crime he may have been guilty of in his rebellion. And if Hermenigild is canonized, it is not because he took up arms against his father, but solely because he died a martyr. He chose death rather than life at the cost of apostasy. *Finis coronat opus!*

The blood of Hermenigild and that of the other Catholic martyrs was, as usual, the seed of the Church. When Recared, his brother, became king (586-601), he followed in the footsteps of his martyred brother, and in a great council of the nation at Toledo (May 8, 589) he made a public profession of the Catholic faith. And as a Catholic, so also a Roman. It was therefore decreed that there should remain in full force the decisions of all the councils and the synodical letters of the holy bishops of Rome. The king's abjuration of Arianism was soon followed by that of his subjects. So that after some two hundred years of heresy, the Visigoths joined their Roman fellow-subjects in professing Catholicity.

A letter which Recared wrote to Gregory (596-9) showed that if he could not write Latin he could manage to express that his sentiments towards the person of the Pope were those of a thoroughly loyal Catholic. He told the Pope that it had been his wish to write to him, "who stood pre-eminent among the bishops", at the time of his conversion, but that the business concerns of his kingdom had prevented him. He had already sent an embassy to the Pope, with presents for St Peter, but its members had barely escaped with their lives from the wreck of their ship. However, he now sends Gregory a golden chalice studded with gems, which he trusts may be worthy of the first of the apostles;

and begs in return for one of the Pope's golden letters. In conclusion he expresses his love for Gregory, and begs his prayers for himself and his people.

Further, in a letter now lost, he begged the Pope to help forward negotiations he was then carrying on with the emperor, especially on the basis of a treaty which Justinian had made with one of his predecessors. For, though most distinguished for his piety and love of peace, Recared had frequently to take up arms to stem the aggressions of the Romans, who were anxious to recover the ground they had lost under Leovigild.

In due course Recared received "the golden letters" he was so anxious for. In one of them Gregory told the king that he could not write to the emperor because he had not been able to discover what the terms of the treaty in question were, inasmuch as a fire had destroyed almost all the documents of the time of Justinian, and it would never do to have to write to a person and tell him to produce documents which told against himself. Recared must then strive to bring about peace. Peace! It was the one cry of Gregory in the midst of wars; the one cry of the true vicar of the Prince of Peace.

In his letter of thanks for Recared0s presents, he praises him for bringing the whole Gothic race from Arianism "into the solidity of the true faith". He often speaks, he says, with admiration of the king's doings to his friends, and contrasts the king's labors for souls with his own inactivity. He congratulates him also in holding firm, despite of offers of money for the contrary, to the law he has made to prevent Jews from keeping Christian slaves. But he would have him beware lest the good he has done should inflate him with vanity. "We send you", are the Pope's concluding words, "a little key from the most holy body of St. Peter (as an earnest of his blessing), in which is enclosed a little iron from his chains, so that what bound his neck when he was led to martyrdom may loose you from all your sins. We also send you a cross in which there is some wood of the true cross and some hairs of Blessed John the Baptist. May the intercession of His Forerunner ever enable you to have the joy of Our Saviour"

Before his death there came to Gregory's heart joy even from the Lombards. Such of them as were Christians in any sense were Arians like the Visigoths. But a very large number of them were heathens, and like other Teutonic tribes, worshipped streams and trees, hills and valleys, and even serpents. Their own laws reveal the fact that even under Liutprand they practiced divination by means of trees and the heads of animals. But more than their Arianism or their idolatry, their brutal ignorance made the conversion of the Lombards slow. However, it had made some progress ere death came to the suffering Gregory. In the very beginning of his pontificate (January 591) he wrote a short but earnest letter to all the bishops of Italy, urging them to do their very best to convert the Lombards. "With all your might, by the power of persuasion, hurry them on to the true faith; preach to them without ceasing the Kingdom of God". The work of bringing the Lombards into the Church was very much forwarded by the exertions of their queen, the Catholic Theodelinda, of whom Prospers *Continuator* says, "That she nourished the Lombard race not only by her royal power but also by the affection of her piety". No doubt it was owing to her influence that Agilulph showed himself very differently disposed towards the Catholics than his predecessor Authari had done. Authari had forbidden, by a law issued at Easter 590, his Lombard subjects from being baptized in the Catholic faith. His death before the following Easter Gregory regarded

as a divine punishment for his tyrannical edict. But so favorable did Agilulph show himself to the Church, that it was even said that before his death he had himself become a Catholic. Although the words of St. Columbanus, in his letter to Boniface IV, seem to show that there was no truth in the report, it is certain that the king allowed his infant son Adalwald to be baptized a Catholic. The queen at once forwarded the good news to the Pope, who "though in imminent danger of death", had still the heart to rejoice at the happy tidings and the strength to write yet one more letter, one of the last half-dozen of his letters which we have. "The letter you sent us from Genoa has made us sharers in your joy that, by the grace of God, a son has been given you, and that that son has been given to the Catholic faith". The new king must be brought up in the fear of God.

The 'Three Chapter' question was still on the queen's mind; for in her letter she had begged Gregory to reply to certain points urged by the abbot Secundus, probably the Secundus of Trient, one of the principal authors on whom Paul the Deacon drew for his Lombard history. This the Pope promises to do, if by the will of God he should recover his health. Meanwhile he sends Secundus a copy of the acts of the council which was held in the time of Justinian, "that he may study them and see that all he has heard against the apostolic See and the Catholic Church is false". To the young king he sends certain small relic cases, containing a relic of the true Cross, etc., and to his sister three rings.

The work of the conversion of the Lombard nation, begun in the days of Gregory and King Agilulph, went on vigorously after the death of those two men during the joint reign of Theodelinda and her son. But the ignorance and turbulence of the Lombards made their Catholicity long a-coming; and the tide of conversion ebbed and flowed more than once before it came to the full in about the eighth century,

THE BARBARICINI

Among the results of the Vandal occupation of Africa was the expulsion of a barbarous and idolatrous people, who bore the appropriate name, *Barbaricini*. They betook themselves to Sardinia, settled in the mountains near Cagliari, and soon proved a very great nuisance to the inhabitants. Consequently, as Sardinia belonged to the province of Africa, Justinian ordered Belisarius, when in command there, to nominate a duke for Sardinia, and that to watch the Barbaricini the duke should take up his abode close to their mountain home.

To bring these savages and many of the peasantry of the island, who were still pagans, to Christianity and civilization, Gregory dispatched a special mission, as the clergy of the island do not seem to have been very zealous. His efforts were greatly aided by the military successes of the Duke of Sardinia (594), who only granted the cowed barbarians terms of peace on condition of their embracing Christianity. For this wise measure he was greatly praised by the Pope, who undertook to make the duke's merits known to the emperor without delay. Gregory also begged him to help, to the best of his ability, those whom he had sent out to work for the idolaters' conversion—a request he also preferred to Hospito, the chief of the Barbaricini, to the chief men in

Sardinia, and later (October 600), to the *praeses* of Sardinia. But, as has been already noted, the good work which was being accomplished by the zeal and energy of Gregory was to a considerable extent retarded by the oppression of the judge of the island, or *praeses*, who wrung money out of the poor heathens both for sacrificing to idols and for not doing so.

It is most interesting to note how, in the midst of all these spiritual concerns, Gregory had still an eye to business. The victories of the duke had resulted, as a matter of course in those times, in a considerable number of the Barbaricini being thrown upon the slave market. The Pope sent one of his notaries over to Sardinia to buy a number of them at a fair price who might be useful in his various hospitals.

THE DONATISTS

Passing over Gregory's work for the conversion of other in different parts of Europe, and turning to Africa, whence the Barbaricini came, his exertions to close the schism of the Donatists may suitably terminate our account of his successful efforts to enlarge the fold of the Church.

The fall of the Vandal power in Africa brought but little relief to its people. They had been persecuted by the Vandals for their religion; they were now ground down by the exactions of the Byzantine officials for their gold. Their endeavors, with the aid of the Moors, to throw off the Byzantine yoke were repressed with such violence "that the population of the country was fearfully decimated. They had indeed peace after so many miseries, but they were all beggars". Taking advantage of the troubles of the times, the *Donatists* once more raised their heads. Overwhelmed by the logic of St. Augustine, and by the civil power, to which they had been the first to appeal, but which had afterwards found it necessary to take active measures against their violence, they now made another effort to regain their old position in the country. Having, as it would seem, secured the connivance of the exarch Gennadius, they so freely lavished their gold "that the Catholic faith was publicly sold". For what the Donatists were ready to buy, some of the Catholic clergy, who had been disorganized during the violent times through which they had had to pass, were ready to sell. And where the schismatics failed to effect their purpose by the glitter of gold, they tried that of the sword. Many of the Catholic clergy were violently expelled from their churches.

Under the name of *Donatism* these African sectaries taught what under other names other heretics have taught since, and had taught before the days of Donatus, *the Great*, and Donatus of Casae Nigrae, who gave their name to them in the beginning of the fourth century. They held that the validity of the sacraments depended on the morality of the priest who administered them, and that only the good belong to the Church. Of course the corollary to these propositions was that they, being the good, formed the real Catholic Church. Hence they re-baptized those who went over to them from the Catholics.

To check their advances, Gregory urged the bishops of Africa to meet in council and practically in all his letters to that province never failed to exhort the clergy to bestir

themselves against the aggressive schismatics. At least one synod was held on this subject—apparently of one province only—under Dominic of Carthage (594). Its acts were duly forwarded to the Pope. In acknowledging their receipt, Gregory praises everything which had been done with one exception. He is afraid lest the last decision of the synod may give umbrage to the primates of the other 'councils' or provinces. The decision to deprive of their property and dignity those who neglect to take cognizance of heretics would only result in internal dissension, and hence in less effective work against error.

Gregory, however, did not confine himself to endeavoring to excite the zeal of the clergy against the schismatics; he wrote also to the civil authorities to induce them "to suppress their attempts and to bend their proud necks beneath the yoke of truth". "For it is well known that if heretics acquire the power of doing hurt, they rage furiously against the Catholic faith to apply the poison of their heresy, to ruin, if possible, the members of Christ's body". *The prefect of the praetorium, i.e.* the civil governor of Africa under the exarch, was written to in the same strain. And even the Emperor Maurice was exhorted not to let his enactments against the Donatists remain a dead letter. He was assured that the Pope had it on the authority of bishops from Africa that there the judgment of God was not held in awe, nor the edicts of the emperors in respect.

Holding, as he did, that all baptized Christians were subjects of the Church, and being full of zeal for the salvation of men's souls, Gregory evidently thought it right (after all other measures had failed) to use some degree of force to bring those back to the right path of the Christian faith who might have strayed from it. He would have this force applied by the State, as the physical protector of the Church, when requested by it to do so. The zeal of Gregory, and perhaps the force of the imperial *jussio*, seem to have had their effect. At any rate the Donatists are never again mentioned in the letters of Gregory; and they certainly disappeared for ever in the Saracen flood which overwhelmed Africa in the following century.

The barque of the Catholic Church, with the successors of St. Peter at the helm, sails onward through the ages, and one hostile craft after another, that has threatened destruction to Peter's ship is engulfed by the ocean of time, and leaves no trace behind it but its name registered on the pages of history!

GREGORY'S CHARITY

In the midst of his dealings with the great ones in Church and State, with patriarchs and with metropolitans, emperors and with exarchs, and in the midst of the weighty cares with which the concerns of nations, of Frank and Anglo-Saxon, of Visigoth and Lombard, filled his mind, Gregory found time to listen to the troubles of the poor and to look after individual souls. And if in contemplating his intercourse with the mighty, or with the nations of the earth, we are struck with admiration at his courage, his energy, his power of keeping in touch with the affairs of the whole world, when we behold him exerting himself for the poor and the oppressed, and striving with

the most delicate and tender attentions to win back to the cause of God a soul that has deserted His standard, our hearts glow with love of the man who showed himself in deed as well as in word "the Servant of the Servants of God". In illustrating here this side of Gregory's character, no notice will be taken of his truly regal almsgiving. Of that a later page will speak.

In the interest of a poor man Gregory thus addresses the bishop of Syracuse: "Such wicked deeds are reported to us as wrought in your province that we believe, if God have not mercy on it, it will be soon destroyed. The bearer of these presents has come to me and complained with tears that some years ago a man on the estate of the Church of Messina stood godfather to him, and that, as the result of a rather rough kind of persuasion, he married one of his godfather's slaves, by whom he had several children. Now it is said that the godfather has torn his wife away from his godson and sold her to another. If this story be true, you, my friend, will see how unspeakable and cruel an act has been committed. Hence we bid you thoroughly look into this matter with all that zeal which we know you display in holy things. And if the man's story shall prove to be correct, you will not only see to the repairing of the injury which has been done, but hasten to inflict such punishment as will satisfy the justice of God. Moreover, bitterly reprove the bishop (of Messina), who has neglected to punish his officials for the performance of such disgraceful deeds, and let him know that if any similar story comes to me concerning any of those who are dependent on him, I will proceed not against the delinquent, but against himself".

The wrongs of even pagan slaves are not beneath the Pope's notice. He insists on freedom being given to certain pagan slaves whom some *Samaritans* had bought and circumcised. Alexander Frigiscus, a serf, must have his wages paid in full; and the bishop of Naples must either persuade or, by the aid of the prefect of the praetorium of Italy, compel one John, a *vir clarissimus* and a *palatinus* or agent of the imperial exchequer, to refrain from unduly harassing the guild or society of the soapmakers.

We cannot refrain from quoting yet one more letter. It shows that especially in his dealings with the poor, who find it so hard to approach the world's great ones for equity, Gregory preferred generosity to justice even when the Church was the sufferer. "Gregory to Romanus the Defensor: Although what belongs to the Church may not be alienated, still the severity of the law may be sometimes relaxed at the call of mercy, especially when the amount given will not overburden the donor, and will somewhat relieve the poverty of the receiver. Now Stephania, the bearer of these presents, with her little child Callixenus (the son of her late husband Peter), has come here and earnestly besought me with tears, on account of the great poverty of Callixenus, to cause to be restored to the child a house in Catania, which his late mother-in-law Mammonia had presented by deed of gift to the Church. Stephania further asserts that Mammonia had no right to bequeath the house, inasmuch as it belonged to Callixenus. Our beloved deacon Cyprian, indeed, who has examined into the case, reports that the contention of Stephania is groundless, and that her son has no right to the house. However, that we may not appear to have paid no heed to the tears of Stephania, and to have followed rather justice than mercy, we order you to give up the house to Callixenus. Because, as we have said, in questions admitting of doubt, it is better to incline to mercy rather than

justice, especially when by the surrender of a small thing the Church will not greatly suffer, and on the other hand the poor and the orphan will be mercifully assisted".

The history of Venantius, as far as the *register* of Gregory makes it known to us, gives us an insight into his thoughtful and tender care for individual souls. Venantius, a man of good standing in the world, had become a monk; and then, unhappily, proving false to his vows, had left his monastery and married a lady of high degree. Before he became Pope, Gregory had endeavored to bring him to a sense of his duty; and when he was raised to the supreme Pontificate he did not forget him. "Many foolishly thought that when I was raised to the Episcopate I should decline to speak or to write to you. But it is not so; my very position compels me, and I cannot be silent ... Whether you wish it or not, I shall speak; for with all my strength I wish either to save you or to free myself from, the charge of your loss. Remember what habit you have worn, and placing before you the thought of the eternal severity, consider to what you have fallen ... If Ananias deserved death (Acts V. 2 f) for taking away from God the coins that he had given, think what peril you will incur in the Divine judgment who have withdrawn not coin but yourself from Almighty God, to whom you have vowed yourself in the monastic habit ... But I know when my letter is received, friends will forthwith assemble, literary clients will be summoned and you will seek counsel in a case of life from the abettors of death, who love not you but your goods, who say nothing to you but what will please for the time. Such were the counselors, as you will remember, who led you into the guilt of such a crime. To quote a secular author, all things are to be deliberated with friends, but first deliberate over these friends ... If, then, you believe that I love *you*, come here to the threshold of the Apostles and use me as a counselor".

Though his exhortations were all to no purpose, Gregory did not cease to correspond with Venantius, allowed Mass to be celebrated in his house, and even wrote to John, Bishop of Syracuse, asking him to continue to allow Mass to be said there (or even to say it himself)—a practice that John had given up owing to some quarrel he had had with Venantius. What an unrestrained violent sort of man Venantius was, may be gathered from this, that Gregory had to blame him for sending his armed men to work their will in John's palace in the course of the quarrel. When at length, on a bed of sickness himself, the Pope learnt (August 599) that Venantius was ill also, he again exhorted him in a quiet way to fear the severe judgment of God; and as they were both suffering from the same complaint, gout, he humorously remarked that, "Whilst the pains of the gout greatly increased in them, they made them decrease from life ... And since we have often sinned by gratifying the flesh, we are purified by the affliction of the flesh. Hence we must realize that if present pain cause the conversion of the sufferer, it is the termination of former faults; but if it does not induce the fear of God, it is but the beginning of pain to come". Soon after the dispatch of this beautiful letter, which deserves to be quoted in its entirety, he sent another to console the two daughters of Venantius, to prepare them for the approaching death of their father and to promise them his protection. At the same time he sent an earnest communication to John of Syracuse, to beg him in the first place to use every effort to make Venantius think of his soul and to resume his religious habit even at the eleventh hour; and then to protect the interests of the two daughters. Whether the Pope's desires were attended to by Venantius we know not. But after his death, Gregory did not forget the orphans. He sent

them a letter of encouragement and told them he was looking forward to their coming to Rome: "Inasmuch as you will get some comfort from me and I shall get no little joy from your presence". He thanks them for the little present of two articles of clothing which they have sent him, and which they would fain have had the Pope believe they had worked themselves. But in a lightly bantering manner he tells them that they are sailing under false colors, and seeking to get credit from the toil of others, as he very much doubts if they have ever touched a spindle in their lives. However, he concludes, that little matter does not sadden him, as he trusts they read the Holy Scripture, so that when, by the will of God, they are married, they may know how to live and to keep their houses in order.

THE PATRIMONIUM

Besides the care of all the churches throughout the world, Gregory had to look after the property of the Church, which, if not to be found all over the Christian world, was to be found at least in all the countries composing the patriarchate of the West. This property, known as the *patrimony of the Church*, or *of St. Peter* and not unfrequently as the *patrimony of the poor,* consisted of considerable estates not only in and about Rome, but also in various parts of Italy, north, south, and centre; of Istria, of Southern Gaul, of Dalmatia and Illyricum, of Africa, of Corsica and Sardinia, and especially of Sicily. Some twenty-three *patrimonies* are known by name. Of the Italian patrimonies, we shall hear again of that of the Cottian Alps; and of that of the Appian Way, it is interesting to note that we have a list of the farms that compose one of its estates not only in one of Gregory's letters, but in an extant marble inscription. For a *patrimony* was made up of a number of estates, and each estate of a number of farms. Certain German authors, who are not afraid to attempt to raise a very lofty building on a very small foundation, have endeavored to form some estimate of the total extent of the lands, with which, in the course of hundreds of years, the piety of the faithful, *e.g.*, of Gregory himself, had endowed the Church. One author puts the area of the patrimonies at 1360 square miles, and calculates the revenue arising therefrom at 200,000 gold solidi, (£120,000) in money and 500,000 in kind. A second estimate gives 1800 square miles. Compared with some of the fortunes of even private individuals under the earlier Empire, this income was not large. Dill, in his excellent work on *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire,* gives the annual income of Pallas, the freedman of the Emperor Claudius, as £384,000. "Even up to the fall of Rome, a senatorial income of the highest class, exclusive of what was derived from the estates in kind, sometimes reached the sum of £180,000". Still, for the close of the sixth century the patrimony of St. Peter was considerable. The vast estates of the Church Gregory managed through his agents, who were known, in the descending scale, as *rectores, defensores* and *actores* or *actionarii.* To do all that lay in his power to ensure a conscientious discharge of their duty on the part of these officials, he not only chose them out of the clerical body, among the deacons or subdeacons, but by various regulations endeavored to impress upon them the importance of their office. For it was the business of the *defensors* in looking after the patrimonies of St. Peter, not merely to

see to the interests of the poor and of those who, in straits, *commended themselves to the Church* (as it was called), or sought its protection and patronage, but also to intervene in ecclesiastical affairs where bishops were concerned. So great was their power that sham *defensors* even presumed to harass bishops, and Gregory found it necessary to advise the bishops of Sicily not to heed those who were not furnished with papers for them, either from himself or from the "rector of our patrimony".

To duly impress upon the *defensors* the dignity of their office, Gregory formed them into a college and bestowed on the first seven of them the *regionary* dignity that was possessed by the *regionary* deacons and notaries.

The head of the seven became the *primicerius* of the *defensors,* just as there was a *primicerius* of the seven *regionary* notaries. To this college candidates were attached by the solemn presentation of a deed of appointment before the body of St Peter. The form of the document was as follows: "Provided that you have no impediment in your condition or person, and that you are not a cleric attached to another Church, and that the statutes of the canons do not forbid it, it is our desire that, for the benefit of the Church, you undertake the office of *Defensor* of the Church, and whatever shall be commanded you by us for the welfare of the poor, you will honestly and diligently execute. You will use the privilege, which after mature deliberation we have conferred upon you, so as to show your fidelity in fulfilling our commands, and shall render to us an account of your actions, subject to the judgment of God".

Before entering into more minute details regarding the duties of the *defensors* and Gregory's careful management of the *patrimonies,* a few words may be said on the cultivators of the soil of the Church's estates, with the result, it may be hoped, of making those details more intelligible. The ecclesiastical lands, like those of landowners generally in the Roman Empire in the days of Gregory, were cultivated by slaves and by *coloni* or serfs, otherwise known as the *rustici* (peasants) of the Church.

These, with the *conductores* (managers or stewards) of the estates and farms, together formed the *familia* of the Church. The coloni, though freemen, were attached to the soil *(adscripti glebes),* and changed hands with the slaves and other *effects* of a farm, whenever the farm to which they were attached was sold. Though "attached to the soil", the serfs were not debarred from working for pay, doubtless in their spare time, off their own estate. The product of their labour was collected, perhaps generally in kind, by managers or stewards *(conductors)* who were set over the farms *(fundus* or *conduma)* and over the estates. These *conductores* were not to be nominated by the *rectores* for a consideration. Gregory did not approve of their being often changed, and he knew well they would be if a *commission* were to be made out of their appointment.

Some of the patrimony of the Church was not thus cultivated in its direct interests and under the direction of the *defensor* or *rector.* Portions of it were held *in emphyteusis.* That is to say, for a fixed rent land was leased by a deed (by *copyhold—scripta),* generally for three generations, but sometimes in perpetuity. Though many came to Rome to beg for a lease to be granted to them, they did not all get their request complied with. Gregory feared—and his fears were in time proved to have been well

grounded—that such lands might be easily lost to the Church. Hence he was careful to grant such leases only under severe restrictions.

When a *defensor* or *rector* set out from Rome for the scene of his labors, he was not only furnished by the Pope with letters of recommendation to the ecclesiastical and civil authorities of his district, but also with a letter of instructions *(capitular).* One such document addressed to the subdeacon Peter (the Peter of the *Dialogues* and the rector of the great Sicilian patrimony) has come down to us; or, more strictly, a letter of Gregory to Peter on the *capitulare.* As the Sicilian patrimony was the most important, and as we have a good many letters of Gregory regarding it, simply to treat of it will be to show what was being done concerning the other patrimonies.

Peter is told to read his letter of instruction's over and over again with the greatest care. Every effort must be made to prevent bishops from mixing themselves up in secular matters, except where necessity compels them in their concern for the interests of the poor.

"It has come to my ears", continues Gregory, "that during the past ten years from the time of the *defensor* Antoninus, many persons have suffered violence and wrong at the hands of the Roman Church, and that men openly complain that their borders have been invaded, their slaves enticed away, their movable property taken from them by the strong hand, with no pretence of judicial process. Pray, in all these things, let your experience exercise the most strenuous vigilance, and let this letter be your warrant for the restoration of whatever you may find to have been violently taken away or wrongfully detained in the Church's name during these ten years ... You will bring me in a more profitable return if you accumulate the reward of a good conscience than if you bring back. We are informed also that many complain of the loss of slaves, saying that any runaway slave who professes himself to be under ecclesiastical law is at once claimed by the Church's bailiffs *(rectores),* who, without any judicial decision in their favor, back up the slave's assertions by violence. All this displeases me as much as it is abhorrent to the spirit of justice and truth ... Let any slaves now in the Church's power, who were taken away without a judge's order, be restored before any proceedings are taken; and if any such do lawfully belong to the Holy Church, let the right to them be asserted against their alleged owners in a regular and orderly action ...

"But if, on the other hand, you see some piece of property which you think justly belongs to the Church, beware of defending our right even to this with the strong hand ... Whatever reasonably belongs to the poor ought to be defended by reason, lest otherwise our unrighteous action in a good cause should make even our just claims seem unjust in the sight of Almighty God.

"May the noble laymen and the glorious Praetor love you for your humility and not abhor you for your pride. So act that your humility may not make you slack, nor your authority rigid".

Besides this letter, treating of the general attitude which Peter had to take up with regard to the different branches of his duty, Gregory dispatched many other letters to him dealing with particular cases. He had, for instance, to go and settle a boundary dispute between some tenants of the Roman Church and the monastery of St. Theodore at Palermo; to see to the filling up of certain parishes whose pastors had fallen away; to

give help to certain poor people who are specified by the Pope; to rein close wandering monks; to contribute both in kind and in money to the expenses for festivities in connection with the dedication of a church; to protect certain Jewish converts from persecution by their brethren on account of their conversion; to purchase and send to Rome large quantities of corn in view of a scarcity there, but at the same time to take care that the coloni of the Church were not harassed in the collection of it; and to restore property taken from the Church of Taormina by the *actionarii* of the Roman Church, and to help the bishop of the same Church to recover certain monies that had been lost.

Turning now to the 42nd letter of the last book of Gregory's letters and to the 38th in the 2nd, we find them full of most interesting details regarding the position of the tenantry of the Church. In these two letters, besides treating of specific cases, Gregory lays down many general principles according to which he would have the *rectores* behave to the peasantry.

In buying corn from the *coloni*, the stewards are not to try and beat down the price in seasons of plenty; but they must, under all circumstances, pay at the rates fixed by the state. Further, the *coloni* were not to be required, on one count or another, to give more than 18 pints *(sextarii)* to the peck *(modius)*. Sixteen pints was the exact equivalent to the peck; but the Pope allowed 18 to be insisted on to cover losses of various kinds. As much as 25 had sometimes been extorted from the oppressed colonus.

An even greater abuse, which Gregory vehemently denounced, consisted in making the peasants pay their dues at the rate of 73 solidi to the pound *(libra)* of gold instead of 72. As 24 *siquilae* made up the solidus, one solidus and a half would be equivalent to 36 *siquilae*. Hence in exacting 73 solidi to the pound, each of the proper 72 solidi to the pound had been increased by *half* a *siquila*. To put a stop to this and other exactions of a variable character, Gregory decided that all *extras* were to be done away with. The amount of the rent might be increased, according to the financial capability of the *colonus*, but then nothing more was to be extorted from him. To prevent a recurrence of these wrongs a proper written agreement was to be drawn up, setting forth the amount of the rent to be paid, and handed to the *colonus*, so that he would fully understand the limit of his obligations. But to be just all round, the Pope arranged that the money that used to accrue to the *rector* from these little extras should be deducted for him from the total rent charge.

Peter was to "look before all things" to the weights and measures. If he found any false ones they were to be immediately broken. Informed that the payment of the first installment of the 'burdatio' (which is explained to be an imperial land tax due in January, May and September) pressed heavily on the coloni, because having to pay before they had themselves received any of the results of their toil, they borrowed money at ruinous rates of interest from the public tax collectors *(actionarii)*, Gregory ordered the *defensor* to make himself responsible for the tax and to get the money back by degrees from the *colonii* as they earned it. From a subsequent paragraph of this same letter, it has been calculated that the annual *burdatio* paid by the Sicilian patrimony to the imperial exchequer was £92.

Various dues were required from peasants on their marriage. The fees, according to the Pope's ruling, were not to exceed one *solidus* (12s.), and if the parties were poor, a less sum was to be paid to the steward.

Besides various individual cases dealt with in this letter by Gregory, many other general directions are also contained in it. It concludes with ordering that it be read to all the coloni of the patrimony, that they might learn their rights. They were also to be furnished with copies of it. By the coming judgment, Peter is urged to carry out the Pope's wishes. "You have heard what I want, see that you put it into execution". Gregory would not have "the treasury of the Church defiled by unholy gain".

The other letter cited above is fuller of small details. Undoubtedly this attention to trifling points shows us the greatness of Gregory's mind which nothing escaped. And the way he managed "his own house" is an earnest of the way "he took care of the Church of God". The letter plunges into *minuticae* at once.

Cows too old to calve and useless bulls must be sold at once, that the price of them may be good for something. Of the herds of mares on the patrimony, the Pope would have Peter keep but 400 of the younger ones for breeding purposes. The rest were then to be sold. Those which were retained were to be distributed one by one to the stewards of the different farms, who were to make a small annual return for them. "For it is beyond a joke to have to pay *£60* a year for men to look after the herds and not to get 60 pence from the herds themselves".

Of the particular cases treated of in this letter, the case of the monk Pretiosus cannot be passed over, as it gives us a touching picture of the Pope's anxiety to be just in other matters besides money. "You know how much I am grieved in mind because, for a fault which was not serious I vehemently upbraided the monk Pretiosus and sent him away from me, sad and full of bitterness. Accordingly I wrote to his bishop that I should be glad if he would send Pretiosus back to me. He, however, did not want to do so. And I cannot and ought not to give him pain; because, busy with God's work, he must be rather supported with consolation than repressed with severity. Meanwhile, as I hear, Pretiosus himself is quite disheartened because he does not return to me. As I said, I do not want to grieve his bishop, who does not wish to let him come, so that between the two I know not what to do. Do you then, if your wisdom is greater than your little body, so arrange this matter that I may get my way and the bishop be not put out".

In this, as in many other of his letters, Gregory is very urgent that prompt restitution be made if any act of injustice has been perpetrated, by the officials of the Church. In carrying out this injunction Peter must not be swayed by fear or favor.

Although sick, Gregory expresses a wish that Peter would come over and visit him. But before he comes he must see that his place is filled by two rectors, one for the patrimony round Syracuse and another for that round Palermo, and that the two have previously secured the good graces of the *scribones* (officers of the imperial body-guard who collected certain of the taxes), and of the praetor, by the gift of some small presents. He must also bring with him the rents of the 9th and 10th indictions (September 590 to September 592) and all his accounts. But owing to the equinoctial gales he was not to leave Sicily till after St. Cyprian's day (September 14).

"You have sent me", concludes the Pope, "one miserable horse and five good asses. The horse I cannot ride, because it is such a wretched specimen, nor any of the good asses, because they are asses. If you are really anxious to oblige me, I must ask you to bring with you something respectable".

Writing to the *defensors* to be just, Gregory wrote to the *coloni* to be obedient, to do what was right and to earn respect for themselves, not only from bearing the name of the "family of the Prince of the Apostles", but still more by being distinguished for their virtues. Well may the mediaeval proverb, "It is good to live under a crook", have taken its rise from the conduct of Gregory the Great as a landlord.

In estimating the position of Gregory with regard to his vast patrimonies, the proposition that some of them at least "were real principalities, sometimes including cities and entire provinces, in which the Pope exercised, through officers appointed by himself, all the rights of a temporal lord", is nearer the truth than the one which lays down that they "were not ruled but owned as an English nobleman owns his estate". For what Gibbon had long ago remarked, viz., that the Pope's agents "had acquired a civil and even criminal jurisdiction over their tenants", is amply borne out by Gregory's letters; and puts the Pope's position as a landowner on a far higher plane than that of an English noble. It is the part which this wealth and power, added to his spiritual authority, forced Gregory to take in the affairs of Italy, which induces modern authors to consider him the real ruler at least of non-Lombard Italy. "Gregory I, in spite of the respectful tone of his letters to Maurice and Phocas, was the civil potentate in Italy". The germ of the temporal power of the popes took root in the days of the first Gregory, to come forth in the days of the second Gregory.

It will perchance ere this have crossed the mind of the practical reader to seek information as to what became of the revenues which accrued to the Holy See from these vast patrimonies, and of the sums which pious persons, from the emperor downwards, sent to the Pope. They were used by Pope Gregory to defray the great expenses necessarily entailed by dealings with the clergy and laity of the whole Catholic world, and by the sending of missionaries to the heathen; by intercourse with the great ones of this earth, and by keeping embassies at Constantinople and Ravenna; by the Lombard war, with paying troops and buying peace, and by the redemption of captives and slaves; and above all, by his countless acts of almsgiving exercised in behalf not only of the people of Rome, but in behalf of people of all ranks throughout the civilized world.

In the sixth century men looked to the popes not only for guidance in spiritual matters but for help in their bodily necessities. The famous Cassiodorus, the Roman minister of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, thus wrote to John II, who died but a few years before the birth of Gregory: "You are the chief of the Christian people; with the name of Father you direct everything. You, to whom its guardianship has been entrusted, must look to the safety of the people. We have to regulate some things, but you everything. Your first concern indeed is to give spiritual food to your flock, but you cannot neglect their temporal needs. For as man is made up of soul and body, so it is the business of a good father to nourish them both". This view of the duty of the common father of all

Christians was not only thoroughly understood by Gregory and expressed by him in words; it was more. It was put into practice by him in a most remarkable manner.

As charity is said to begin at home, an enumeration of the charitable deeds of Gregory may well begin with a description of what he accomplished in that way in the city of Rome itself. And here we may avail ourselves of the edifying picture sketched for us by John the Deacon, in the second book of his biography. What he tells us is amply borne out by the unimpeachable testimony of the Pope's letters.

To those poor whom the calamities of the times brought to Rome, Gregory gave daily support, inviting twelve of them to his table, perhaps to the great stone one which is still shown in Rome as that at which he served the poor in person. On the first of every month he distributed to the poor generally, corn, wine, cheese, etc., according to the season, and to the nobles of the city delicacies of various kinds. Nor were the clergy forgotten. From time to time an *aureus* (12 shillings) found its way to them. And the nuns, to whose piety Gregory ascribes the salvation of Rome, not only received thousands of pounds a year, but grants of hundreds for present needs. To many, quarterly payments in gold and silver were made; and every day was cooked food conveyed to the sick, with some special dishes for the bashful poor. So that, says the deacon, the Church came to be regarded as a storehouse open to all. To ensure that no deserving person should be passed over, Gregory caused a list to be compiled in which were set forth the names and status of all those who were living not only in Rome and the neighborhood, but also in more distant cities. This list formed a large volume, which was preserved in the archives of the Lateran palace, and was still to be seen when John the Deacon told us of its existence. How searching was Gregory's care of the poor may be gathered from this incident, also preserved for us by the worthy deacon. On one occasion a poor man was found dead in a common lodging-house. Fearing that he might have died of want, Gregory refrained from saying Mass for some days, as though he had himself been the cause of the man's death. With justice might John assert that he gave freely to all who asked and to all who did not ask him for help.

Gregory seems to have been just as eager to give as *any* miser ever was to accumulate. He encouraged generosity in others; he blamed his rectors for not making known to him the needs of the poor or the distressed, for whom he would allow the very sacred vessels of the altar to be sold; and he gave expression to the annoyance that he felt when he was not asked to help the poor, the more so, as he said, that he would only be asked for what belonged to the poor. His alms found their way everywhere. Bedding, clothes and money were sent as far as Mount Sinai. And not only did he merely give, but he gave with such grace as to double the value of whatever he did give. An aged abbot of a monastery in distant Isauria had asked the Pope to send him 50 solidi for the needs of his establishment; but thinking he had asked too much, he had proceeded to lower his request to 40, and had even suggested that perhaps he ought to have begged for even less. To this Gregory: "Because I find you have acted towards me with such consideration, I must behave in the like spirit. I have therefore sent you the 50 solidi, and for fear that might be too little I have sent you 10 more, and lest even that might not be sufficient I have superadded 12 more" *(i.e.* 72 solidi in all, or one pound of gold). "In this you have shown your love for me that you have presumed to place the full confidence in me that you ought to have done."

But with all his unbounded generosity, Gregory did not give indiscriminately or with careless prodigality. He is willing that the *rector* of the Campanian patrimony should give the abbot Felix a large quantity of lead for roofing purposes or for water-pipes, if only he is convinced that the proposed building will serve some useful purpose. The monks of a monastery at Tropea (near modern Monteleone), in the patrimony of Bruttium, can have their wants supplied, if they are leading a good life and are in real need.

Hence, too, any loss of money through negligence annoyed him very much. Information brought to him that Pascasius, Bishop of Naples (through devoting his attention to the building of ships instead of to the performance of his episcopal duties and to hearkening to the advice of the wise), had already lost over 400 solidi, brought down on the subdeacon Anthemius, the Campanian rector, a severe letter from Gregory. Anthemius ought not to have put off calling the bishop to account. He must do so at once, before either some of the clergy or some of the nobility. Disliking, as a sensible business man, the loss of money or property, he took pains for its preservation. The ravages of the Lombards had caused a great many of the clergy to fly with the sacred vessels of their churches to Sicily. There through accident and design a great number of them were *lost*. When Gregory was informed of this state of things he at once ordered his *rector* there to make the strictest search for them. When recovered they were to be carefully catalogued, and, when a receipt had been got for them, deposited with the different bishops of Sicily, till such time as they might be restored on the conclusion of peace. Not to quote all the letters of Gregory under the pretext of illustrating his princely charity, mention will only be made of one more, as it also brings out the fact that in him the sublimest charity walked hand in hand with shrewd business. Again it is a question of the sub-deacon Anthemius. The spring of 596 had seen Arichis raiding the Campanian plain. He had returned to Beneventum with a numerous train of captives. The grief of Gregory was, as he said himself, only to be estimated by the magnitude of the disaster. He at once sent money for the redemption of the prisoners. Still, though he instructed Anthemius to redeem not only such freemen as were unable to pay their own ransom, but also those slaves whose ransom their masters could not afford, he was careful to remind the *rector* to redeem the captives at as low a rate as possible, and to send to him a careful list of all he redeemed. If charity “covereth a multitude of sins”, Gregory’s must have been well hidden.

THE JEWS

Among those who turned to the Pope for justice, denied them everywhere else, were the ever-oppressed Jews. And in him they found what the Jews in every age, including our own, have found in the Roman pontiffs, a ruler more tolerant towards them than any of their other masters. In the Middle Ages, the Jews, everywhere persecuted, called Rome their “paradise on earth”. We have many letters of Gregory written in behalf of the Jews. He will not have them injured, deprived of their synagogues, prevented from holding their religious festivals, nor forcibly baptized. “For those who are not Christians must be won to the unity of the faith by mildness and

kindness, by admonition and persuasion". One of the *persuasive* methods used by the Pope was to cause the rent of those Jews on the Church's patrimonies to be somewhat reduced if they expressed a willingness to become Christians. But he would not have them or their belongings ill-used, as Bishop Victor of Palermo found to his cost, when Gregory insisted on his making restitution for damage done to some of the Jewish synagogues, in his episcopal city. In thus seeing that the Jews got justice, Gregory showed that he was not only a Christian bishop and a theologian, but a ruler who had thoroughly grasped that the strength of a state depended upon the union of its people, and that that union could be cemented by nothing but by justice for every man. Side by side with the enunciation of abstract principles of justice in behalf of the Jews, we find placed the practical deductions of the soundest common sense. On one occasion it had come to his ears that a certain convert from Judaism had forcibly taken possession of a synagogue in Sardinia where there were then a great many Jews. He at once ordered the synagogue to be restored to them, and laid it down: "The civil laws do not permit the Jews to erect new synagogues; at the same time they allow them the undisturbed use of their old ones. That Peter and his supporters may not pretend that they have acted as they have simply from zeal for the faith and to force the conversion of the Jews, you must (this to the metropolitan of Sardinia) point out to them that moderation is to be their rule in these matters. The Jews must be drawn to the Church by their own will, not forcibly pushed into it. For it is written: 'I will freely sacrifice to thee', and 'With my will, I will give praise to him'. Let your holiness then, with the aid of those who, like yourself, condemn Peter's violence, endeavor to make peace between the people of your city; because, especially at this time, when there is every fear of a descent of the enemy (the Lombards), *you ought not to have a divided peopled".* If the emperors at Constantinople had always acted on the lines here marked out by the Pope, a very different front would have been presented to the Moslems. It were very desirable, too, that those who nowadays are so fond of lauding the Iconoclastic emperors, for their noble efforts to root up *superstition* (Oh! that blessed word superstition! How efficaciously its free use serves to gloss over flaws in weak arguments!), as incarnated, as it were, in *Image-worship*, should contrast Gregory's treatment of the Jews and that of their idols, the emperors.

But if Gregory's efforts to secure justice for the Jews were such that, whenever they had a grievance they flocked to him to have it remedied, he made equally manifest his determination that they should abide by the existing laws, especially those which had been devised to stop their proselytizing.

Owing to the power possessed by masters over their slaves, Jewish masters were able to put a considerable amount of pressure on such Christian slaves as they might possess to force them to give up their religion. This was not unnaturally strongly resented by Christians generally. Besides, it was thought an indignity to the Christian religion that Christians should be subject to Jews. Hence the latter had been forbidden, even by Constantine, to keep Christian slaves. The prohibition found a definite place in the laws of the empire, and took its place in due course in the codes of the barbarians and the synodal decrees of the Church. This law, through the collapse of the Empire in the West, or through their wealth, the Jews were enabled in many parts to set at naught with impunity. Its enforcement was constantly insisted upon, however, by the Pope, and

this, too, whether before bishops or lay officials. He, of course, was equally resolute on what was a necessary corollary to this line of action—*viz.*, that such slaves of Jews as wished to become Christians and fled to a Church for that purpose should be set free.

SLAVERY

This compulsory liberation of certain slaves from Jewish masters was one of the means made use of by the Church to bring about the total abolition of slavery. Slavery was literally part and parcel of ancient civilization. And whatever view the Church might take of it, it was clearly impossible for her to change the whole social order of the world all at once. And, indeed, had she been able to do so, the experience of modern times has shown that the sudden compulsory liberation of multitudes of slaves is of more or less doubtful benefit to the slaves themselves. But what we find the Church doing from early times was to prepare the way for the gradual extermination of slavery by asserting the natural equality of all men, and by giving men a high motive to induce them to free their slaves—pointing out to them that such a line of conduct was a most fitting act of gratitude to offer to God, who by His Son's death had freed all of us from the slavery of sin. "Since our Redeemer mercifully assumed our human flesh, that the grace of His divinity might break the bonds of slavery by which we were held, and restore us to our original freedom, it is a wholesome act, by the benefit of manumission, to restore to the liberty in which they were born, men whom in the beginning nature brought forth free, and whom the law of nations has made bondsmen". Such is the preamble of the act of manumission in which Gregory declared free and Roman citizens two of the slaves of the Roman Church—"being moved", as he said, "by reflection on this matter".

And if, in later times, "it seemed", even to the *unspeakable* Lombard, "the very greatest gain that slaves should be brought from slavery to freedom", the reason given is that of Gregory—"because our Redeemer deigned to become a slave to purchase liberty for us". And if in later times the Franks freed slaves, they so far copied the formula of Gregory in doing so, that they not only freed them to honor Our Lord, but even declared them *Roman citizens.* Gregory did not live to see rooted up the noxious weed of slavery, firmly established as it was by a growth of thousands of years. But he began the task of eradicating it, and, instructed by him as to the best way of destroying it, the Church did at length succeed in stamping it out of all Christian countries.

THE LITURGY

Occupied as Gregory thus was with the spiritual and temporal needs of the Church's children, with the concerns of emperors, kings and peasants, with pagan and heretic, and with all the multifarious external relations in general of the Church Catholic, he found time to attend to what may be called the inner life of the Church, to her intercourse, so to speak, with her Divine Founder, to the way in which she expresses

herself to Him in her liturgy. That Gregory, as a matter of fact, did interest himself in improving the liturgy, we know not only on the late testimony of John the Deacon, but also on that of the Pope himself. For he tells us he had been asked how he hoped to repress the Church of Constantinople if in all his (liturgical) arrangements he followed the customs of that Church in everything. Various points had been adduced by the Pope's questioner to show that in his changes he had followed the customs of Constantinople. For instance, the fact that he had altered the position in the Mass of the *Lord's Prayer* was alleged in proof of the accusation. "We say the *Lord's Prayer"* replied Gregory, "immediately after the Canon, because the apostolic custom was that the consecration of the Host took place in connection with the *Lord's Prayer* only. And it seemed to me very unsuitable that we should say over the Host the Canon composed by a scholastic, and should not say over His Body and Blood the prayer composed by Our Redeemer Himself. Moreover, the *Lord's Prayer* among the Greeks is said by all the people, among us by the priest alone". But while, in conclusion, asking his critics, "In what have we followed Greek customs when we have either brought back our old ones or established new and useful ones?" and assuring them with regard to the Church of Constantinople that no one doubted that it was subject to the apostolic See, he concludes, as might be expected from such a broad-minded man: "Still if that Church or any other has anything good, whilst I restrain my inferiors from what is unlawful, I am prepared to follow them in good. For a fool is he who thinks he shows that he then holds the first position when he disdains to learn the good he may see around him".

With regard to the position of the *Lord's Prayer,* it is said: "Its ancient place in the Roman rite was at the actual *fractio,* or breaking of the bread before communion. Between the *fractio* and the communion no prayer appears in the Roman Orders, where, in all likelihood, the *Lord's Prayer* occurred before the time of Gregory". But if it is now no longer certain what was the exact change made by Gregory in the position of the *Our Father* in the Mass, it is not to be wondered at if we do not know what were the exact changes he effected in the Sacramentary. Grisar supposes that what alterations he did make were effected in the early years of his pontificate, and in connection with his attention to the devotion of the *stations.* According to John the Deacon, Gregory's work in this direction consisted in alterations made to the Sacramentary bearing the name of Pope Gelasius (492-6). And just as that Pope's edition (or that edition by whomever drawn up) was only an adaptation of the liturgy as he found it, so Gregory's Sacramentary—the groundwork of the Roman Missal as we have it today—was only a revised version of the issue of his predecessor. To Gregory's orderly mind the liturgical productions of the preceding century seemed defective in arrangement, and to him they also appeared too long and too much scattered through different books. Accordingly, while changing the order somewhat of the prayers in the earlier edition, and adding a few of his own, he cut out a great many, and brought them together in one volume for the convenience of the celebrant.

After this it might be thought a comparatively easy task to decide what were the changes effected by Gregory. All that would be necessary would be to compare the Sacramentary of *Gelasius,* of which a new edition has been recently published at the Clarendon Press, with that of Gregory, and the task would be accomplished. There is,

however, this difficulty in the way. There is no longer extant a copy of the original Sacramentary of Gregory. By the addition of a supplement to the original work, and by the gradual fusion of that supplement with the primary text, the true *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* was lost.

"Though", says Bishop, in an isolated later MS., "a trace of the primitive distinction (*viz.*, between the original text and the supplement) may still be found, the true *Gregorianum* and the supplement were, by the close of the tenth century, so fused into one whole that it was impossible to distinguish any longer the component parts of what now passed as the *Gregorianum Sacramentarium*. And it is the book thus fused which, practically speaking, forms the Roman missal of today".

When and where and to what extent additions were first made to Gregory's Sacramentary, it seems now impossible to say. But when Charlemagne was carrying out his reforms in Church matters he found it necessary to write to his friend Pope Hadrian I. for an unadulterated copy of the work. This he received. Here we must leave the Sacramentary of Gregory in the hope that it may be given to some fortunate scholar also to receive it from some neglected corner in one of the archives of France or Germany.

With his attention fixed on the Church's liturgy it was impossible that the question of music and singing (ever an integral part of liturgy) should fail to claim some share of his regard. As we have already seen, the very first canon of the council he held in Rome in 595 shows at least that he had given some thought to it. And tradition has always connected his name with extensive and beneficial improvements in the matter of musical notation. Some few *writers*, indeed, brushing aside, without adequate grounds, the statements of John the Deacon, would deny to Gregory any share whatsoever in advancing the science of music.

The statements of John the Deacon are as follows: "For the glory of God's House, in imitation of Solomon, the Wise, and on account of the sweetness of the compunction evoked by music, Gregory composed with the greatest care an Antiphonary, a cento of chants, or, a cento for the cantors". To perpetuate his work, we are assured by the same biographer that he founded a school of singers endowed it with lands, and erected two buildings for it—one in connection with the Basilica of St. Peter and the other with the Lateran Palace. There to the present day, continues John, are preserved, together with his original *Antiphonary*, the couch on which he used to recline when singing (as his gout would prevent him from standing) and the rod with which he threatened the boys! The great pontiff, whose mission was to emperors and to kings, could find time and not think it beneath his dignity to instruct small boys in the music of the Church.

But the work of Gregory on the *Antiphonary* (the volume or volumes in which were collected the parts of the Mass or the Divine Office which had to be sung) is vouched for not merely, as some suppose, by John the Deacon, but by others before his time. In the *first* half of the ninth century, the distinguished abbot of Reichenau, Walafrid Strabo, wrote that it was the received opinion that, besides re-ordering the masses and the consecrations, the Blessed Gregory had practically thrown the music of the Church into the convenient form it had preserved down to his day, "as it is, moreover, expressly stated in the beginning of the antiphonary itself". And in the preceding century our own Egbert of York specifies the Antiphonary and Missal of

Blessed Gregory, as brought into England by St. Augustine, and tells us that he himself saw in Rome both the Sacramentary and the Antiphonary of the Pope.

Finally, among the letters, or fragments of letters, of Leo IV discovered by Mr. Bishop, there is one to an abbot Honoratus, who is bitterly blamed by the Pope for not appreciating "the sweetness of the Gregorian music", and his liturgy, and thus differing not only from the Roman See (the supreme head of religion, the mother of all churches, and your mistress), but from all who in the Latin tongue praise God and who sing at all. With the greatest exertion did Pope Gregory invent this chant, that by artificially modulated sound he might draw to the Church not only ecclesiastics, but also the uncultivated. The abbot is, in conclusion, threatened with excommunication if he does not follow the teachings of Pope Gregory in the matter of music and liturgy. This highly interesting fragment has been printed most fully by Hirsch-Gereuth.

Further recent researches into the mass of unpublished manuscript music of the Middle Ages have brought to light a remarkable fact, which of itself goes far to establish the truth of the tradition as to the reforms in music initiated by Gregory. The result of these investigations has been summarized in the *Dublin Review* for October 1897. In the words of that article may well be stated the fact above alluded to: "All the plain-song MSS., from the 8th to the 14th or 15th centuries, to whatever nationality they belong, agree in presenting the melodies in precisely the same form". This fact, of course, points to a common and authoritative origin for the chants. "Such conformity between documents of different ages, together with the proofs we have given above (the words of John the Deacon, etc.), seems to be quite sufficient to reassure timid minds with regard to the lapse of the two centuries which separate St. Gregory from our earlier MSS. If, during eight centuries, in spite of the ... errors of copyists, etc., the chant of the great Pope has passed unscathed through a period of decadence, why should we fear that the Gregorian melodies could be lost or altered in a lapse of time relatively so short?"

But if it be asked more closely what precise change did the Pope effect in the music of the Church, as he found it, so that for all future ages it was to bear his name and be known as the Gregorian chant—the answer must obviously be largely conjectural. However, of the eight tones which now compose the *Gregorian chant* four are supposed to have existed before his time, and to them he is supposed to have added other four, each a fourth below the existing tones. So that the general scale of the sounds in the eight tones extended from the *la* grave *(i.e.,* the *a* in the first space in the modern base clef) to the *sol* of the second octave *(i.e.,* the *g* on the second line of the treble clef). "He made use of the old Latin notation to represent the tones, and employed the first seven letters of the Roman alphabet, in capitals and small print, as the signs of the two octaves".

However all this may be, there is, at least, every reason to believe that Pope Gregory I had a hand in the perfecting of a style of musical composition which for certain purposes still remains unsurpassed, and in which have been written some of the most solemnly grand pieces which the world has yet heard.

Intimately connected with music, which, especially through the labors of Gregory the Great and Guido d'Arezzo, they have done so much to advance, and which to this

day they cultivate with care, have always been the monks of the order of St. Benedict. His *Dialogues*, which contain his life of the great father of western monasticism, are a tribute of Gregory's admiration for St. Benedict and the early fathers of the Order. His devoting his patrimony to the erection of monasteries and his becoming a Benedictine monk himself are facts which tell the same story more eloquently still. When he went as apocrisiarius to Constantinople he would not be without the company of his beloved monks. When he became Pope, was he likely to forget them? They and the monastic life became, if possible, dearer to him than ever. He would have, as we have seen, monks ever about his person. With them he filled important Sees, and accomplished important undertakings. In the midst of his troubles his mind ever regretfully turned to the quiet of the cloister—the harbour of refuge from the storms of the world. "I sailed with a favorable wind when I led a quiet life in my monastery. But stormy gales have arisen since, and hurried me on along with them".

As proof of his love and regard for the monks of his order is cited a document (often called the *Magna Charta* of the monks), purporting to be a *Constitution* of Pope Gregory, addressed to all the bishops, in which is proclaimed the freedom of the monks from episcopal control. Though this decree is no longer regarded as genuine, still the authentic letters of his *Register* show that Gregory undoubtedly did for many particular cases what he is falsely alleged to have done for the whole. And the individual exemption from episcopal control, granted by him to promote the welfare of the monasteries, paved the way for the general exemption of later times, and was in turn only an extension of a policy already entered upon by his predecessors.

The monks were, in the West at least, and in the development they had received through the organizing hand of Benedict, practically a new element in the Church. Naturally, then, time was required to fix their relations to the authorities of the Church, and for themselves to settle down as one of its ordinary working powers. In different letters regarding various monasteries, Gregory laid down a number of principles to define the position of the monks.

In the first place the peace and tranquility of the monasteries must be provided for, "so that the minds of the monks may be freer to attend to God's work". Hence he would have them entrust the secular business of their monasteries to laymen, and be freed as well from the duties of ordinary citizens as from those of the *secular* clergy. He would not allow their property to be interfered with by bishop or priest, and supported them in their efforts to free themselves from episcopal control if only "security of mind in prayer" were sought for and not immunity from well-deserved episcopal severity.

Another point which Gregory strongly insisted upon was that the monks should enjoy full freedom in the election of their abbots; and that, once elected, only a *canonical fault* was to avail to depose them. To prevent their being annoyed by episcopal interference, he ruled that monks were not to be raised to sacred orders or removed from the monastery without the consent of the abbot. On the occasion of their visits to a monastery, the bishops were not to prove a financial burden or so act as to interfere with the monastic quiet.

On the other hand, he would have the monks submit to the civil power in matters that pertain to it, and observe their vows of chastity and poverty. "Where individual

gain is the order of the day among monks, neither peace nor charity can long endure. The habit of a monk denotes contempt of the world. And how can monks despise the world who seek gold?". They must not wander about; and, if need be, force must be used to prevent them. Youths under eighteen are not to be allowed to become monks, and all candidates must undergo a two years' novitiate. By this last regulation he split the difference between the laws of Justinian, which required a novitiate of three years, and the *rule* of St. Benedict, which required but one. Lastly, he insisted that men should not belong to the ranks both of the secular clergy and of the monastic order. "For it is highly out of place that when, on account of their difficulties, there is no one who is competent to fulfill the duties of either state completely, one is judged to be competent for both. The duties of the *mission* interfere with the monastic life, and the monastic rule is an obstacle to the ordinary clerical duties". The lapse of over a thousand years has not caused this dictum of the great monk-pope to lose its force. The truth, therefore, contained in it ought never to be lost sight of. So that where the necessities of the Church in different parts have caused a violation of the principle here laid down by Gregory, every effort should be made that their proper spheres of action be restored to monk and to secular priest with the least possible delay.

Gregory's influence on the future of the *cloister*, and, through it, on the civilization of Europe, cannot be overestimated. So great was, deservedly, the name and authority of Gregory the Great in the Church of the Middle Ages, that the policy of the Holy See towards the monastic orders was, as it were, fixed by his attitude towards them. His action decided that Rome was to show favor to the monks. And in supporting them the popes gave strength to one of the greatest, if not the very greatest of the agencies which labored to refine and civilize the barbarian conquerors of the Roman Empire, The monasteries became centers wherein all that goes to make a civilized, virtuous and Christian man was taught by word, and above all by example. They were, moreover, places of retreat wherein such as were in distress of soul or body could find comfort and nourishment, whether spiritual or temporal. In the stormy days of the Middle Ages, and some decades of those ages were tempestuous indeed, they were the only harbors in which peace—that peace to which we all look forward as the greatest of the joys of heaven—was alone to be found. To those abodes of peace, driven from elsewhere in the timid alarm into which they so easily fall, fled science and letters. And whilst the passions of men, armed with fire and steel, were converting the smiling campaign into feverish wastes, the monks, who alone bent the spear into a ploughshare, were silently reclaiming the wild forest and the trackless bog. And, trained by the constant thought of death to despise it, there issued from the silent and peaceful cloisters, men who, in the cause of God and man, feared not to face the noise and tumult of the world; and braving, for liberty's sweet sake, fierce baron and tyrant king, won from them those charters of freedom, which were then preserved in their archives, and of which we are now enjoying the blessed fruit,

What has been said of Gregory's solicitude for monasteries of men applies equally to those of women, to whose prayers he attributed, as we have seen, the preservation of Rome from the swords of the Lombards. He was as anxious for their material and moral advancement as for those of men. We find that he granted some convents the same rights of autonomy as he granted to monasteries of men; and that "those who are

devoted to the service of God might not suffer want", he endowed them with property. As an example of his care for them we may cite an extract of his letter (June 597) to Theoctista, the emperor's sister. Thanking her for an alms sent to him for the needy, Gregory tells her that "With half the money he had received from her he had arranged for the purchase of bed-clothes for the maids of God (nuns), whom you in Greek call *monastrice*; because from the want of sufficient bed-coverings they suffer much from the great cold of the winter here. These nuns are very numerous in the city. According to the memorandum by which distribution (of alms) is made, they are 3000 in number. Each year, indeed, they receive from the patrimony of St. Peter 80 pounds of gold. But what is that among such a multitude, especially in this city, where everything is so dear?" As the nuns particularly spoken of in this letter had evidently come from some warmer part of Italy, and as the total number of them reaches so large a figure, some idea may be formed of the extent of the Lombard ravages throughout Italy already achieved, and of the terror they inspired.

SAINT COLUMBANUS & SAINT COLUMBA

Most of the monasteries to which Gregory granted privileges were probably living under the rule of St. Benedict, with which he was personally acquainted. But about the very time that he became Pope, another great *patriarch* of monks was founding his principal monastery of Luxeuil. This was the famous Columbanus, "the great glory of the school of Bangor", and the intimate friend of St. Columba of Iona, and not infrequently confounded with him. Leaving his native Ireland about the year 588, he took with him to the continent of Europe not only the faith of Christ, which he spread with the greatest zeal and energy; but, like every other Irishman, a passionate love for Ireland and everything connected with it. For Columbanus was a typical Irishman. With all their enthusiasm at his back, he saw monastery after monastery, and hundreds of monks living under the rule he drew up. Irishmen, however, are not distinguished as quiet, peaceable, law-abiding citizens, and consequently not as law-givers. It is from their very enthusiasm that they are naturally wanting in that self-restraint that is necessary to make men good observers of law themselves, and good makers of law for others. Great indeed was the virtue of Columbanus, a glorious character. Men rushed to him, and, fired by his enthusiasm, performed wonders for the conversion of Germany especially. But his rule was not founded on prudence. It was too strict. It could not and did not last. The rule of the practical Roman Benedict had completely superseded it in the century in which its founder died. The character of his race and of Columbanus is seen in the opposition which the Irish offered to the comparatively new regulations as to the time of celebrating Easter, *i.e.* to the cycle established by Dionysius the Little, in 525. Of course there was no point of *faith* in question. The cycle to which they had become attached had come to them from Rome through St. Patrick. An Irish custom and hallowed by Rome and St. Patrick! There was quite enough there for Columbanus to fight about!

Accordingly on this and on other matters he addressed various letters to Gregory between the years 595 and 600. Some, at least, of these letters of his, prolix, often

obscure, and containing a strange mixture of most respectful and most free language, we know, from a later letter of his to Pope Sabinian (?), were prevented by the disorders of the times from reaching Gregory. However, as one of the letters of Columbanus to Pope Gregory has been preserved, an outline of its contents cannot fail to be of interest, even though we are not sure that it was ever perused by Gregory himself. It is addressed: "Bargoma—a wretched dove—to the most beautiful ornament of the Church, the, as it were, brightest flower of all this decaying Europe, and distinguished overseer". It is relying on the Pope's evangelical humility that he writes to him for a decision in favor of the Irish Pasch. For, he argues, there can be no presumption in writing even to his betters when there is necessity. Then, following Anatolius, whose early cycle was the one used in Ireland and not the later one of Victorius (which was then used in Gaul), and still less that of Dionysius, he asks the Pope how, with all the light of his wisdom, which is diffused through all the world, he can reverence a "dark Pasch".

He then goes on to beg the Pope on such a question not to rely on humility or weight of authority. And after mentioning Gregory's presumed respect for his predecessor, Leo I, at whose instigation Victorius is said to have constructed his paschal cycle, he quotes *Ecclesiastes* rather more wittily than respectfully, to the effect that, in this matter, "a living dog is perchance better than a dead lion". However, he begs the Pope: "Direct towards me, rather a timid pilgrim than a learned scribe, the power of your authority; and do not disdain quickly to transmit to me your favorable decision to quell the storm around me". Then comes a reversion to the other tone; and he rails against the pronouncement that we must not make the Pasch with the Jews, a decision which he assigns to Pope Victor (189-199). Again he is in the submissive key. He recognizes that he has been writing with more forwardness than humility. It is utterly incongruous to argue, as it were, "with your great authority, and it is absurd that my Western letters should trouble you, who lawfully sit in the chair of Peter, the key bearer (of the kingdom of heaven)". However, he begs the Pope not to have regard simply to Columbanus, but to the many 'masters' who think as he does. And because, by way of a sweet, he proceeds to say: "Know that I open my mouth with good intention though in a somewhat confused and hyperbolical manner", he thinks he has a right to add the bitter: "I assure you, with all simplicity, that whoever opposes the authority of Jerome (who had spoken in praise of the work of Anatolius, but of course not of Victorius and Dionysius, who lived after him!) will be rejected as a heretic by the Church of the West (Ireland)".

Columbanus next asks the Pope how he is to behave towards simoniacal and adulterous clerics; regrets that ill-health, etc., prevent him from coming to Rome "to draw of the living waters of knowledge that flow from heaven"; tells Gregory he has read his book on the *Pastoral Care* (a book, short indeed, but full of wisdom and sweeter than honey); asks for other works of the Pope, for an answer to his questions, and for pardon for having written with such forwardness; and then, as a last word, writes as forwardly as ever: "If, as I understand from your Candidus (the Pope's agent in Gaul), you will reply that what is sanctioned by length of time cannot be changed, it is manifestly an old error; but truth which condemns it is ever older"

If Gregory ever read this letter, and if he was otherwise unacquainted with the Irish character, he must have been utterly lost in astonishment, that one man at one and

the same time could say things so replete with at least seeming insolence and respect; with wisdom and arrant folly. The letters of Columbanus to Boniface IV will be found to display the same characteristics. It may be noted here that in a letter—strikingly short for the loquacious Columbanus—to Gregory's successor, Sabinian, he again expresses his regret that the "disorders of the time and the wild unrest of the adjoining nations" prevent him from visiting those "who preside in the apostolic See, prelates most dear to all the faithful, and, by the merit of the apostolic honor, most reverend fathers"; speaks of the letters which, *with presumption,* he wrote to Gregory of blessed memory; and limits himself to begging Sabinian through Jesus Christ and their common faith, "to confirm, if it be not against the faith, the tradition of our fathers, so that by your decision we may observe in our wanderings such customs regarding the Pasch as we have received from our elders". He then touchingly assured the Pope that even in the midst of the wilds in which they lived they seemed still to be in their own dear country, as long as they were living under the regulations they had received from their fathers, and had not to submit to the decisions of *those Gauls.* He knows that his raving rather than reasoning has not availed him; so he again implores the approval of the Pope's authority to enable them to live in communion with their neighbors and yet retain their own customs.

This letter, in which there is not a word of even disrespectful sound, is certainly the key to the proper understanding of the language of Columbanus to the Holy See. Where there is question of standing up for the maintenance of a custom in which no point of faith seems to be involved, then Columbanus can dispute with a thorough Celtic warmth of argument and flow of words. But where there may be question of a matter of faith, he has no more to say. He would not for a moment ask for any privilege if there was danger of it being in any way "against the faith". Where the obedience of faith is concerned, Columbanus is all submission to the decision of the Holy See.

If his own writings connect Columbanus with our saint, his friend St. Columba, "Saint of the seas", is only brought into touch with the great Pope by legend. We are told that clerics "came from Rome to present him, in the name of Pope Gregory, with a richly enshrined relic of the true Cross, known afterwards as Morgemm, and long, it is said, preserved at Iona". In return for this present, Columba is reported to have sent his famous hymn, *Altus Prosator,* to the Pope. Gregory, "a hymnologist himself" was greatly pleased with it, especially as he was privileged to see the Angels listening to it at the same time". In consequence of the Pope observing that he thought the Praise of the Holy Trinity was too scanty in it, Columba is said to have written an addition to his *Altus* in honor of the Trinity. Bishop Healy, from whom these particulars are drawn, allies Gregory with another famous Irishman, Carporius (Mac Cuirp), whom he makes a disciple of the Pope.

DEATH AND CHARACTER OF ST.GREGORY

And now that we have accompanied Gregory in his journey through life, and noted at least the principal actions of his glorious career, we must, though with regret, leave him after assisting at his death. Of details of his last hours we have unfortunately

none. Sickness, as we have already noticed, was his constant companion all during his pontificate. His letters reveal to us how grievously gout was ever afflicting him. It reduced his once massive frame to the last degree of attenuation. By the beginning of the year 603, his sufferings of all kinds had brought him to such a pass that "his one consolation was the hope of the speedy approach of death". In the midst of his pains, he would ask for prayers in the most beautiful and touching language. "Pray for me lest I give way to impatience through my sufferings, and lest the sins, which might be pardoned me on account of my pains, be increased by my complaining". But, tortured as he was, he could think of the woes of others. He could rejoice that the eyes of his friend, Eulogius of Alexandria, were better and he could beg Marinianus of Ravenna to take more care of his health. By the last month of 603 his illness had so increased that he had scarce strength to speak to the ambassadors of the Lombard queen. As late as January 604, he wrote with the most engaging thoughtfulness to Venantius of Perugia that he had heard that "our brother and fellow-bishop Ecclesius" was suffering considerably from the cold, because he had no winter clothing. Gregory, therefore, begs Venantius to forward without delay, because the cold is intense (and to let him know that he has done so), the thick woolen tunic that he is sending to him (Venantius) for Ecclesius, by the bearer of this letter. A few more letters, a few more months of labor to the last, and the flowing pen and tongue of the great Pontiff moved no more! He died March 12, and was buried on the same day, in the portico of St. Peter's, to the left before the sacristy. There it remained till the ninth century, near the bodies of his great predecessors St. Leo the Great, Gelasius, etc. Then his namesake, Gregory IV, thinking that one "whose bright wisdom had spread the gifts of the Holy Ghost over the whole earth" should be buried more honorably, removed the body from the portico to an oratory dedicated to him, which he built and adorned, not far from the place where the body was previously resting, but built off the outermost aisle of the basilica. In the present basilica of St. Peter the saint's bones rest beneath the altar of St. Andrew. The upper part of the skull, however (less one of the *temple* bones, which was given to our holy father Leo XIII), and another bone are preserved in the treasury of the cathedral of Sens. They were obtained from Pope John VIII by Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens.

His epitaph, of which a few fragments still remain, must have been in existence soon after his death, as it is to be found in a collection of inscriptions drawn up in the seventh century, and is cited by Bede. It ran :

"Earth! take that body which at first you gave.
Till God again shall raise it from the grave.
His soul amidst the stars finds heavenly day;
In vain the gates of darkness make essay
On him whose death but leads to life the way.
To the dark tomb, this prelate, though decreed.
Lives in all places by his pious deed.
Before his bounteous board pale Hunger fled;

To warm the poor he fleecy garments spread;
And to secure their souls from Satan's power.
He taught by sacred precepts every hour.
Nor only taught, but first the example led.
Lived o'er his rules, and acted what he said.
To English Saxons Christian truth he taught.
And a believing flock to heaven he brought.
This was thy work and study, this thy care.
Offerings to thy Redeemer to prepare.
For these to heavenly honors raised on high,
Where thy reward of labors ne'er shall die".

The grief of the poor of Rome on Gregory's death may easily be imagined. Their sorrow will have been as that of those of Joppe, who bewailed the death of the bountiful Tabitha. Along with some of them we will go and look at the portrait of their benefactor, which Gregory had had painted, along with those of his father and mother, on the walls of his beloved monastery of St. Andrew, on the Coelian. These likenesses were still fresh in the days of John the Deacon, who has left us a full description of that of Gregory. From it we gather that Gregory was of average height and well-shaped—*i.e.*, doubtless before his body became the *moles* we have seen him describe it. His face combined in comely proportions the length of his father's with the roundness of his mother's. His beard, like his father's, was somewhat tawny and sparse. The head was bald, with two little curls in the centre of the forehead bending towards the right. The *clerical crown* of his hair was round and ample, consisting of dark, neatly-curled hair, reaching down below the middle of his ear. His forehead was handsome; his eyebrows thin, raised and long. The pupils were of a yellowish-brown tint, and not large but open. The under eyelids full. The nose near its base at the point of juncture with the eyebrows was thin, grew broader near the middle, then curved a little, and at its termination became prominent by reason of the open nostrils. His lips were ruddy, full, and subdivided. His cheeks were shapely, and he had a becomingly projecting chin. His complexion was pallid and swarthy, and had not the flush it had in later life. His expression was gentle; his hands graceful, with slender fingers suitable for writing.

He was represented as standing, with a chestnut-colored chasuble over a dalmatic. In his left hand was the book of the gospels; his right was raised in the act of blessing. His pallium was represented as hanging down, not (as in the days of John and since) in the centre of the breast, but down the left side. The *square* nimbus showed that Gregory was still living when the portrait was painted. The following distich of his own composing was placed below the picture :—

Christe potens, Domine, nostri largitor honoris,

Indultum officium solita pietate guberna.

But it required no frescoes to keep alive the memory of Gregory the Great in the hearts of the Romans. Had he not saved them from the hands of the hated Lombards and from the jaws of famine? Had he not nourished their weary and fainting souls with the spiritual bread of the word of God? Year after year with heartfelt love they kept his feast, and John tells us how in his days the vigil of Gregory's festival was passed in fervent prayer, and with what devotion the Romans kissed such relics of him as his pallium and girdle.

To him, too, turned the Christian world at large. In his life and in his works men found a model they loved to imitate. A modern writer prefers to look on Gregory rather as a great Roman than as a saint. But in the East (where, from his *Dialogues,* he was spoken of as *Dialogus),* as in the West, till the days of the *new learning,* there was no one, priest or layman, king or peasant, Greek or Latin, but regarded Gregory the Great as a man who was pleasing to God as well as to his fellow man; and so he is still regarded by all who look for guidance to the chair of Peter, *viz*., as a great saint.

Enough, it would seem, has been written of the deeds and enough transcribed of the words of Gregory to enable the reader to judge for himself of the nobility of Gregory's character. But, both to confirm the judgment already doubtless passed, and because in truth one is loath to leave Gregory, a few more details may be added here to bring out the salient points of his character into still bolder relief. In duly estimating a man's character, account must be taken not only of what he was and how he fulfilled the duties of his position, but also of the circumstances under which he carried out those obligations.

Now Gregory was the shepherd of Christ's flock on earth; and he performed the duties of a good pastor by toiling unceasingly for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his people, whether high or lowly, by an incessant watchfulness over them, by sincere love for them, and by a courageous defence of their interests. We have seen it was all one to Gregory whether he was working for the benefit of an emperor or a slave, a noble lady of Constantinople or a soap-maker at Naples. He lived not for himself but for others, else never would he have left his beloved cloister. In his anxiety for the welfare of souls, he had an eye to everything and everybody all over the world. Hence John the Deacon could find no other term to describe his extraordinary vigilance but to call him *Argus-eyed.*

And Gregory's work for his fellow men was accomplished despite the cruel pain that ever kept his poor body on the rack, as it were; despite the swords of the Lombards, and the seditions of the imperial soldiery in Rome; and despite the selfish opposition of grasping officials and trouble from those who ought to have been his chief support.

Of his superhuman energy what need to add another example? And of his love for the flock committed to his care, a quality so essentially characteristic of a good shepherd, what call to adduce here in illustration another fact? "Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father", says St. James (I. 27), "is this: to visit the

fatherless and widows in their tribulation, and to keep oneself unspotted from this world". Gregory's *religion* must be then assuredly described as pure.

If the *good shepherd* must have love for his sheep, to win their affection he must be lowly like them too. Gregory was *the Great* in his humility. Proof of it, says John the Deacon, he left to his successors in abundance, not only in being the first to call himself, in his letters, servant of the servants of God, but also in the inferior quality of pontifical vestments with which he was content, and which, adds John, are preserved to this day. The same deacon relates a story in illustration of Gregory's humility which is, no doubt, accurate in all its details. For he is quoting from the *Pratum Spiritale* of John Moschus, who died about 620, and in Rome. This Greek monk, who had travelled a great deal, and who occupied himself while in Rome in collecting together and writing in a book the instances of remarkable virtue he had met with, had heard what he tells of Gregoryat first hand.

A certain abbot, John, a Persian (Persa), who had come to Rome to pray at the tombs of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, assured his brethren on his return home that, seeing Pope Gregory coming along, he made his way towards him to do him humble reverence. But the Pope, seeing that the abbot was a stranger, was the first to do lowly obeisance to him, and would not rise till John had arisen. Then Gregory embraced the abbot "with great humility, and with his own hand gave me three solidi and ordered that all my wants should be supplied. I accordingly gave praise to God who had given him such humility towards all and almsgiving and charity".

Not only did Gregory profess himself the servant of all bishops, but he declared that so far was he from being accounted worthy to rank among them, that he was unworthy of being reckoned among the simple faithful. In his own eyes he was but a "manikin" .The success that practically on every occasion attended his efforts to bring men back to the path of duty is the solid proof that his professions of humility were not mere empty words. For men are only reclaimed from evil courses by such as they feel are, while completely forgetful of self, working for their good and the glory of God. The subsequent history of the patriarchs of Constantinople shows that, in the one conspicuous case where Gregory failed, it was not in man's power to do otherwise. In view of the extraordinary pronouncements not infrequently met with on the subject of humility, it will not be out of place here to insist that vigor, energy and determination are not inconsistent with true humility; and that humility is not incompatible with a spirited exercise of those qualities. For what else is it but a practical acknowledgment, before God and man, what helpless creatures a conscientious self-examination has revealed us to be, apart from the divine assistance?

Undoubtedly untiring energy, unbounded charity, and deep humility were the most conspicuous features of Gregory's character. To proceed to draw out the fact that he had many other of the moral virtues in an eminent degree, that he had a true love of country, of honor, and of the other virtues which distinguish a good citizen and a gentleman, would be to tediously inculcate what the mere reading of his actions must have already deeply impressed upon the mind. It may, however, be further shortly pointed out that his character was a thoroughly even one. It was well balanced by the cardinal virtues.

With the "simplicity of the dove", Gregory certainly combined "the cunning (or prudence) of the serpent". With his letters, models of tact, before us, there is no need for us to have to fall back on the evidence of John the Deacon, that he was a "most prudent father of the family of Christ". His letters reveal the caution, the smooth-spokenness of a diplomatist of the highest order. With the wish to fulfill the behest of his Divine Master that he should be a "fisher of men" well did he practice the fisherman's art. He knew when to coax, to tempt and to wheedle, and when to pull and to tug.

All his diplomacy was exercised with the one object of catching the souls of men, and not to win for himself honor or esteem, gold or power. To the number of Gregory's letters already cited, which is amply sufficient to justify all that we have here said, we will add another, as it will, moreover, be useful for reference when the Iconoclast controversy comes to be treated. It is a letter to Serenus of Marseilles, who had destroyed the images in his Church. Gregory does not simply write to him a strong letter, full of angry expressions of blame. But extracting what good he can out of the act he has to blame, he praises Serenus for his zeal against idolatry and then points out to him the danger of going too far in that zeal. "It has come to our knowledge that, seeing that some adored images, you have broken and cast forth the images of your Church. We praise, indeed, your zeal in not suffering anything to be adored that has been made by the hand, but you ought not to have broken your images. Pictures are used in the Church, that those who cannot read in books may read by looking at pictures on the walls. You must then keep the pictures and at the same time prevent anyone from adoring them".

How thoroughly Gregory was animated with the old Roman spirit of love of justice will be clear to anyone who has not forgotten the Pope's letters to his *defensores.* Justice for all, great and small, and restitution for wrong done, was the burden of them all. "Restore everything which has been unjustly taken away, knowing that you will earn great profit for me, if you heap up for me a reward in heaven rather than earthly riches". Under all circumstances, Gregory would have justice done. He would not pass over the unjust or excessive punishment of a poor pauper woman even by a bishop though when another had been punished according to his deserts, feelings of humanity would make him take measures for his support. "Because I love man for justice' sake; and I do not put justice to one side for man's sake". With thoughts such as these adorning them, Recared was not flattering Gregory when he described his letters as *golden.*

It may be put forward as an axiom that the just man is a bold man. And if Gregory had *justice,* he had also *fortitude.* He had no rash daring, which leads men recklessly to court danger, unreasonably to pick quarrels, or rashly to provoke hostility. "You know my ways, how I forbear for a long time. But if once I make up my mind to bear no longer, I cheerfully face all danger". And then to him "all human terrors or favors were but as a little smoke, which a light breeze soon dissipates". If he feared, it was only God Almighty, or for those committed to his charge, and not for himself. "For myself", he declared to the Emperor Maurice, "I am not in the least degree disturbed, as I am prepared to face all extremities provided I save my soul". At duty's call he feared not to write to the emperor, "with the utmost zeal and freedom"; to impress upon kings that their highest glory was to cultivate justice and to see that the rights of every one of their

subjects were respected; and upon emperors that they were the lords of freemen and not of slaves. This fearlessness of his in the cause of justice he breathed into his subordinates. One of his *rectors* is urged, when engaged in carrying out an act of justice, not to slacken, "whatever secular authority might offer opposition to him". And an apocrisiarius is exhorted "to fear nothing, but for truth's sake to despise all the world's power raised against it". To what do civilized men, and we Englishmen especially, owe their freedom more than to the Christian fortitude of the ecclesiastic, of Pope, of bishop, and of priest? The ferocity of the barbarian conqueror of Rome quailed before the moral courage of the Christian bishop, and tyrants like our Norman kings, and such emperors as Henry IV and Frederick II, were only cowed by the moral strength of an unarmed bishop or Pope.

There were two injunctions of Our Lord that Gregory regarded as especially addressed to him. The first was the command given to the rich young man: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven : and come, follow me" (St. Matt. XIX. 21). We have seen how faithfully the young prefect of Rome performed that mandate. The second was the condition proclaimed by Jesus Christ under which alone a man could become His follower: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me" (St. Luke IX. 23). Whatever may be thought and said nowadays by certain men who call themselves Christian teachers, these words of Our Lord have always, from the time of St. Paul downwards, been held to include bodily mortification. And if Gregory erred in carrying out this latter precept, it was on the generous side. He did too much in the way of castigating his flesh. Much of the illness he had to suffer whilst he was Pope was due to the immoderate mortification he practiced as a monk. He had, of course, to moderate his austerities, and, among other things, to take a little wine for his stomach's sake. From one of his letters to his friend Eulogius, the patriarch of Alexandria, we discover the wine he liked best. Eulogius had sent him a little present of some '*collatum'* and '*viritheum'*. These liquors, Gregory states, are not to his taste. He would like a little '*cognidium',* which Eulogius had introduced to his notice the year before. "For at Rome", he added, "we can get from the dealers what bears the name of '*cognidium'* but not what has the substance of it". Wine merchants of the sixth do not appear to be particularly unlike those of the twentieth century. What these different wines exactly were is not known. Some think that '*viritheum'* is the same as '*juritheum',* which is said to be found in some MSS. (though no such alternative reading appears in the latest edition of Gregory's letters), and which was a sort of date-wine. Others suggest '*biriteum',* which was either a sort of beer, if made from barley, or a sort of cider, if made from some kind of fruit. Similarly others connect '*cognidium'* with the Greek '*konias oinos'*, and tell us that it was a '*vinum resinatum'* or 'pitched wine', whatever that may mean.

Though Gregory, then, may have exceeded in the matter of over-mortification of his body when a young man, there can be no doubt that the complete command over himself which he always held was due to a life of self-denial, to the constant practice of temperance in all its branches.

If it now be asked why, as a *set-off* against this list of virtues, an occasional tendency in Gregory to play the proselytizer or to be overly-suave to the imperial court

has not been more strongly branded, it is answered by another question : Who would stop to dwell on the small faults and imperfections of Gregory, but the fool, who, having no eye for the general beauties of sky and land when the sun is setting gorgeously on a fair campaign, can see nothing but some small slimy pool at his feet? Compared with the other great ones of his age, Gregory was indeed perfection itself.

To anyone who has had the patience to follow what has hitherto been said about Gregory, it must come as a shock to be assured: but this Pope was, after all, an *obscurantist;* he was an enemy of the light of learning. At one time this baseless accusation was regularly hurled against Gregory. Nowadays, through the well-deserved contempt thrown upon it by many of the highest non-Catholic writers, this charge is generally discredited. For Gregory was both learned and a lover of learning himself, and required it in those whose business it was to be teachers of the people. If we find him stating that he does not consider the rules of grammar and the art of rhetoric of any great moment, that the word of God must not be bound by the rules of Donatus, he had in mind to emphasize the truth that preachers and teachers of revealed truth ought to think more of *what* they have to say than of the manner in, which they may set forth the saving truths they have to instill into the minds and hearts of their hearers. Besides, the words of the humble are not to be understood too strictly; and allowance must be made for the literary custom of the period. For the Emperor Maurice, in the preface to his *Strategic,* also declared that he had no concern for the 'pomp of words'. And to turn to facts. Gregory's letters are the best refutation of his own words, should anyone be disposed to interpret them literally. Their easy flow, their neat phraseology, show that he used the highest art in their composition, viz., the art of concealing art. It would be to fall into the pedantic fallacy of the more conceited *humanists* of the Renaissance to suppose that a Latin composition cannot be artistic because its Latin is not Ciceronic. The letters of Gregory will be read, ay, even for their literary excellence, when the insipid productions —classically perfect—of the Renaissance will be consigned to well-merited oblivion.

But did not Gregory formally condemn the pursuit of profane or secular literature? Is there not his famous letter to Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, to be reckoned with? There is. It is here. "After I had heard so much of your zeal (studies), I was so delighted that I could not bear to refuse the favor your fraternity had asked. Later, however, I was informed—and I cannot mention the subject without a blush—that your fraternity lectured on profane literature to certain persons. By this news I was so upset that my former joy was turned to sorrow, because in the same mouth the praises of Jupiter and Christ do not harmonize. And think how unbecoming it is for a bishop to profess what is unsuitable for a devout layman ... If it shall be clearly proved that the stories I have heard are unfounded, and that you have not been devoting your attention to trifles and to profane literature, I shall thank God for not having permitted your heart to be defiled by the blasphemous praises of the wicked". From the terms of this letter it is impossible to say precisely what Desiderius had been doing. Some writers, relying on an ancient gloss on the text of the canon law, have supposed that Desiderius had been lecturing on literature in his *church,* instead of preaching the word of God. However that may be, it is at least clear that Desiderius was devoting to profane literature time which Gregory thought would be better spent in directly working to save souls. And, considering the

sad state of the Church in Gaul at this time, the Pope's censure was not uncalled for. Besides, there is no doubt that he considered that profane literature was but the handmaid or forerunner of sacred studies, and that a bishop ought to spend his time on the higher pursuits of philosophy and theology. So far from condemning secular studies, Gregory, in treating *ex professo* of the relation between the two branches of study, showed the necessity of them as indispensable adjuncts to the comprehension of higher things. This he did commenting on I Kings XIII. 19: "Now there was no smith to be found in all the land of Israel, for the Philistines had taken this precaution, lest the Hebrews should make them swords or spears. So all Israel went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his ploughshare and his spade, and his axe, and his rake". Pointing out first the literal bearing of the passage, Gregory adds : "If after our wont we look at this text in a spiritual way, we shall find it not devoid of mystery. For what is meant by the phrase, 'No smith was to be found in Israel', but that we are formed for spiritual warfare not by secular learning but by divine ... For, helped by the smith's handicraft, men would be thus successful if by the weapons of profane eloquence they could prevail over hidden enemies. However, learning drawn from secular studies, although not directly useful in spiritual combat, still, if it be joined to sacred studies, greatly helps to the understanding of those studies ... The wicked spirits take away from some the desire of learning, so that they have no knowledge of profane literature, and never reach the height of sacred studies. Well, then, is it said : The Philistines took care that the Israelites should not make sword or lance. The devil knows well that by a knowledge of profane literature we are helped in sacred knowledge. When, then, they dissuade us from acquiring secular learning, what else do they do but prevent us from making swords and lances? ... But the ploughshares are sharpened at the forges of the Philistines when the word of God in sermons is composed with the aid of secular learning ... Ignorant of profane literature, we cannot penetrate the depths of sacred learning ... A mind untrained cannot lance the tumors of vice, because it cannot see what has to be pierced".

Hence, too, in his synodical letter to the different patriarchs Gregory wrote: "In a priest's vestments gold is prominent to show that in him the light of wisdom is pre-eminently conspicuous". And in practice he always required learning as well as sanctity in the ministers of the Church, and if they had it not, or were not zealous about obtaining it, he blamed them severely. And not only was he ever surrounded with the most learned clerics, but he took care that in his household the presence of refinement should be always manifest. He was quite one of the old school in that respect. "None of those in the Pope's service", says John the Deacon, "from the lowest to the highest, ever showed anything barbarous in speech or attire. But in his palace pure Latinity of speech and the use of the toga or trabea of the Quirites preserved the manner of life of Latium". It can only have been with very considerable effort that Gregory can have kept up a pure Latin style of speech among the members of his household. For the great Gallo-Roman bishop, Apollinaris Sidonius, more than a century before Gregory became Pope, had already declared, in a letter to a young student, that unless he and his very small circle of friends preserved the purity of the Latin tongue from the fast-spreading *rusi* of barbaric speech, its demise would soon have to be bewailed. Whatever especially annoyed Gregory in connection with the professorial doings of Desiderius, both his own works and words cry out to us that no extensive signification in the direction of a

general condemnation of profane literature must be attached to the words of his letter to that bishop.

No story of Gregory would be complete without some literary short account at least of his literary productions. After what we have seen of his prodigious activity in the external affairs of the Church and of the State, we should be utterly at a loss to understand how, in spite of all the work-a-day labors he got through, and in spite of his wretched health, he left behind him the literary works of the extent and merit he has, did we not know that, with great men, the more they have to do the more they can do. The less time they have at their disposal, the more they make of it. And in this respect we may well form some idea of the work of Gregory by using our knowledge of the extraordinarily active yet literary lives of our own great cardinals Wiseman and Manning, of whose characters Gregory's was a sort of compound. In him was the genial enthusiasm of the first with the political activity of the second; though his learning was neither so wide nor so deep as that of Wiseman, nor so keen and polished as that of Manning.

Whatever were the merits of Gregory's works if strictly weighed in the balance of literary criticism, they exerted an immense influence on life in the Middle Ages. This was probably because of their practical character and of their comparative simplicity, whether of thought or of mode of expression, if contrasted, say, with the works of St. Augustine or of his great predecessor St. Leo I. At any rate, throughout the Middle Ages they not only served as models to other authors, but as literary quarries, whence those drew good material who were constructing liturgical or theological works. And to say the least, as even Photius remarked, who highly praises Gregory for his teaching and miracles, his books "preserved intact the doctrines he had received from Our Lord and the fathers".

Magna Moralia and the *Book of Pastoral Rule*

The first of Gregory's works to see the light was his *Moralia*, or Morals of Job, which, in form, a commentary on the book of Job, is, really, a treatise on moral theology; and, says Montalembert, "Was worthy of becoming, through all the Middle Ages, the text-book of that theology". It was begun, as we have seen, when Gregory was apocrisiarius at Constantinople, and was ultimately published in the early years of his pontificate at the instigation of St. Leander. The work, in six parts, subdivided into thirty-five books, was of course sent to the Spanish bishop who had been the cause of its production. In the dedicatory epistle to the same bishop, Gregory begs his friend to assign to ill-health of body, which upsets the mind, any shortcomings he might find in the work. And yet he feelingly adds: "Perchance it is the will of God, that, as one struck by Him, I should expound Job in his affliction; and that, scourged myself, I should the better understand the mind of one who had been himself so scourged". It is in this epistle that he expresses his resolution not to be fettered by the rules of Donatus any more than the other interpreters of the sacred Scriptures have been. For as the child displays the likeness of its mother, so his work ought to resemble those whence it has sprung. But in all this Gregory was condemning not only, as we have seen, an excessive

attention to style over matter, but also a too ornate style. For, as he very aptly notes, "The more the tree runs to leaves, the less the fruit it bears".

He further explains to Leander that in his comments he has sometimes followed the literal sense in order that the obvious meaning might not be lost, and that at other times he has been even compelled to draw out the figurative meaning. That interpretation, for instance, must be applied to the words: "Under whom (God) they stoop that bear up the world" (Job IX. 13), because it cannot be supposed that Job imagined, like the poets, that the world was supported by Atlas—"by a giant's sweat", as Gregory poetically expresses it. And here we may remark that though many of his figurative interpretations are in the highest degree poetical and beautiful, many of them are, to our way of thinking, to the last point far-fetched and fanciful. However, these allegories were to the taste of the times; and in this respect Gregory no doubt wisely did not attempt, had he indeed been able, to serve up for people for their spiritual nourishment either what they had no inclination for, or what, from its mode of presentment, had no attractions for them. Though to us, from its diffuseness, the commentary on Job cannot be said to be attractive, it soon became very popular. John of Ravenna had extracts from it read in church. But this Gregory would not allow to go on. The work, he said, was not suitable for the popular mind. And then came the true reason—his humility. "Whilst I am in the flesh I would not have men generally know of it, if it should be that I have said anything".

More important than the *Moralia,* though much shorter, was the *Book of Pastoral Rule*. After the inspired Word of God, it is second to no other work in what it has effected in raising the standard of moral worth. Since the date of its publication it always has had, it still has, and it always will have, great influence on the religious world. There is no need to point out how thoroughly practical a spiritual treatise must be which has been found to be useful by men for over a thousand years.

The *Regula Pastoralis,* like the *Moralia,* also made its appearance in the beginning of Gregory's pontificate. It was a reply to John of Ravenna, who reproached him with trying to shirk the episcopal charge. Unfolding the duties and all that is looked for in a bishop, he showed he had reason to shrink from taking upon himself such a serious burden. The work is divided into four parts. The first treats of vocation to the episcopate, that he who is called thereto may look into the dispositions with which he approaches it. The second part sets forth the duties of a true bishop; the third, the instructions he must give to his people; and the fourth, the frequent reflections he ought to make on his own conduct, in order to humble himself for the faults he may have committed in the government of souls. So exalted is the view of the episcopal calling taken by the *Regula Pastoralis,* that it has been said that it made the bishops who made the modern nations.

As soon as it appeared it was received with a chorus of praise. East and west, bishop and emperor, welcomed it alike. Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, at once translated it into Greek, and wrote to tell the Pope how much he was pleased with it. "But", said Gregory himself, "I was displeased that those who had so much better things at their disposal should have their minds taken up with inferior matter". Our own great King Alfred translated it into Anglo-Saxon, as one of the books "most needful for men

to read", and sent a copy of it to every cathedral in his kingdom. And from Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, it appears that a copy of it, along with a book of canons, was delivered to bishops on the occasion of their consecration, with an injunction to live in accordance with them.

Dialogues.

Another very popular work of Gregory's, more popular than the preceding one in the Middle Ages, though nothing like so much read now as the *Pastoral Rule,* viz., his *Dialogues,* was also the delight of our forefathers. King Alfred ordered Werefrith, Bishop of Worcester, to translate it into Anglo-Saxon. Pope Zachary (752) rendered his great predecessor's work into Greek, though, adds John the Deacon (IV. 75), "the astute perversity of the Greeks" took care to erase the name *of the Son,* where there was question of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son.* Before the close of the same century Zachary's version became the base of an Arabic edition.

In July 593 the work was not finished. For in that year Gregory wrote to Maximus, Bishop of Syracuse, for information concerning a certain abbot, as his friends were urgent with him briefly to write down certain details "concerning the miracles of the fathers, which we have heard have been wrought in Italy". However, at least a first edition of it was issued before the end of the year. It received its name from its having been written in the form of a Dialogue between Gregory and his friend the deacon, Peter. The occasion of its production is charmingly recounted by the Pope in the Prologue to the work. "One day, much troubled by the excessive importunity of certain men of the world, who wring from me in their affairs what I know I ought not to concede them, I sought a spot, retired apart, suitable for grief, where I might review all that displeased me in the work I had to do, and all that was wont to bring me sorrow. After I had been seated for some time in silence and dire affliction, my most beloved son the deacon, Peter, who has been linked with me in the closest bonds of friendship from his early youth, and who has been my companion in my study of the sacred Scriptures, came to me. Seeing that I was thoroughly upset in mind, he asked me what new trouble had come upon me that I was in greater grief than usual. To him I replied:

"The sorrow, Peter, which never leaves me, by its constant presence is always old, but is by increase ever fresh. Unhappy that I am, my mind, wounded with its daily task, remembers what it once was in the monastery. It remembers how there all earthly cares that pass with time were beneath it, and how it soared above everything here below. It reflects how it was wont to dwell but on the things of heaven; and how, though still in body, it passed in thought out beyond its fleshly barriers; and, as the gate of life and the reward of toil, loved even death, which to well-nigh all is a grief. But now, by reason of the pastoral: care, I am mixed up with affairs of the world; and my soul, once fair in its sweet retreat, is defiled by the dust of the world's works. And when, after care for the many has caused it to spend itself on exterior concerns, it turns again to the inner things of grace, it does so with lessened capacity for them. I think of what I now endure, and of what I have lost. And thinking of what I have lost makes what I now bear seem the more unbearable. Sometimes, to add to my grief, there recur to my mind the lives of

some who have wholly left this world. And when I see the height of perfection to which they have attained, I see in what a depth of misery I lie myself".

"I knew not", interposed Peter, "that in Italy there had been men whose lives were so holy that they wrought miracles".

"Peter! I should never have done were I to relate only what I myself, mere nobody that I am, have learnt myself or have been told by good and trustworthy men".

"I would that you would give me some particulars ... For there are many who are more inflamed to the love of virtue by the recounting of examples than by mere words of exhortation".

"I will tell what I have heard ... and to remove all occasion of doubt, I will state at every turn on whose authority I rely for my stories".

In three out of the four books of *Dialogues* between Gregory and Peter, the Pope gives short accounts of the doings of various holy men. The second book, however, is completely taken up with the history of St. Benedict. Whatever else may be thought about the *Dialogues*, they are unquestionably useful in affording us an insight into the social life of the time. To take an example from small things, who can fail to be interested in knowing that in the sixth century, as in the twentieth, itinerant musicians took round for the entertainment of the populace, if not barrel-organs and monkeys, at least cymbals and monkeys? But with regard to the merits of the work as a whole, a work very different to the rest of Gregory's literary productions, and which is practically little else but a record of miraculous events, very different judgments have been passed, as might have been expected. The freethinker, Gregorovius, wishes "that the great Pope had not been responsible for their authorship, and that the belief in such superstitions had not been sanctioned by the authority of so illustrious a man". That very broad Churchman, Milman, scoffs at "the wild legends contained in the *Dialogues".* But the Catholic writer who is able to enter into the spirit in which they were written judges of them differently. "They are the simple talk of a great soul", says the illustrious Cardinal Pitra, "who descends to trifles to raise the lowly to the science of the saints". And so Grisar : "Let the *Dialogues* be read with the same openness of soul with which they were written and with which they were read in the Middle Ages, and their worth and marvelous attractiveness will soon be recognized". While to such as rashly, against all evidence, disbelieve all miracles, these *Dialogues* will seem to be a mere collection of fairy tales, no doubt even by those who do believe that God has in every age been the author of miracles, through His special servants and friends, it will be felt that if Gregory had written in a critical spirit he would have rejected many of the miracles he relates. But writing in a simple way, in a simple age, Gregory had full assurance of the reality of many of the miracles he recounts. And as to the rest, he accepted them, without investigation, on such evidence as was forthcoming, and which he states simply, as he was convinced that they were quite possible, and would certainly edify. For it is to show more common sense and to be less really credulous to believe a number of miracles on insufficient evidence than to reject all despite the best of evidence. The child that accepts all it is told makes more rapid progress in the acquisition of truth than the philosopher who doubts everything. The child extracts

some truth from all it hears, whilst the philosopher has eyes but for the false or the doubtful.

For ourselves, knowing that, sent to Queen Theodelinda, the *Dialogues* had a considerable influence on the conversion of the Lombards, we may be quite ready to subscribe to the opinion of such an authority as Photius, *viz*,, that it was a useful work; useful, it may be added, not only for the preacher and for the devout reader, but also for the historian.

But the most generally interesting of Gregory's works is the collection of his letters. Substantial as it is, it is certain that the 850 letters which have come down to us do not give us the sum of Gregory's correspondence. For some seventy-seven letters are referred to by the Pope himself, of which no trace is to be found in the *Register* as we have it today.

However, the letters, which 93 MSS. and 27 editions have brought down to us, are more than enough to show that Gregory's correspondence was as universal as the Church itself. Not only were his epistles addressed to "all sorts and conditions of men", but they were dispatched to all parts of the world, to Europe, Asia and Africa. And in Asia, for instance, to such distant parts as Iberia, Armenia and Arabia.

Justinian had in 535 altered the arrangement of the province of Armenia. He formed it into four provinces. Of these Melitene was the metropolis of the Third Armenia, and, when Gregory was Pope, its metropolitan was Domitianus, a relation of the Emperor Maurice. With this distinguished man Gregory had formed a close friendship, begun, no doubt, when he had been apocrisiarius.

Domitian had written to the Pope a letter in which, among other topics—such as *the emperor*—he had sent him an interpretation of a passage in the sacred Scripture, differing from one given by Gregory. In his reply to his friend's communication, Gregory defended, from the context, the meaning he had assigned to the passage in question, and then neatly added: "What your sanctity has written on the passage for my consolation I willingly accept. For in the interpretation of Holy Writ, whatever is not opposed to the true faith ought not to be rejected. For just as from the one piece of gold some make necklaces, some rings and others bracelets for ornamental purposes, so from one passage of Holy Writ different commentators by their various interpretations make, as it were, a variety of ornaments, which all tend to the glory of the heavenly spouse ... I grieve, indeed, that the emperor of the Persians (Chosroes II, Eberwiz) was not converted, but I greatly rejoice that you preached the faith of Christ to him. For though he did not merit to reach the light of truth, still your holiness will reap the reward of your preaching. The Ethiopian enters the bath black and as black leaves it; but, for all that, the bath-man gets his pay"

But here, while treating of Gregory's letters in general, the temptation must be resisted to go on citing further extracts from individual letters. Did space allow, one would gladly draw out the relations between Gregory and the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem. With them all he was on the most friendly terms, and especially with Anastasius of Antioch and Eulogius of Alexandria, with the latter of whom (with his fondness for playing upon words) he was constantly exchanging *eulogies* (presents). But never did either he or they forget that he was their

superior. And so Eulogius is at pains, when refuting heretics, to prove that the power of Peter has not proceeded from the apostles or the Church, but from Christ Himself; from Gregory he takes his orders, and to the See of Peter turns, as to the feet of his master.

To such as would get a deeper acquaintance with the interesting and pleasing correspondence of Gregory, we must address the words used on a similar occasion by a former biographer of Gregory, *viz*., John the Deacon : "I must refer the eye of the reader to the abundant fullness of his venerable register".

Already a sufficient number of quotations have been made from the *Register* to enable the reader to form for himself a judgment as to the literary, historical and moral worth of those innumerable documents which Gregory dispatched to the four winds of heaven—exhorting, encouraging, reproving, helping, consoling and raising poor fallen humanity. Dr. Hodgkin, who, as the talented translator of the letters of the last of the Roman statesmen, Cassiodorus, has a special right to speak with authority, may help that judgment. "It is probably the very fact that he did not care to write rhetorically which makes his letters so much pleasanter reading than the prolixities of Cassiodorus, or the pompous obscurities of Ennodius. He does not, like the scholars of the Renaissance period, labor to give all his sentences a hexameter ending, but they are often instinct with manly and simple eloquence. Thus there is in them no affected imitation of Cicero, but often a true echo of Caesar". We may add, further, that in them there are two things which must strike everyone, viz., that there pervades them a strain of melancholy, despite their writer's natural gaiety of mind, and, despite his humility, a tone of authority. He could never shake off the thought of the greatness of the burden that was on his shoulders, of his own unworthiness and the calamities of the times, nor, on the other hand, could he ever forget that, whatever humility he had to show, he was nevertheless the Head of God's Church, the Vicar of Christ. It is, moreover, very curious to note what a love for the sea is everywhere in his letters, and indeed in all his writings, displayed by Gregory. If ever he is in want of a metaphor, the sea must furnish it.

Although all the world, except the Pope himself, praised his works, the same judgment would scarcely be passed on them now as was passed upon them by his contemporaries SS. Isidore and Ildefonsus. The former regards Gregory as the most learned of any of his contemporaries or predecessors, and sings that his teaching has glorified Rome as that of St. Augustine did Hippo. And St. Ildefonsus has no doubt that in holiness he was superior to St. Anthony, in eloquence to St. Cyprian, and in learning to St. Augustine. So great was the effect that Gregory's commanding personality produced on the men of his age, that they could not think that any preceding man had ever exercised such an influence on the world. However, without asserting that he was what is understood by a very great or deep writer or thinker, it may be safely stated that he was something better both for his own age and for succeeding ages. He was a great practical thinker and writer. He understood men and things as they are; and thought and wrote for them in that view. He knew the common mental ailments of our race and how to apply the proper remedies. He was Roman or English in his literary habits, and not French, Greek or German.This sketch of Gregory's life was opened with a few words in prose of a Northumbrian Englishman who wrote before Bede. It may conveniently be closed with a few simple verses of another Northumbrian Englishman, the greatest of those who came soon after Bede, *viz.*, Alcuin.

“Rexit tunc temporis almus
Gregorius praesul, toto venerabilis orbi,
Ecclesiae sedem Romanae maximus, atque
Agrorum Christi cultor devotus, ubique
Plurima perpetuae dispersit semina vitte”.
AMEN!

SABINIAN.

A.D. 604-606.

EMPEROR OF THE EAST.

PHOCAS, 602-610

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

AGILULPH, 590-615

EXARCH OF RAVENNA.

SMARAGDUS, 602-611

WE have now to notice a group of Pontiffs who, like the ghostly kings in Macbeth, pass across the stage of life but say nothing. The life of Sabinian, however, is not without interest, as it may be used as an admirable instance to show how groundless stories to the detriment of the popes have by the potent forces of ignorance, carelessness or malice gradually been elaborated.

It is in the summer of 593 that the name of Sabinian is first met with in the correspondence of Gregory. At that time he was sent as apocrisiarius to Constantinople. Hence two letters of recommendation addressed in his behalf to John, the Faster, and to Priscus, patrician and exarch of the Orient, one of the emperor's most distinguished generals, who in 612 retired into a monastery. The mere fact of his being chosen for such an important office by Gregory, who knew its difficulties by experience, is sufficient proof of the abilities of Sabinian.

The son of one Bonus, he was a Tuscan and a native of the town of Blera, a few miles from Viterbo. About the year 772, Desiderius, the Lombard king, "extinguished the ashes of Blera in the blood of its citizens". Ruins and the modern village of Bieda serve to point out this ancient birthplace of one of the popes.

Sabinian's task in Constantinople was no easy one. He had to deal with a well-meaning but rather weak emperor (Maurice), and a vain, obstinate and sanctimonious patriarch (John, the Faster). It was a work which required astuteness and courageous firmness, as the men against whom the apocrisiarius had to match himself were at once wily and tyrannical—men whom Gregory declared to be superior to the Romans both in smartness and in *double dealing*. And it may perhaps be correctly argued, from the spirited language adopted by Gregory in his letters to his apocrisiarius, that he was a little wanting in boldness, and was not diplomatist enough for the Faster. "I wonder",

wrote Gregory, "that he (the Faster) could so deceive you that you should permit the emperor to be persuaded to write to me to tell me that I ought to make peace with him (the Faster). Whereas, if he had wished to be just he ought to have told him to refrain from using the haughty title (ecumenical), and then there would have been peace between us at once".

From some cause unknown to us, Sabinian returned to Rome about the middle of 597, and was succeeded in his office as apocrisiarius by the deacon Anatolius.

After a delay of some six months after the death of Gregory, a delay caused by the necessity of waiting for the emperor's assent to his election, Sabinian was consecrated September 13, 604.

The ensuing winter was marked by an intense frost, which killed the vines in very many parts of Italy. The frost was followed by a plague of mice, and then by a spread of the rust among the corn. The crops were ruined and famine set in (605). Paul the Deacon thinks it only right and proper that the world should suffer a dearth of food and drink, seeing that by the death of Gregory men were deprived of spiritual food and drink. To these horrors were added those of war. The truce between the exarch and the Lombards expired in April.

However, by a payment of 12,000 solidi Smaragdus managed (November 605) to get the peace prolonged for one year, and then in the following year for three years longer. The famine meanwhile had been felt very severely in Rome. But the possibility of Rome having to stand a siege caused Sabinian to be very careful with the corn in the granaries of the Church, the more so that the care of the corn supply of Rome seems to have belonged to the Pope ex officio. No sooner, however, was the danger of war over than Sabinian ordered the granaries of the Church to be opened and corn to be sold to the people at the rate of 30 bushels, or rather pecks (*modius*), of wheat for one solidus. In the time of Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, indeed, we are told that 60 *modii* were sold for the solidus. But as it is a question of Rome, where Pope Gregory said that everything was dear; and, moreover, of a time of famine, the price named by Sabinian was eminently reasonable.

Anastasius further informs us that the Pope filled the Church with clergy. With this obscure phrase Duchesne compares the assertion of the biographer of Deusdedit: "He recalled the priests and clergy to their former positions", and sees in it an assertion that Sabinian restored to the secular clergy posts which St, Gregory had entrusted to monks. If this be the true interpretation of this difficult sentence, it is clear that Gregory's view of the advantage of the monks for different positions was not that of Sabinian. After it has been further stated, following the *Liber Pontificalis*, that the Pope gave certain gifts to St. Peter's, and in one ordination consecrated twenty-six bishops for different localities, all has been told of Sabinian that is known for certain.

In complete accord with the above narrative is the epitaph of the Pope, which will be quoted in full at the end of this sketch of his life. For it tells of his gradual rise to the supreme pontificate, of his generosity which in death left him with nothing to leave, and of the peace which endured (for Rome at least) during his reign.

The above is the only sound material that we have for forming a judgment on the character of Sabinian. But, of course, with the good wheat there is often chaff, and with the pure metal, dross. And so Platina, Bower and Milman, simply repeating one another, or relying on false readings in the *Liber Pontificalis*, on the accretions to Paul the Deacon's life, and on the unsupported testimony of John the Deacon, or still later writers, and then mixing up the worthless chaff thus laboriously got together, give us a picture of Sabinian that has not the slightest foundation in genuine history. On the authority of one of the additions to the life of Paul the Deacon, it is related that after the Pope had shut up the monasteries, deaconries, etc., whence the alms of Gregory were wont to be distributed, he opened the granaries of the Church and sold wheat at thirty solidi a peck. The poor, thus deprived of their great resource, came clamoring to the Pope and asked him if he was going to allow those to starve whom his great predecessor had fed. Sabinian replied that if Gregory, for his own glory, had taken care of everybody, he could not. As a consequence of this oft-repeated answer, Gregory appeared to Sabinian three times in visions and bade him do differently. Sabinian took no notice of this portent. Gregory, therefore, appeared to him a fourth time, and after giving him a terrible scolding, struck him on the head. Of this blow Sabinian soon afterwards died. In John the Deacon's account no mention is made of Sabinian at all. It is Gregory himself that is assailed, because, on account of his extravagant liberality, there was an empty treasury. And as his accusers could not lay their hands on Gregory or anything that belonged to his person, they wished to burn his books. Peter, the Deacon, however, the great friend of Gregory, pointed out to them what a sacrilege it would be to destroy books which he himself had seen the Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove, inspiring into the mind of the Pope. He then prayed that he might die on the spot to prove his words. This happened, and the books were saved! In Paul's account, Peter is not made to die, and only tells the story about the dove because some people had maintained that Gregory had written his works from an inflated idea of his own powers. This is the farrago, written down some hundreds of years after the events they are supposed to describe, that some writers set down as history. Milman, copying Platina, who wrote in the fifteenth century, and who has added to the tales cited above, is really remarkable in his treatment of the material he has thus acquired. He has discovered "two hostile factions, one adoring, the other hating Gregory", and "an old Roman attachment to majestic edifices and gods yielding to the most credulous Christian superstition". Mr. Seeley, narrating an interview he had with that distinguished German scholar, Ewald, says: "I was not surprised that he listened with a kind of superb indifference when I spoke of our Milman". No one who was acquainted with the dean's wholesale inaccuracies could have been surprised.

If Milman had either looked at the original life of Sabinian in the *Liber Pontificalis*, or given any thought to the selling price of corn, he could never have written that he sold corn at thirty solidi a *modius*. Though he wrote before the accurate editions of Duchesne or Mommsen were issued, the older edition of the L. P., *e.g.*, that of Fabrotti in 1649, showed that the correct reading was "thirty *modii* for one *solidus*". Later mediaeval writers who quote the Liber also show which was the proper reading. Besides, one solidus a bushel was a very high price; and even in famines caused by sieges we do not read that one *modius* fetched thirty solidi.

If there is any truth underlying these legends, it will probably be that men, unstrung by famine, blamed everything and everybody for what was the fault of nobody. And so the foolish, helped by the wicked who had been punished by Gregory, may not unlikely have attributed their starving condition to his liberality, or have assigned to parsimony Sabinian's inability to help them to a greater extent than he did.

Sabinian died in February 606. He was buried in St Peter's, February 22. His body was taken out of the city proper, for St. Peter's on the Vatican hill was not in the city then, by St. John's gate and across the Tiber over the Ponte Molle.

BONIFACE III

A.D. 607.

EMPEROR OF THE EAST.

PHOCAS, 602-610.

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

AGILULPH, 590-615.

EXARCH OF RAVENNA.

SMARAGDUS, 602-611.

WHEN Phocas usurped the empire he did not find a papal *responsalis* at Constantinople. Of this he wanted to know the reason from Pope Gregory, and at the same time asked that the vacancy might be filled up. In reply the Pope said that there was no apocrisiarius at the imperial city because he had no wish to force anyone to accept the post, and no one offered himself for it on account of what the papal envoys were often made to suffer there. Now, however, he continued, that they have heard of the accession of *your clemency*, many are willing to undertake the charge. Out of these he has picked out the first of his *defensors*, Boniface, whom he has ordained deacon for the purpose. "From long intercourse his life is favorably known to me, and he is of tried faith and character". From what follows in the same letter Gregory evidently commissioned Boniface to do what he had himself when apocrisiarius been told to do, *viz*., to try to get help for Italy against the "daily swords" of the Lombards.

This Boniface, who again, like Gregory himself, was ordained deacon to be sent as apocrisiarius to Constantinople, and who appears as "the first of the defensors" some five years before he was thus selected by Gregory, is generally regarded as the one who became Boniface III. And in view of the fact that, as we shall see, Boniface III found some favor in the eyes of the tyrant Phocas, it seems not improbable that that favor was won when he was at the imperial city.

Besides begging for help against the incursions of the Lombards, Boniface had also to enter into negotiations with the emperor relative to the affair of Alcison of Corcyra, now Corfu. It appears that John, Bishop of Euria in Epirus, harassed by the inroads of the barbarians (Avars and Slavs), took refuge in Cassiope in Corcyra with his clergy, and then wished to withdraw that city from the jurisdiction of its proper bishop, Alcison. He contrived to get the Emperor Maurice to sanction his uncanonical endeavors. Of course, as Gregory pointed out to Boniface, such sanction was valueless, as it was against the canons. The matter was then put into the hands of the disputants'

metropolitan, Andrew of Nicopolis, who naturally decided in favor of Alcison. To still further strengthen his position, Alcison appealed to the Pope, who, of course, confirmed the decision of the metropolitan. In the meantime Andrew died, Maurice was murdered, Phocas came to the throne, and Boniface went to Constantinople. He can hardly have got there before he received a letter from Gregory, dated October 603, instructing him as to how far matters had proceeded in this affair; and, with his usual diplomatic foresight, telling him what he has to do to prevent a collision between his (Gregory's) support of Alcison and the previous imperial edict against him. Boniface has to point out how unjust it was to favor the bishop, and how much against the canons, and to endeavor to bring it about that a rescript of Phocas in favor of Alcison be sent to him along with the Pope's decision. Boniface seems to have had the requisite amount of skill to carry the affair to a successful issue.

When Boniface returned to Rome is not known. Possibly part of the year's vacancy of the Holy See after the death of Sabinian may be accounted for by supposing that Boniface was elected Pope when he was at Constantinople. At any rate, a Boniface, who was a Roman and the son of John Catadioce, a name that would rather suggest Greek origin had not names of many nationalities become indigenous in Rome, was consecrated on Sunday, February 19, 617.

During the very short pontificate of Boniface, he obtained from Phocas an edict setting forth that the See of Rome was the Head of all the Churches; because, continued the writer in the *Book of the Popes*, the Church of Constantinople had put itself down as the Head of the Churches. The immediate cause for the publication of this decree is sought by some historians in the disagreements between the emperor and the patriarch. According to them, Phocas was actuated by a wish to humble Cyriacus, by thus declaring that notwithstanding the mighty title of *Universal Patriarch* which he boasted, the Primacy in the Church was not his. It was not that he loved Boniface more, but that he loved Cyriacus less. In issuing this decree it must be borne in mind that he was not doing anything new. A similar statement as to the position of the See of Rome among the Churches had been made by Justinian eighty years before. As Muratori takes notice, Boniface asked for this decree, not because the primacy of the Roman pontiffs, which had been acknowledged in every preceding century, stood in need of it, but for the same reason that Phocas issued it, *viz.*, to bring down the patriarch of Constantinople to his proper level.

In connection with this decree, there has been much wild writing by historians in this country. Bower, Milman, etc., quoting as reliable authorities writers who lived centuries after Boniface III, and who were either hostile to the popes, as the imperialist, Sigebert of Gemblours (*d.c.* 1113), or quite uncritical, as Platina (*d.*1481), give us a graphic picture of Boniface, as apocrisiarius, flattering the tyrant Phocas, and then, as Pope, assuming "that awful title before which Christendom bowed for so many centuries, that of Universal Bishop". As a matter of fact, neither Boniface III nor any other pope ever assumed that title, as we have already seen. And so, though the *Liber Diurnus*, which contains a number of formulas generally considered to have been those used by the Roman Church, on one occasion speaks of Martin I as Universal Pope; still in the formula (I), where the modes of addresses used by the popes are given, only one

title is assumed by them, and it is the formula of Pope Gregory : “Servant of the Servants of God”.

The only other recorded action of Boniface III is that, at a council, at which seventy-two bishops and all the Roman clergy took part, he issued a decree in favor of freedom of ecclesiastical elections, and forbidding anyone to treat of the election of a new pope or bishop until three days after his burial, or to speak of a pope’s successor during his lifetime. This interval, not always observed, was extended by Gregory X, at the council of Lyons (can. 2), 1274, to ten days. The events that gave rise to this decree are not known.

Boniface died the same year he was consecrated. He was buried in St. Peter's, November 12, 607.

ST. BONIFACE IV.

A.D. 608-615

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

PHOCAS, 602-610. HERACLIUS, 610-641.

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

AGILULPH, 590-615.

EXARCHS OF RAVENNA.

SMARAGDUS, 602-611. JOHN (LEMIGIUS), 611-616.

THOUGH Boniface IV, reigned for over six years, he is little more than a name to us. Very little is known about his doings during that time, and hardly anything which gives us any insight into his character, so that the biography of this Pope will scarcely be able to point a moral or adorn a tale.

After a long vacancy of over ten months, presumably again due to the tardiness of the emperor in confirming the election, Boniface, the son of John, a physician, and a native of the territory of the ancient Marsi in the province of Valeria (natione Marsorum, de civitate Valeria), was consecrated Bishop of Rome, August 25 (Duchesne), or September 15 (Jaffé), 608. These long vacancies alone are quite enough to show how undesirable it was that the papal elections should have to be dependent on the confirmation of the civil power.

What the *L. P.* here calls *civitas Valeria*, we have translated as the *province* of Valeria, in which the country of the Marsi was situated. But no doubt in the province there was a town which at this period was called by its name; and this passage of *Anastasius* shows that that town was in the country of the Marsi. Duchesne, therefore, looks for this town along the Via Valeria, the main road east from Rome, which traverses the country of the Marsi to the north of Lake Fucinus; and identifies it, with no small degree of probability, with Cerfennia (Collarmela), where the road bifurcates, going north to Marruvium and south to Corfinium.

Now it is very curious that Gregory in his *Dialogues* (III. 20) tells a story of a priest Stephen, of the province of Valeria, who, he says, was a very near relation "of this our Boniface, the deacon and *dispensator* of the Church". The *Dialogues* were published at the close of the year 593, and in one of Gregory's letters (IV. 2) of this same date there is mention of "my most beloved son Boniface, the deacon". No doubt,

then, Boniface IV was the *dispensator* of the Church who was related to the priest Stephen, and who was most beloved of Gregory. The *dispensator* seems to have been the Pope's right-hand man, or the first official in connection with the administration of the patrimonies.

On May 13, 609 (?), Boniface consecrated the Pantheon to the worship of the true God under the invocation of Our Lady and the Martyrs. Though Gregory the Great sanctioned the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon pagan temples into churches, there is no example before this of one in Rome being so treated. This beautiful specimen of ancient architecture, still one of the most perfect of the architectural wonders of Rome, and from its shape often spoken of as the Church of Our Lady of the *Rotunda*, had been built by Agrippa (*BC* 25) in honor of Augustus, and consecrated to Jupiter the Avenger, to Venus and to Mars. The pagan temples had been closed from the end of the fourth century, and the Pantheon would have fallen to ruin with the others had not Boniface obtained leave from Phocas to turn it into a Christian church. He, moreover, received many presents for it from the same emperor. "The finest architectural monument of ancient Rome has to thank the Church, which hallowed it to Christian uses, for its preservation from the spoiler. Had this transformation not taken place, the splendid building would undoubtedly have been converted into the fortress of some noble in the Middle Ages, and, having undergone assaults innumerable, would have survived, like the tomb of Hadrian, only in a ruinous and mutilated guise". So Gregorovius. Truly does Rome belong to the popes, for in every way have they preserved it. "On the score of its antiquity, its beauty, and its sanctity", continues the same author, "the new Church has always been esteemed by the Romans the most precious ornament of their city, and from the seventh century onwards remained the zealously guarded property of the popes. Even in the thirteenth century every senator was obliged to swear that, together with St. Peter's, the castle of St. Angelo, and the other papal possessions, he would also defend St. Maria Rotonda for the Pope". But in our time, by a penurious and tyrannical government, with the brigand proclivities of many of its oppressed people, the Pantheon has been taken from the popes, its preservers, and declared *national property*. If it remains in the hands of the government, there is reason to fear it may ere long go to ruin. The national property, to which it is declared to belong, is believed by some well acquainted with Italian affairs to be going headlong to national bankruptcy.

An historian of our own country, the Venerable Bede, is our authority for the next act of Boniface of which we have any knowledge. Mellitus, the first bishop of London, after the landing of St. Augustine, had occasion to go to Rome "to consult the Pope on important matters relative to the newly-established church in this country". Arrived in Rome he took part in a synod of the bishops of Italy, which the Pope had called together to legislate on "the life and monastic peace of the monks". These words of Bede constitute all we know of the work of this council. What is usually cited as the decree of the council is now generally regarded as spurious. Mellitus, however, brought home the genuine decree, whatever it was, as well as letters from the Pope to Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, and to all the clergy, and to King Ethelbert and the English nation, concerning what had to be observed by the Church in England.

The letter to Ethelbert is somewhat obscure, but in it, "by his apostolic authority", Boniface willingly grants what the king has asked through Bishop Mellitus, viz., that in

the monastery over which Lawrence presides the king may establish a dwelling for monks living together in complete regularity, and that the monks, "who have preached the faith to you may associate these (and other) monks to themselves". The letter concludes by warning the king that, if any of his successors, or any bishops or others violate this decree, "they will fall under the anathema of the Prince of the Apostles and his successors till they have done penance". Montalembert conjectures that the introduction of monks of Saxon origin into the Italian community founded by St. Augustine is here indicated.

Some, indeed, doubt of the genuineness of this and the rest of the series of papal documents given by William of Malmesbury. But as their doubts rest but on trivial grounds they need not detain us. This letter is interesting also as being the first of the papal letters in which the *era of the Incarnation* is used, or which is dated in the year of the Lord. Some considerable time, however, was to elapse before the practice of dating letters in this way became regular with the popes, as the authors of *L'art de vérifier les Dates* note in connection with this Pope.

Among the many heroic souls who left Ireland in the seventh century, perhaps the most glorious age of the Church in Ireland, to labor to bring souls to God, none is more deservedly famous than the great St. Columbanus, the founder of a monastic order, which for the comparatively short period of its existence was a rival of the community of St. Benedict. In Columbanus we see, as was remarked before, all the distinguishing virtues as well as shortcomings of the Irish or Celtic character in a marked degree. And fascinating as is the life of Columbanus, one cannot fail to see that he had all the virtues in a preeminent degree except that of prudence. It is not contended that he had not enough of that virtue to enable him to be a very great saint. But while the fact that prudence was the least-developed virtue in him gave a glorious dash and *go* to his actions, it also gave an ephemeral character to his undertakings, and not unfrequently put him into an awkward or foolish position. Compelled to abandon for the time the grand work for the good of souls he was doing in France and Switzerland through the hostile attitude of Theodoric II, King of Burgundy, St. Columbanus crossed over into Italy. He was well received by Agilulph and Theodelinda, and did a great deal of good by his words and writings in helping on the work of withdrawing the Lombards from their Arianism. But unfortunately "he made himself, ridiculous by offering advice to Pope Boniface IV on a theological question which he himself confessed he had not studied". The question was that of the *Three Chapters.* Some of the bishops in Agilulph's dominions, *viz.*, those who were parties to the *Istrian Schism*, were supporters of the *Chapters* and Agilulph persuaded Columbanus to write to Boniface on the matter. Accordingly the abbot dispatched a very long letter to the Pope, in parts too garrulous to be clear and in parts too eloquent to be practical, in which he mixes up the strangest expressions of respect and love for the See of Peter and the Pope with charges and advice the more offensive that they came from one who, as we have said, evinced "no grasp at all of the theological problem" of the *Three Chapters.* Hence, though the letter is addressed "To the most beautiful Head of all the Churches of Europe ... to the Shepherd of Shepherds", though it is "a poor wretch" writing "to the powerful; and wonderful to tell, a new portent, a rare bird, a dove, dares to write to his father Boniface", still the Pope is plainly told that he is charged with heresy and exhorted to

prove his orthodoxy in the matter of "a certain so-called 5th Council", *viz.*, that of Constantinople (553). And though he writes, "as is becoming, to offer a suggestion in a most lowly spirit", though he is bound to the See of Peter, by which alone Rome is great to him, and though he writes as a humble follower still he will speak out freely to his masters and to the steersmen of the spiritual ship and bid them watch. By all the Irish "is the Catholic faith held firm, just as it was first given to us by you, viz., by the successors of the Holy Apostles. This gives me confidence to rouse you against those who call you a schismatic. Though with importunate clamorings, I endeavor to stir you up, as the prince of the leaders. The army of the Lord looks to you, who have the power of arranging and directing everything, of proclaiming war and urging on the leaders; of ordering arms to be seized, the line of battle to be drawn up, the trumpets to ring out, and in fine, yourself in front, the battle to be begun. Call a council to free yourself from the charges made against you".

It would, however, be a complete mistake to suppose that, because Columbanus wrote with more freedom than discretion, he regarded himself as one not subject to the Pope, or that he was a rebel against the papal authority. If he heard anything against the popes, against Chair of St. Peter, "he lamented over it", and if he cries out "to the mystic pilot", he only does so because the water has entered the bark of the Church and the ship is in danger. And when he was told that the Pope had received heretics: "I declared in your name that the Roman Church never defended a heretic against the Catholic faith". In the midst of the troubles around him he looks to the Pope, "who in your power through the honor of the holy apostle Peter are the only hope among the leaders", *i.e.* the spiritual leaders, the bishops. He would have the chair of Peter cleansed from error if, as some say, any may have got there. "For it would be matter for weeping and wailing if the Catholic faith were not held in the apostolic See". It was the greatness of his love and attachment to the See of Rome that made Columbanus quite beside himself at the stories of its falling away which the clever schismatics of North Italy had poured into his simple and credulous ears.

"But", he continues, "that I may say all and not seem to unduly flatter even you, it is also matter for grief that, with zeal for the faith, you have not displayed the purity of your faith, and long ago, as was becoming, seeing that you have the legitimate power, condemned and excommunicated the party which has receded from you. Wherefore it is that they dare to blacken the fame of the principal See of the orthodox faith. My father and patron, I beg you drive away the confusion from before the faces of your sons and disciples, who for you are confounded; and, what is more important than all this, bring it about that all breath of suspicion be removed from the chair of Peter... Because of the two great apostles of Christ, you are almost celestial, and Rome is the head of the Churches of the whole world, saving the singular prerogative of the place of the divine resurrection". In this last clause, as Dollinger notes, "he confounds the veneration which was due to that Church on account of possessing the holy scenes of our Redemption, and of being the place of pilgrimage for the whole world, with its ecclesiastical authority. This was not essentially attached to the Church of Jerusalem, but only as it was one of the apostolical, patriarchal Churches of the East".

When he came into those parts (Bobbio), concludes Columbanus, he was warned against the Pope as having fallen into the heresy of Nestorius. But this allegation he

declares he believed not: “For I believe that the pillar of the Church is ever firm in Rome ... Do you, then, O king of kings, follow Peter and let the whole Church follow you”.

What answer the Pope returned to this glowing effusion of the impulsive Celt, all aflame with love for God and the honor of the See of Peter, but fuller of classical quotations than theological knowledge, we do not know. But if the most recent editor of the letters of Columbanus, *viz*., Gundlach, is correct in marking a letter of Columbanus, discovered in recent years by Krusch, as addressed to Boniface IV, the two must have been on good terms. For in that letter the saint says that he has to speak about the feasts of the Church, Easter, etc., “under the compulsion of your commanding charity”. In the course of this epistle he notes that what unity then existed with regard to the time of celebrating Easter was due to the Church “following the authority of the apostolic See”. He concludes: “I have not been afraid, poor foreigner that I am, to send you in your richness this scrappy production because ‘perfect charity casteth out fear’ (1 John IV. 18); and because I believe, O venerable Pope, that obedience with faith is of more worth than human genius”. With this humble profession on his lips, we will leave that *rara avis,* Columbanus.

The same Theodoric II of Burgundy, who had expelled Columbanus from Gaul, and whom St. Gregory had, to no purpose, endeavored to lead along the path of virtue, wrote to Boniface IV to beg the pallium for the newly consecrated Archbishop of Arles, “according to ancient custom”. Praising the king for his care of his churches the Pope commends to him the interests of the church and the poor of the patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul; and, as the same Pope’s letter to Florian himself shows, sent the pallium as desired. In the last-mentioned letter, Boniface expresses his pleasure at the good character that he finds given to him on all hands. He exhorts him to live up to the honor he is conferring upon him, and especially to fight against simony—the same evil in the Church of Gaul against which we saw Gregory struggling and which we shall see so many other popes struggling earnestly to subdue. Boniface also commends to Florian the small patrimony of the Roman Church in those parts, of which Gregory’s nominee, Candidus, is still the *agent.*

In the case of Boniface IV it was not the Lombards who were his cross. The peace brought about by Gregory was renewed at frequent intervals, generally for a year at a time. But, as his biographer says that “in his time were famines, pestilences, and inundations”, it was doubtless with these that the attention of the Pope was taken up till his death.

His biographer also tells us that Boniface turned his own house into a monastery and endowed it. In this, as in certain other respects, we find Boniface imitating his great predecessor St. Gregory, a fact long ago noticed in the epitaph placed on his tomb,

Gregorii semper raonita atque exempla magistri

Vita, opere ac dignis moribus iste sequens.

Boniface was originally buried (May 8, 615, but May 25 615. according to Jaffé) in the portico of St. Peter's. On his tomb there was placed the inscription, of which two lines have just been cited, and of which the rest may be read in Duchesne. His body was afterwards taken into the interior of the basilica. Papebroch, the Bollandist, gives particulars of three removals of his body—the first in the tenth or eleventh century; the second at the close of the thirteenth, under Boniface VIII, and the third in 1603. The later inscription on the tomb, in the days of Boniface VIII, may still be read in the crypt of St. Peter. Grisar, in his *Analecta,* has a reproduction of it.

DEUSDEDIT.

A.D. 615-618.

EMPEROR.

HERACLIUS, 610-641.

KING.

ADALWALD, 615-624.

EXARCHS.

JOHN, 611-616. ELEUTHERIUS, 616-620.

Of Deusdedit we know no more of the character and even less of the deeds than of those of his predecessor. A Roman and the son of a subdeacon Stephen, he was consecrated, after a delay of about five months, on October 19, 615.

He seems to have been chiefly distinguished by his love for the secular clergy. He replaced them in their former positions, *i.e.*, he either simply continued the policy of Sabinian; or, if it is safe to place full reliance on the word (*revocavit*) used to express his conduct, he undid the work of Boniface IV, just as the latter had undone that of Sabinian by carrying out the system of Gregory the Great in placing monks in important positions. And not only did he love them in life, but in death also, leaving money to be distributed to them at his funeral. In this he was often imitated by his successors during the course of this century.

The pontificate of Deusdedit was greatly troubled by the again disturbed state of the political atmosphere throughout Italy, and by the outbreak of a plague in Rome. The vices and incompetence of Phocas had caused disturbances within the empire, and had allowed it to be fearfully harried from without by the Persians; and of course his successor, Heraclius, was unable to right everything at once. His exarch John and the civil authorities of Ravenna *(judices)* were put to death in the course of a popular tumult or conspiracy. The emperor, however, at once dispatched his chamberlain, the patrician Eleutherius, to succeed John and to restore order in Italy. For there was trouble in the South as well as in the North. Whether or not in connection with the disturbance in Ravenna, a certain John of Compsa (the modern Conza, in the ancient district of Samnium, some sixty miles east of Naples), declaring his independence by proclaiming himself emperor (?), seized Naples. Eleutherius showed himself a man of action. The

murderers of John were put to death, and then (probably in 617) he marched along the Flaminian Road for Rome. After a royal reception from the Pope—loyal, as usual, to the cause of the emperor—the exarch continued his march to Naples, which he took by storm. The *tyrannus* shared the fate of the rebellious Ravennese, and was executed. Next, taking advantage, no doubt, of the youth of Adalwald, Eleutherius renewed the war with the Lombards. But he was no match for the Lombard general Sundrar, who had been trained to war by Agilulph. The exarch had to sue for peace, which he only obtained on payment of a large sum of money. In the reign of the following Pope (Boniface V) Eleutherius himself rebelled and aspired to the empire. He was, however, slain by his own troops (620), and his head sent to Constantinople. These incidents serve, at least, to show how ineffectual was the grasp of the imperial power over Italy at this period, and how thoroughly left to itself it really was.

Rome was itself more immediately affected by an earthquake (August 618), and then by a plague. This latter consisted in the outbreak of a scab of such a size that people could not recognize one another. Many think that the disease was elephantiasis, a sort of leprosy, which produces a frightful scurf. Later writers have a legend of the Pope meeting one of the sufferers from this loathsome disorder, and of his being touched with compassion at the sight of him, kissing him, and thereby restoring him to health on the spot.

Anastasius has preserved us a decree of this Pope which, with enigmatic brevity, he states thus: "Hic constituit secunda missa in clero". Noting that in the 30th canon of the council of Agde (506), vespers are called *missae vespertinae,* Duchesne thinks that this decree *may* refer to some evening service which the Pope wished to impose upon the clergy, and that there is an allusion to it in the fifth distich of the epitaph of Deusdedit. This epitaph was composed by Pope Honorius.

The fact that Deusdedit made some decree relative to the Mass must be our excuse for here introducing a description of a Papal Mass according to the ritual in use in this century. In our modern missals and pontificals many of the ceremonies that have to be observed during the course of the Mass and different offices of the Church are placed side by side with the various prayers which have to be said. This, however, was not the case in the seventh century. No rubrics are to be found in the Sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory. They were instead written down in books by themselves. These books of ritual were known as *Ordines Romani.* That most industrious and learned Benedictine, Mabillon, collected together in the second volume of his *Museum Italicum* no less than fifteen of these *ordos* belonging to different ages and treating of different ecclesiastical functions. Of these books of ceremonies it is universally agreed that the most ancient is the one which is placed first in the collection of Mabillon. And of the *Ordo Romanus I* itself, the first portion is the oldest. This part gives the ceremonies to be observed in the celebration of a *stational* Mass by the Pope; and Grisar seems to have proved conclusively that it belongs to the seventh century; and, if not actually the work of Gregory the Great, at least shows us practically what took place when he left the Lateran palace to celebrate Mass at one of the stations. The same most learned author has also published a new text of the first portion of the Ordo. This is the one which will be here made use of.

On Easter morn, then, in the year 616, there assembled at the Lateran palace a number of officials to escort Deusdedit to the Church of St. Mary *Major* or *ad praesepe,* where it had been previously announced he was to sing Mass. The procession to the Church of the station was headed by a number of acolytes of the third region and the *defensors* of all the regions on foot. Then in front of the Pope rode the archdeacon, carrying the book of the gospels, with a richly jewelled cover, the primicerius of the notaries, two regionary notaries and the regionary defensors and subdeacons, one of whom carried the book of the epistles. On foot, in front of the Pope, walked an acolyte carrying the holy chrism, in an ampulla covered with a napkin, just as it is carried today during the ceremony of blessing the holy oils on Maundy Thursday. Then followed the Pope himself on horseback with grooms on either side of him.

Next, more acolytes, bearing the less important requisites for the Mass, and the *mansionarii* (guardians or caretakers) and *bajuli* (bailiffs) with the more valuable ones, *e.g.,* the chalices, the *scyphi* (the vessels used to contain the wine to be consecrated), the *amae,* the paten and other sacred utensils in gold and silver from the Basilica of St. John Lateran.

Finally, also mounted, followed the *vicedominus* (majordomo), the *vestiarius* (wardrobe keeper), the *nomenclator* (usher) and the *sacellarius* (treasurer).

Meanwhile the rest of the clergy and the people had assembled at St. Mary Major's, which had been gorgeously decorated for the occasion. In the *presbyterium* (sanctuary), awaiting the arrival of the Pope, were seated the bishops on the Gospel side of the altar, and the priests on the Epistle side. There also were the bearers of the regionary crosses and various other officials who were to take part in the ceremony.

When the papal cortege drew near to the basilica, another one from the church went forth to meet it, consisting of acolytes and defensors of the third region, with the priests attached to St. Mary's, the majordomos of the Roman Church and the mansionarius carrying incense stands *(timiameteria).* After receiving the Pope's blessing, they fell in with the papal procession.

Arrived at the basilica, two deacons helped the Pope to dismount, and conducted him to the sacristy. The deacons then changed their vestments outside the sacristy. The one who was to read the gospel, at the bidding of the archdeacon, opened the seal *(reserato sigillo)* of the book of the gospels, marked the place, and handed the volume to an acolyte. He carried it to the sanctuary and a subdeacon placed it on the altar.

Meanwhile the regionary subdeacons vested the pontiff, in the same way as we see a bishop vested today, each one carrying one of the vestments, the alb, the girdle, the dalmatic, etc. Then with three pins, just as now, the pallium was fastened on to the chasuble. When the maniple was given to the Pope, he was informed who was to sing the epistle and gospel.

Then, at a sign from the Pope, a subdeacon went to the door of the sacristy and chanted *Accendite* (Light up). The candles were then lighted and the subdeacon put

incense in the golden thurible. The choir, too, took their places in front of the altar, men and boys on each side, and began the *Introit,* so called because sung when the ministers were entering the church.

When the two deacons at the door of the sacristy heard the first notes of the *Introit,* they joined the Pope, kissed his hands and led him towards the altar, preceded by the subdeacon with the thurible and seven acolytes with lighted candles.

This procession was met on its way to the altar by two acolytes and a subdeacon with a vessel in which was the Blessed Sacrament. After an inclination of his head to reverence the Holy Eucharist, the Pope looked to see whether there was too much of the sacred species (to be placed in his chalice), and so whether it would be necessary to again reserve a portion.

Arrived in front of the altar, and before they reached the choir, the 'torchbearers' divided, four going to the right and three to the left. The Pope, however, went in front of the choir, bowed his head to the altar, raised himself, prayed, and making the sign of the Cross on his forehead, gave the kiss of peace to the hebdomadary bishop, the archpriest, and all the deacons. Whilst the choir, at a sign from the Pope, sang the *Gloria Patri* at the end of the *Introit,* the deacons kissed the sides of the altar, and the Pope himself kissed both the book of the gospels and the altar. Then he went to his seat (which was in the centre of the apse behind the altar) and stood with his face to the East, and, of course, with his back to the people.

When the choir had finished the *Kyrie eleison,* the Pope turned to the people and intoned the *Gloria in excelsis Deo,* and then turned back to the East till the canticle was finished. Then again turning to the people, he said *Pax vobis,* and again turning to the East he said *Oremus* and the prayer. At its conclusion he sat down, as did also the bishops and priests.

But the regionary subdeacons went up to the altar and stood, some on the right of it and others on the left, while one of their number ascended the ambo (pulpit), and read the epistle. When he had finished, a cantor mounted the ambo with his antiphonary and chanted the Gradual.

A deacon then stepped forward and kissed the feet of the Pope, who pronounced over him the blessing in use to this day—*Dominus sit in corde tuo.* Proceeding to the altar, he kissed the book of the gospels, took it in his hands and carried it towards the ambo, preceded by two subdeacons (one of whom bore incense), and two acolytes with their candles. When *the place* had been found for him by the unoccupied subdeacon, the deacon recited the gospel from the ambo.

On the completion of the gospel, the Pope said *Pax tibi. Dominus vobiscum,* to which was answered *Et cum spiritu tuo,* while the book of the gospels was being kissed by all in order. The volume was then placed in a case *(capsa),* held by an acolyte, to be sealed and taken back to the Lateran.

Accompanied by an acolyte bearing the chalice and a corporal, the deacon then went to the altar; and with the aid of the second deacon spread the linen corporal over the altar. A subdeacon took the chalice, and with it followed the archdeacon, who, with

the Pope, now went to collect the offerings which the people had brought for the sacrifice.

With the primicerius of the notaries at his right, and the primicerius of the defensors on his left, the Pope descended to the *senatorium* (the place reserved for the nobility), and received the offerings (the bread) of the great *(oblationes principum).* A subdeacon took the breads from the Pope, and they were placed in a linen cloth held by two acolytes. The hebdomadary bishop helped the Pope to collect the offerings. The small vessels of wine, brought by the faithful, were taken by the archdeacon and their contents poured into the chalice held by the subdeacon, who followed him. When his chalice was full he emptied it into a larger one carried by an acolyte. The Pope also received the offerings of the defensors in their place *(ante confessionem)* and from the women in theirs (which was in the north aisle), and returned to his seat.

After both had washed their hands, the archdeacon, at a sign from the Pope, went up to the altar. The archdeacon then arranged the breads which were necessary for the sacrifice and for communion, and which he received from the hands of the regionary subdeacons. He also poured the wine, supplied by the Pope himself and others, into the chalice through a strainer, so that it might be very pure. A subdeacon, who had received the water from the choir-master brought it to the archdeacon, who poured it into the chalice, making the sign of the Cross over it.

The Pope himself now advanced to the altar, received the breads (presented by himself, the deacons, etc.) and placed them on the altar. Taking the chalice from the hands of the regionary subdeacon, the archdeacon placed it (with its two handles wrapped in a linen cloth, called the offertorium) to the right of the Pope's *bread (oblatam pontificis),* put the linen cloth at the corner of the altar, and then took up his stand behind the Pope. After a short prayer, the Pope signed to the choir, who had been singing during the offertory, to finish, that he might begin the Preface,

Meanwhile, at the close of the offertory, the bishops and deacons took up their stand behind the Pope and in front of the altar. The regionary subdeacons, on the other hand, went behind the altar and stood facing the Pope. After the 'angelic hymn' (as the Ordo calls the *Sanctus),* at the close of the Preface, had been said by all, the subdeacons came to the front of the altar and with the bishops, priests and deacons, remained bowed down in silence, whilst the Pope alone said the canon of the Mass.

At the words. *Nobis quoque peccatoribus,* the deacons stood erect, and at the words, *Per quern haec omnia,* the archdeacon raised the chalice by its handles with the *offertorium* towards the Pope, who touched it on the side with some of the consecrated hosts, and said the prayer: *Per ipsum et cum ipso* to *per omnia saecula saeculorum.* The chalice and hosts were then returned to their places.

From the beginning to the middle of the canon an acolyte, with a veil on his shoulders (what is now called the superhumeral veil), had been holding before his breast the paten, just as the subdeacon does today. At the middle of the canon the assistant subdeacon took the paten, passed it on to the regionary subdeacon, who, at the words, *ab omni perturbatione securi,* gave it to the archdeacon to kiss. It was then given to the second deacon to hold. When the Pope had said. *Pax domini sit semper vobiscum,* he put into the chalice 'de sancta', *i.e.,* the portion of the host consecrated the

day before. The kiss of peace was then given by the archdeacon to the clergy and people.

After this the Pope broke one of the hosts at its right, and placed on the altar the part he had broken off; in order, says one of the readings of the ordo, that throughout all the ceremony the altar might never be without sacrifice. The rest of his own hosts he placed on the paten which was being held by the second deacon.

The archdeacon then gave the chalice to be held by a subdeacon at the right hand corner of the altar, and placed the hosts in the linen bags, which were carried by acolytes. The hosts in the little bags were then taken to the bishops and priests, to be broken into particles to be given in Holy Communion.

The Pope, meanwhile, had returned to his seat. Thither followed him two subdeacons with the paten bearing the hosts of the pontiff. At a sign from the Pope, the hosts were broken by the two deacons. With the exception of the particle broken off by the Pope himself, the archdeacon removed all the hosts from the altar, signed to the choir to recite the *Agnus Dei* and then went and stood by the Pope, holding in his hands the chalice he had received from the subdeacon.

When the hosts of the pontiff had been broken, the second deacon brought the paten to where the Pope was sitting that he might communicate. When he had done so, he placed a particle of the host into the chalice, saying, as the priest does to this day: "May this mixture and consecration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to us that receive it effectual to eternal life. Amen. Peace be to you. And with thy spirit". He then received the Precious Blood from the hands of the archdeacon.

With the chalice in his hand the archdeacon went to the corner of the altar and announced where the next *station* was to be held. And after he had poured some of the contents of the chalice into a *scyphus* held by an acolyte, the bishops came forward to the Pope's seat, that they might there receive Holy Communion at his hands; and the priests went to the altar for the same purpose. The 'first bishop', receiving the chalice from the archdeacon, *confirmed*, as it was called, *i.e.*, administered the Precious Blood to the different clerical dignitaries down to the primicerius of the defensors.

This done, the bishop returned the chalice to the archdeacon, who poured its contents into the above-mentioned *scyphus*, and then handed it (the chalice) to a regionary subdeacon to be put away in the sacristy. In turn the subdeacon presented the archdeacon with a metal reed, by means of which he was to administer the chalice to the people.

Escorted by the primicerii of the notaries and defensors, the Pope proceeded to the *senatorium* when he had finished giving Communion to the clergy; and there, assisted by the archdeacon with the chalice, gave Holy Communion to the lay dignitaries. Bishops, priests, and deacons helped the Pope to give Communion to the people.

As soon as the Pope came to the *senatorium*, the choir began to sing the antiphon at the Communion, and continued to do so till all had been communicated.

At the close of the antiphon, the Pope, who had meanwhile returned to his seat, went up to the altar with the archdeacon and the second deacon, and recited the concluding prayer (the post-communion). A deacon then gave out, *Ite missa est,* to which was answered, *Deo Gratias.*

Finally, after asking and obtaining the Pope's blessing, the various ministers returned to the sacristy. First went the regionary subdeacon, with the thurible, and the seven torchbearers. Then came the Pope with his immediate attendants. After them followed the bishops, priests, and monks; the choir, the military standard-bearers and the bailiffs; acolytes, the cross-bearers stationed outside the sanctuary, and the junior mansionarii.

With the exception of the ceremonies connected with the giving of Communion under both kinds, and with the exception of the 'breads' for the Mass in use in the days of Deusdedit being much more bulky than the wafers at present used in the West, there is nothing which anyone now accustomed to a papal or episcopal Mass, and to the Roman Missal of today, would find strange in a papal Mass of the seventh century, such as it is portrayed in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory and in the Ordo Romanus.

BONIFACE V.

A.D. 619-625.

EMPEROR.

HERACLIUS (610-641)

KING.

ADAWALD (615-624) .

EXARCHS.

ELEUTHERIUS, 616-620 OR EUSEBIUS (?) 620-625.

THIS Pope, who was possibly one of the many clerics of his name who were employed by Gregory the Great, and who is described as 'the mildest of men', was consecrated (December 23, 619) after the See had been vacant for more than a year. He was a Neapolitan, and the son of the omnipresent *John.*

As was stated under the life of Deusdedit, Eleutherius the exarch rebelled against Heraclius. This took place some time in the year 619, and before the consecration of Boniface. At peace with the Lombards, and hoping to succeed where John of Compsa had failed, he assumed the Imperial purple. Acting on the advice of John, Archbishop of Ravenna, he set out for Rome to take the imperial crown, "there, where the seat of empire had its permanent place". This dictum of the archbishop shows, at least, what was the view of patriotic Italians on the transference of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople.

Eleutherius evidently overestimated the strength of his popularity, for he was slain by his own troops at *Castrum Luciolis* (Ponte Riccioli, near Cantiano), a fort on the Flaminian Way. His head was sent "to the most pious emperor at Constantinople". His death must have been a great relief to Boniface. He would doubtless have been called upon to crown the usurper had he reached Rome; and he would then have had to choose between an emperor at Constantinople and an *intarta* at his own door.

Like his predecessor, Boniface showed his practical love for the clergy by grants of money to them. His biographer assigns several decrees to him, which, from the brief way in which they are stated, are not very easy of comprehension. In connection with the right of asylum he forbade anyone to be dragged from a church. Acolytes were not to presume 'levare' (to expose? or translate?) the relics of the martyrs. This had to be done by priests only.

In his notes on this latter decree, Duchesne holds that "there is no question here of the translation of relics, properly so-called". In the days of Boniface V, he says, the bodies of the saints of Rome still lay in their graves, in the churches or cemeteries. They were not then carried about in reliquaries. The earliest mention of a translation from the suburbs into one of the city churches occurs in the time of Pope Theodore in the case of that of SS. Primus and Felician. And in the seventh century, at least, such ceremonies were too rare to be made the object of a general regulation such as this. He believes, therefore, that it is a question of the objects which were placed on the tombs of the martyrs, and then taken away as relics. In entrusting the distribution of these pious souvenirs to the priests in charge of the religious services of the sanctuaries, the Pope doubtless had in view increasing their value in the eyes of the pilgrims.

But the translation and distribution of relics, properly so-called, was by no means so rare in the seventh century as the abbé seems to suppose. The letters of Gregory the Great very often speak of the sending to and fro from Rome of relics or cases containing relics of saints, and of their being carried to new churches and oratories to be therein reverently placed. His contemporary, John of Ravenna, is recorded to have translated relics; and his epitaph tells of his receiving relics from Gregory. It may, indeed, in the seventh century, have been *the custom* at Rome, when relics were given, not "to give any part of the body of the saint"; but it was a custom that was very often honored by its breach. That curious vice of the pious too, relic-stealing, was in vogue in the days of Gregory I. Now all this necessarily implies a considerable amount of *translation* of relics of one sort or another. 'Levare', moreover, seems to have been the technical phrase to denote the taking about (translation) of relics. The decree, therefore, of Boniface may be taken to mean that acolytes were not to translate, or in any way to prepare, relics for distribution.

The acolytes of the days of Boniface V must have been a pushing body, for a second decree was necessary to restrain them. In the Lateran basilica, at any rate *(in Lateranis),* they were forbidden to take the place of the deacons in administering the sacrament of baptism. This had to be done by the subdeacons who were not attached to the regions, the so-called *subdiaconi sequentes.* However, it would seem, from the second part of the Ordo Romanus I, that even after the time of Boniface the acolytes, at least in some churches, occasionally administered the sacrament of baptism.

Finally, Boniface ordained that the laws of the empire on the subject of *wills* were to be obeyed, presumably, as Duchesne observes, by the ecclesiastical notaries. For the Pope would not legislate for the civil lawyers.

His intercourse with England comprises practically all that is known of this Pope's relations with the church at large. Bede tells us that he wrote "encouraging letters" to Mellitus, the third Archbishop of Canterbury, and to Justus, Bishop of Rochester. And sorely were such letters needed. For after the first successes under St. Augustine and King Ethelbert, the inevitable reaction had come, and the companions of the saint had somewhat lost heart. On the death of Mellitus, the Pope sent the pallium to Justus, the successor of Mellitus, and gave him power to consecrate bishops as the need arose. In the letter conferring these privileges upon Justus, Boniface tells him that he has heard from Eadbald, the son and successor of Ethelbert, that it was the eloquence

and learning of Justus that had fully reconverted him to the true faith. For, on the death of his father, Eadbald had returned to his gods. The Pope goes on to say that he takes this as an augury that the conversion of many will be brought about by Justus, and exhorts him to use the privileges of the pallium, etc., which he has given him, not in such a way as to bring upon himself condemnation on the great accounting day, but for the salvation of souls. This letter was written in 624.

In another letter, of the following year, after noting that Justus had stated in a letter to him that St. Gregory had established the metropolitan See in Canterbury for St. Augustine and his successors, Boniface forbids any Christian to contravene that arrangement at any time, and "by the authority of Blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles", he himself renews the decree, making Canterbury, which is specially under the guardianship of the See of Rome, the metropolitan of all Britain.

Boniface V evidently shared the affectionate vigilance for this country of Gregory I and his namesake Boniface IV. We next find him endeavoring to help Paulinus in his work for the conversion of Northumbria, that Anglo-Saxon kingdom, which stretched from the Humber to the Firth of Forth. It is well known that Edwin, the powerful ruler of that kingdom, was induced to agree to examine into the claims of Christianity, in order to obtain the hand of the Christian princess Ethelberga of Kent. The Pope, therefore, wrote (625) a letter of some length to him, in which he exhorted him to give up the worship of gods, so helpless that they could not stir unless someone moved them, and embrace the worship of the one true and living God who made heaven and earth. As an earnest of his goodwill, he sent the king a little present of an embroidered tunic and a cloak. He wrote at the same time to Edwin's Christian wife, bidding her, by prayer and every means in her power, never to cease striving to obtain for her husband the grace of faith which she herself possessed. He begged her, in conclusion, to keep him well informed of the progress that Christianity made, as he was most anxious to know all about it; and he sent her little presents that were sure to have been very acceptable to the lady, a "silver mirror" and an "inlaid ivory comb". The conversion of Northumbria was the work of these servants of God—the Pope, the Queen, and the Bishop, each in their respective spheres. Should any apology be needed for the enumeration of such details, with regard to events in corners of England, the words of Malmesbury himself may be offered, who has preserved us some of these details. "What is sweeter than to tell of the lives of our ancestors, that you may know the deeds of those from whom you have received the beginnings of faith and models of a good life?"

During the pontificate of this Pope, and his more immediate predecessors and successors, events of the very first importance in the world's history were taking place, in the East. In 615, under Chosroes II, the Persians, who had for a long time been giving great trouble to the Eastern Empire, had advanced so far beyond the Euphrates that they captured Jerusalem, whence, to the intense grief and shame of all Christians, they carried off the relic of the true Cross. Soon afterwards they made themselves masters of Egypt, the granary of the Empire. After a long period of willful, or perhaps, rather, enforced inaction or preparation, the Emperor Heraclius took the field against them. One glorious campaign followed another, and in 629 the relic of the Holy Cross was retaken by Heraclius and by him brought back to Jerusalem. Unfortunately, these wars

weakened both empires and made them an easy prey to that fanatical impostor, Mahomet or Mohammed.

Born during the lifetime of Gregory the Great, the ambitious and lustful Mohammed, self-styled "prophet of God", in the year 622 gave to the world a new era in a political as well as in a chronological sense. The year 622, the year of the *Hegira*, or flight of Mohammed from Mecca, is the epoch from which his followers reckon their dates; and it serves to mark the appearance of a new power in the history of mankind—a power which, acting on the doctrine that "there is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet", and that all have to confess that doctrine or be made to do so, had at its feet, in less than seventy years, most of the civilized world.

In the year 630, Mohammed issued from the deserts of his native Arabia and declared war against the Empire. And in the reign of his second successor, Omar (634-643), the three patriarchal cities of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria were in the hands of the Moslem, who has retained his hold on them, in the main, ever since. In the same reign, too, the Saracen also broke up the empire of Persia, and in thirty years after Omar's death had even besieged Constantinople, That city did not indeed come into the power of the Moslem for several centuries. But the fall of Carthage (698), twenty-five years after the first appearance of the Mohammedans before the walls of the imperial city, gave them the command of North Africa and a base of operations against Spain. This latter country was added to the empire of the Caliph in 711, and fortunately was, for over a century, the only considerable portion of Europe which suffered from the exterminating *rule* of the Crescent.

It would be most interesting to know the views of the popes of this period on these momentous events, and to be able to compare them with those of the popes of later times, who showed themselves such uncompromising and able opponents of the Saracen and the "unspeakable" Turk. But the scanty records of the seventh century have hardly preserved us bare outlines of the leading facts of that age, much less the ideas of the principal men in it. We can only conjecture the grief of the Roman pontiffs at the sight of the numerous defeats of the Christian armies, their indignation at the conduct of the Greek emperors issuing dogmatic decrees instead of fighting the Arabs, and that they displayed the same instinctive opposition to the Moslems as did their successors of the days of the Crusades, regarding them not merely as heretics but as enemies of true civilization.

The Catholic historian may well be excused in seeing the hand of God in the fact of three out of the four Oriental patriarchs becoming at this period subject to the Saracen. With an ambitious patriarch of Constantinople a mere puppet in the hands of emperors often worthless and tyrannical, and with the other three patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem also subject to their sway, one cannot help feeling that, short of this calamitous subjugation of Christian bishops to Moslem Caliphs, nothing could have checked the growing pretensions of the Byzantine emperors and patriarchs in the ecclesiastical and spiritual orders, or have prevented the bishop of Constantinople from becoming "Universal Patriarch", in fact as well as in name. And while, moreover, temporal power also was, of course, at the same time lost to the Oriental patriarchs, it was largely increased to the bishops of Rome. In a word, as a direct result of the

Moslem conquests, which can only be described as an “act of God”, the power and importance of the Oriental patriarchs has gone on decreasing from age to age since that period, till now their names are scarcely known; while, on the other hand, the authority and influence of the bishop of Rome has gone on increasing up to this very day, when some 1300 bishops and over 260,000,000 people look up to him as their spiritual Head and Father.

Though Boniface completed the cemetery of St. Nicomedes (the remains of which, with its small basilica, were discovered in 1864) on the Via Nomentana, not far from the present Porta Pia, he was not buried there, but, as usual, in St. Peter's (October 25, 625).

HONORIUS I.

A.D. 625-638.

EMPEROR.

HERACLIUS, 610-641.

KINGS.

ARIWALD, 626-636. ROTHARI, 636-652.

EXARCH.

ISAAC, 625-644.

OF all the successors of St. Peter, Honorius I has in those our days been more discussed than any other. This is owing to his alleged fall into the Monothelite or "One-will" heresy. When at the Vatican Council in 1870, it was defined that the Pope, "when he speaks *ex cathedra,* that is, when fulfilling his office of pastor and doctor of all Christians ... he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church ... is endowed with that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be furnished in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals", when, we say, this was defined to be of Catholic faith, many appealed to the history of Pope Honorius, as showing that in his case at least "error" and not truth had been the subject of an *ex cathedra* decision of a pope. It will be seen in due course that even if Honorius had taught the doctrine of "One-will" in Our Lord, which as a matter of fact he did not, he issued no *ex cathedra* decree on the subject.

Considering, therefore, the interest that attaches to the doings of Honorius in the "One-will" controversy, it will be to the point to form a judgment as to his character from the other acts of his which history records. And a knowledge thus gained of his practical character will throw light on his conduct in the "One-will" controversy.

Honorius, who was consecrated November 3, 625, was a Campanian and the son of Petronius. As the latter is spoken of as a "consul" by the papal biographer, he probably occupied some civil or military position—more likely the former.

With chronological difficulties connected with the exact date of the consecration of the seventh century pontiffs, it is, generally speaking, scarcely worthwhile delaying the course of the narrative, as it is simply now impossible to fix the day of the month with certainty. In this case, however, an exception must be made, as certain conclusions have been drawn from the date of the consecration of Honorius. The biographer of Boniface V tells us that the See was vacant thirteen days after the death of that pontiff. That interval would make the consecration of Honorius fall in the middle of the week

between Sunday, November 3, and Sunday, November 10. Hence Jaffé selects Sunday, November 3.

But counting the length of the reign of Honorius, as given in the *Liber Pontificalis,* backwards from the known date of his death, Sunday, October 27, is arrived at as the day of his consecration. This date is accepted by Duchesne. However, as this would not allow the three days interval required by the decree of Boniface III, the date November 3 is perhaps preferable. Though here again Duchesne contends that as, according to the Roman method of calculating, October 27 was of course exactly the third day after the burial of Boniface, the consecration of Honorius took place on the last day of the "close time" because it happened to be a Sunday. But this would certainly seem to be tampering with the decree of Boniface. Duchesne further urges that if there was any intervention of the exarch in this case of Honorius, it must be set down as due to some exceptional circumstance. Whichever date be accepted, the interval between the death of Boniface V and the consecration of his successor was very short for this period. Hence Sickel and others have concluded that the election of Honorius was confirmed by the exarch and not by the emperor himself directly. But, unless the exarch was in Rome, the interval assigned above was too short for confirmation even by him. It must either be supposed that there is some considerable error in the figures (at least as we have them now) of the biographers of Boniface and Honorius, a supposition by no means unlikely, or that, for some unknown reason, Honorius was consecrated without waiting for the emperor's consent. Suffice it to say here further, that the question as to the confirmation of papal elections by emperor or exarch is very obscure. More will, however, be said on it under the *life* of John IV, when an account will be given of the *Liber Diurnus,* with which the question is closely connected.

His biographer goes on to inform us that in his time Honorius did much good. Among his good deeds, he notes the Pope's instruction of the clergy, and his building, adorning and repairing a long list of churches and cemeteries. Several contemporary inscriptions still extant bear testimony to the activity of Honorius in keeping up the great Christian monuments of the city. He did a great deal as well for the preservation as for the beautifying of St. Peter's. With 975 pounds of silver he so adorned its principal gate that it came to be called the "Silver Gate", and attracted the fatal attention of the Saracens when they plundered St. Peter's in 846. An inscription sets forth how the *Word* took flesh; made St. Peter the first of his disciples; and gave him power to open and shut the gates of heaven. Among those to whom he would have to close the gates of heaven were those in the schism of Istria. But the leader of the people, Honorius, restored to the Church the members that had been torn from her. And as with finest silver he adorned "thy gates, do you, blest door-keeper of heaven, give peace to thy flock". The inscription on the second leaf of the door shows that medallions of the two apostles, richly adorned with gold and gems, were conspicuous on the two leaves of the gate. With the consent of Heraclius he re-roofed St. Peter's with bronze tiles taken from "the temple of Rome", *i.e.* from the great basilica of Constantine on the Sacred Way. The shrunken population of Rome was no longer able to keep up the numerous colossal public edifices with which Rome had been graced in the days of her might. So that Honorius not unnaturally thought it best to preserve the buildings that

were in use, even at the expense of those which were not used, which centuries were bringing to ruin, and which there was no money forthcoming to keep in repair.

On the Via Nomentana he rebuilt the famous church now known as S. Agnese fuori le Mura, and which had been built under Constantine the Great. The Church of St. Agnes is particularly interesting, because, despite modern alterations and restorations, it has to a very large extent kept its ancient form and internal arrangement. Extant inscriptions still tell of the gorgeous, if somewhat rude, manner in which Honorius decorated the tomb of the saint "with silver without stint", and the Church itself with mosaics. The very mosaic (with its inscription also in mosaic) with which Honorius is said to have decorated the apse of the basilica is still preserved. There St. Agnes is seen with the emblems of her martyrdom and in the garb of a Byzantine empress, and to her right a figure in a purple planeta and white pallium, and with tonsured head, presenting to her a model of the basilica. "Below the mosaic, the ancient verses, among the best of their period, and more artistic than the picture which they extol, are still legible". The last four of the verses tell us that the mosaic was given by Honorius, who is to be recognized in it by his vestments, by the model, and by his bright face, the index of his pure heart.

Inscriptions, the book of the popes and topographies, dating back to the seventh century, tell of the restoration of the Church of St. Pancratius, as well as of that of St Agnes. But, as this is not a history of the city of Rome, we must cry: Enough of churches.

However, before finally leaving the subject, it is worthwhile recording that among the discoveries made (1900) by the new "English School" at Rome, was the base of a fountain. It was found on the upper surface of the Comitium, "the greater part of which has now been laid bare .... immediately opposite to the door of the Curia (S. Adriano)", and probably "formed the *cantharus* in front of the church which Honorius I constructed in the Curia about the year 635". For this and other items of information to be quoted later, regarding the recent work of our school of archaeology in Rome, I am indebted to a letter sent to the *Times* (January 9, 1901) by the head of the school, Mr. G. Rusforth.

If weight can be attached to a passage of the *Liber Pontificalis,* which has been interpolated into one MS., Honorius repaired the aqueduct, known as the Aqua Trajana (Acqua Paola now), which entered Rome by the Porta S. Pancrazio, bringing water from the Sabatine Lake *(Lago di Bracciano),* some thirty-five miles from Rome. Witigis had, in 537, cut the eleven aqueducts which supplied Rome with water. They must have been repaired in some kind of way, for Gregory the Great's words, when endeavoring to get the care of them placed in proper hands, show they were to some extent in working order. "The aqueducts are so neglected, that if greater care be not bestowed upon them, they will, in a short time, be entirely useless". Likely enough, then, Honorius bestowed the needful care on the Aqua Trajana, only to have his work undone by the Lombard king, Aistulf, in his siege of Rome in 756. He also erected mills close to the wall to be worked by the water of the Trajan aqueduct, and it is certainly interesting to find between the Janiculum and the Tiber flour-mills still being worked by water from the same source.

The scanty remnants of the *Register* of Honorius are extensive enough to furnish further illustration of how temporal sway in Rome was falling into the hands of the popes by the force of circumstances. The care of the corn and water supply of the city is now in their hands. And, like Gregory the Great, Honorius extended his care to the city of Naples. He appointed for it, and all that appertained to it, civil and military authorities, and gave them instructions as to how it was to be ruled.

The case of certain "clerics of Cagliari", if it does not put before us direct exercise of temporal power on the part of the Pope, gives us a further insight into the authority he possessed through the great officials of the empire, in virtue of imperial concessions. Excommunicated and summoned to Rome, these clerics had embarked to obey the papal orders when, writes the Pope to the sub-deacon Sergius, "the perverse president of the Isle of Sardinia" shipped them off to Africa. Though Honorius had already written himself to Gregory, the prefect of the praetorium in Africa, urging him to punish the misconduct of Theodore, he instructed Sergius also to admonish the prefect, to reprimand the president, and to send the clerics to Rome. "We have sent to your experience", continued the Pope to Sergius, "a copy of the constitutions of Theodosius and Valentinian, for you to forward to the prefect. The mere reading of them will show how the emperors have all confirmed the privileges of the Apostolic See, and what privileges have of old been granted to it". Of the issue of these negotiations nothing is known. But taken in conjunction with the Pope's action with regard to Naples, they are enough to justify the epithet, which the inscriptions concerning him repeatedly give him, viz., "the people's ruler or duke"—*dux plebis.*

His *Register* also shows Honorius attending to the "patrimony of St. Peter", letting estates in Rome and its neighborhood. Before passing to more lengthy matters, it may here be noted that he also issued various decrees connected with ritual, *e.g.*, that metropolitans who used the pallium in the public streets or in processions were to be deprived of the right to wear that sacred vestment In this strictness with regard to the use of the pallium, he was but imitating Gregory. He also decreed that every Saturday there should be a procession of all the people chanting sacred canticles from the Church of St. Apollinaris to St. Peter's, from which it was not far distant. And, at the request of St. Bertulf, the second abbot of Bobbio, the famous abbey of St. Columbanus, he freed that monastery from subjection to any other authority but the See of Rome.

In the beginning of his reign, the name of Honorius occurs in the story of the mysterious downfall of the Lombard king Adalwald. During his reign the conversion of the Lombards from Arianism went on steadily. Whether because he was a Catholic, or because, as Paul the Deacon expressly avers, he had lost his reason, this son of the devout Theodelinda was dethroned and the Arian Ariwald put in his place by the Lombard nobles. The so-called *Fredegarius*, really some unknown writer in Gaul, who continued the Frankish history of Gregory of Tours, but in a most barbaric style and inaccurate manner, and who died about 663, relates some extraordinary details about the fall of Adalwald. On his *authority* we have it that about the year 624, the Lombard king came in some most marvelous manner under the influence of Eusebius, an official (exarch?) of the court of Constantinople. For after being anointed in a bath with some unguents, Adalwald is said to have fallen under the control of the will of Eusebius. Under his magnetic (?) influence, the Lombard king began to destroy the chief men of

his kingdom, with the object of afterwards surrendering both it and himself to the empire. However all this may be, it is certain that the Lombards rebelled, and Ariwald (married to his rival's sister) got the upper hand. Perhaps Adalwald then turned to the Pope. At any rate there is extant a letter of Honorius to the exarch Isaac, which is generally assigned to the close of the year 625. The Pope writes that he has been informed that some bishops in the parts beyond the Po had been endeavoring to induce the 'glorious Peter' to be false to Adalwald. Peter scorned their suggestions. "But because it is injurious to God and man that those who ought to dissuade others from traitorous conduct, exhort them to it; when, by the help of God and yours, Adalwald has been restored to his kingdom, do you be good enough to send the aforesaid bishops to Rome, because we cannot suffer such conduct to go unpunished".

Adalwald, however, died soon after this, by poison says *Fredegarius,* and Ariwald became the acknowledged ruler of the Lombards (626).

Treating of the relations of Honorius with bishops across the Po, it will be suitable to speak of those which he had with the bishops, both schismatical and orthodox, of Venetia and Istria. Paulinus, the metropolitan of Aquileia (it is not known when these metropolitans first took the title of *patriarch),* the originator of the *schism of Aquileia,* through fear of the Lombards fled to the islet of Grado, with all the treasures of the Church, about the year 569, and there fixed the See of Aquileia. By the exertions of the popes, helped sometimes by the influence of the emperors, whose ships of war had easy, access to Grado, many of the schismatics were brought back to the unity of the Church. And this in such numbers, that, on the death of the patriarch Severus in 606, the Catholics were able to secure the election of a patriarch *(Candidian),* who was ready to place himself in communion with the See of Rome. The schismatics, on their side, sheltering themselves behind the swords of the Lombards, elected a patriarch (John) for themselves. He fixed his See at Aquileia, the ancient See of the metropolitans of Venetia and Istria, and begged *(c.* 607) Agilulph to see to it that, "after the unhappy Candidian had passed from this life to eternal torments, no other unholy consecration might take place there" *(i.e.,* Grado). "From this time", says Paul the Deacon, "there began to be two patriarchs".

About the time that Honorius became Pope, one Fortunatus, who at heart was a supporter of the *Three Chapters,* was elected patriarch of orthodox Grado. His position, however, soon became too hot for him; and having stripped his church, and several others of the province of Istria, fled (c. 628) with his treasure to Cormons, not far from Aquileia. The Catholic bishops of the plundered provinces at once sent to inform Honorius of the robberies and heresy of Fortunatus. The Pope accordingly chose Primogenius, a regionary subdeacon, to be the new patriarch of Grado, and sent him thither with the pallium, and a letter addressed to all the bishops throughout Venetia and Istria. In his letter (February 18, 628) Honorius renewed the censures he had already issued against Fortunatus for his traitorous conduct, and said that they (the bishops) ought to be thankful that the wolf in sheep's clothing had been cast forth from the fold. They must rejoice that by the ruin of one man the foundations of the faith of all have been restored. He has sent them Primogenius to be consecrated, and to him they must render sincere obedience. His (the Pope's) ambassadors have been sent to the Lombard

king to urge him to have Fortunatus, with what he had carried off, seized, as a traitor to God and man.

Primogenius was duly consecrated, and was still ruling the See of Grado when Theodore I was Pope. "And to this day", writes the anonymous author of the chronicle of the patriarchs of Grado, "has the bishop of Grado received the honor of the pallium from the supreme apostolic See".

From some lines of the epitaph of Honorius it has been conjectured that, at least for a time, he extinguished the schism of Aquileia. The verses tell how Istria, worn out with schism, has at length, at the admonition of Honorius, returned to the faith of the Fathers. The Pope's words, just cited, about the fall of one man being a gain to the faith of all, point to the same conclusion. But the end of the schism was not yet. The success of Honorius can only have been partial.

Scanty as are the records of the age, the energy of the Venerable Bede has saved a few facts from being buried in the darkness that envelops the seventh century. He tells us of the efforts of Honorius to spread the faith in fresh portions of England, and to still more firmly establish it in those parts which had already embraced it.

By this time (about 634) the faith had been preached and was to a considerable extent established in the kingdoms of Kent, Northumbria and East Anglia. The beginning of the conversion of Wessex is thus told by the Venerable Bede. To a certain Birinus is due the bringing of the knowledge of the faith of Christ to the West Saxons. He came to England with the approval of Pope Honorius. But after he had, by the Pope's orders, been ordained bishop, and had undertaken, in the Pope's presence, to sow the seeds of faith in the interior regions of England, where no preacher had ever been before, when he found that the first people he came to had never heard of the faith, he remained among them and died among them, after having firmly planted the faith among them.

In Northumbria the letters of Pope Boniface V and the labors of St. Paulinus had brought forth their fruit in due season, and King Edwin had been baptized at York (627). The people in great numbers had followed the example of their king, to whom in 634 Honorius addressed an eloquent letter, exhorting him "with paternal love to preserve by earnest endeavor and constant prayer the grace to which the divine mercy had deigned to call him, and to constantly occupy himself with reading the works of Gregory, his preacher, in order that his (Gregory's) prayers may cause the king's realm and people to flourish and the king himself to be blameless in the eyes of God". Honorius concludes by telling the king that, in return for his great faith, on account of the distance between them and at his request, he has sent two palliums, one for Honorius and the other for Paulinus; and that on the death of either, the survivor may by his (the Pope's) authority consecrate a successor to the deceased prelate. And in a letter to the newly consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, who was also called Honorius, in which the Pope tells him of the sending of the palliums, he exhorts the archbishop to do his best to increase the faith which the labors of Gregory had sown in the country, and tells him that he sends the palliums and grants the above-mentioned rights of consecration at the request of the archbishop and the king, "by this present rescript, and acting in the place of Blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles".

Later on, at the request of the archbishop, the Pope confirmed the decrees of Pope Boniface V, setting forth that the Church of Canterbury was to be forever the head of the churches of England.

Honorius was solicitous also for our "sister isle", and was instrumental in bringing to a partial settlement the Easter Controversy in Ireland. This question of discipline agitated the Catholic Church, to a greater or less degree, for nearly the first 800 years of its existence. It was not till during the seventh and eighth centuries that this matter was, in these islands, brought to a satisfactory termination. That a mere question of discipline should be so long under discussion, and should cause, as it did, so much trouble, was due first, of course, to the importance of the question, and secondly, to the many, varied, and complicated points that arose in connection with it as time went on. Despite the scoffer, the question was important. Even one of our old Anglo-Saxon kings could feel deeply how unseemly it was—not to say inconvenient and absurd—that while some were still in the fast of Lent, others were in the full joy of Paschal time. As, then, the matter was of moment, and will crop up again, it will be worthwhile to spend a little time in discussing it.

Controversy on the time of celebrating Easter arose in the first instance from a wish on the part of many Christians to dissociate themselves from the Jews in every possible way; and then from astronomical difficulties in connection with fixing the time of Easter and the subsequent obstacles in the way of getting the solution of those difficulties known in distant and semi-barbarous lands.

As the crucifixion and resurrection of Our Lord occurred at the time of the celebration of the feast of the Passover by the Jews, it was, of course, only natural that at first the Jews and Christians were both celebrating their greatest feasts at the same time, viz., on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, *i.e.*, Nisan (our March), the period of the first full moon in the spring. But when the Christians found that they were being confounded with the Jews, they thought it better, as one way of distinguishing themselves from the Jews, to celebrate the feast of the resurrection, not on the fourteenth day of the month, but on the following Sunday. Of course, there are always some people who will let their feelings sway them instead of their reason, and who prefer sentiment to common sense; and so many of the Eastern churches refused to comply with the change. However, the celebration on the Sunday was enforced by the Council of Nice (325 AD), and those who held to the fourteenth day were branded as '*quartodecimans'*. The council also fixed the vernal equinox to the 21st of March; and so Easter Sunday was to be the Sunday after the full moon which occurred on or after the vernal equinox.

The decree of the Council of Nice only settled one set of difficulties. Others soon arose from the ascertained inaccuracy of the old Jewish cycle of eighty-four years which was first used by the Church to calculate the day on which the spring full moon would occur in each year. First one cycle was adopted, then another. It was not till the year 525 that the cycle now in use was finally adopted, *viz.*, the Metonic cycle of nineteen years. After each nineteen years, the new moons begin again to fall on the same days as they did nineteen years before. Even this cycle is not perfectly accurate, but it is practically the most convenient.

In the Seventh century the Irish were still using the old cycle of eighty-four years they had learned from St. Patrick, blissfully ignoring apparently the existence of any other system of calculation. However, from a visit of St. Dogan to England (610), from his there meeting with St. Lawrence and others of the missionaries from Rome, and from a letter which these missionaries sent "to the bishops and abbots of all Ireland" on the subject, the question of the proper method of calculating the time of Easter was looked into. The investigation was stimulated by a letter 3 (630) from Honorius, earnestly begging of the Irish people, comparatively few in numbers as they were, and at the ends of the earth, not to consider themselves wiser than all the churches of Christ throughout the world, but to celebrate Easter at the time laid down by the bishops of the world.

In consequence of this letter a synod was held at Old Leighlin, or Magh Lene (630). In the debate that ensued at the council there was cited the famous *Canon of St. Patrick*: "Moreover, if any case should arise of extreme difficulty, and beyond the knowledge of all the judges of the nations of the Scots, it is to be duly referred to the chair of the archbishop of the Gaedhil, that is to say, of Patrick, and the jurisdiction of this bishop (of Armagh). But if such a case as aforesaid, of a matter at issue, cannot be easily disposed of (by him), with his counselors in that (investigation), we have decreed that it be sent to the apostolic seat, that is to say, to the chair of the apostle Peter, having the authority of the city of Rome. These are the persons who decreed concerning this matter, viz., Auxilius, Patrick, Secundinus and Benignus. But after the death of St. Patrick his disciples carefully wrote out his books". Thus does the canon run in the *Book of Armagh*, the most important of the extant ancient books of Ireland, a book as remarkable for the beauty of its penmanship as for its antiquity of some 1100 years.

To Rome, then, it was decided by the Fathers of Magh Lene that representatives "should go as children to learn the wish of their parent", as the letter of the Abbot Cummian to Abbot Segenius expresses it. Segenius, it may be noted, was the abbot of Iona who sent St. Aidan to preach the faith in Northumbria. Cummian (*d.* 661), known as the Tall, to whose letter just cited we are indebted for most of what we know of the synod of Campus Lene, was bishop and abbot of Clonfert. Related to the chieftains of South Connaught, and equally distinguished for learning and piety, he was the admiration of his countrymen. His master, Colman, who survived him, regarded him as fit to sit in the chair of Peter. The *Four Masters* have preserved a few lines of Colman's elegy on his pupil. In Bishop Healy's translation they read :

"Of Erin's priests, it were not meet
That one should sit in Gregory's seat,
Except that Cummian crossed the sea.
For he Rome's ruler well might be".

The deputies of the synod, on their return (633), pointed out the unanimity with which the Roman calculation as to the time of keeping Easter was observed throughout

the Christian world. From that time, "on the admonition of the bishop of the apostolic See", says Bede, the whole of the South of Ireland fell into harmony with the rest of Christendom on the Paschal question. The North of Ireland, the Picts and the Britons of Cambria, came over to the Roman calculation at different epochs of the eighth century, and so brought the Easter controversy to a close.

SPAIN

The Visigothic kings who succeeded Recared were engaged in finally breaking up the remains of the imperial power in the peninsula, in subduing the Basques, in trying to bring into harmonious working the naturally discordant elements of their kingdom, the Visigoths, the Suevi and the Spaniards. Under Chintila (636-40) were held two councils at Toledo (V and VI), attended by the bishops and nobles of the kingdom, to legislate on its religious and civil concerns. To the bishops assembled in the sixth council (January 638), Honorius dispatched a letter exhorting them to show themselves "more zealous for the faith, and more alert in suppressing the disorders of the perfidious". Whether these words were directed against the Jews it is impossible to say, as only the *argument* of this letter is extant. But decrees of the assembly, to which it was directed, bore heavily on them, thus sharing in the general movement against the Jews which, as we have noted above, was on foot at this time. The twenty-first letter of Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa (from which is gathered the substance of the Pope's letter), addressed in the name of the synod to Honorius, begged him to condemn those who put forth the report that Rome allowed baptized Jews to return to their superstitions.

As this letter of Braulio (ap. Florez, *España Sagrada,* vol. XXX. p. 348) is written in the name of all the bishops of Spain, it is deserving of a full analysis. It opens by stating that the Pope will be fulfilling in the very best way the obligations of "the chair given him by God", when, "with the holy solicitude of all the Churches, and with shining light of doctrine", he provides protection for the Church and punishes "those who divide the Lord's tunic with the sword of the word". The bishops of Spain, at the instigation of Chintila, 'their king' and the Pope's 'most clement son' were going to assemble together, when the Pope's exhortation that they should do so reached the king. They thought, however, that the language used in the papal 'decree' was rather hard upon them, as they indeed had not been altogether inactive in the cause of their duty. They therefore thought it right to let the Pope see what they had accomplished—sending him the decrees of their synods—that 'his eminent apostleship' might judge for himself. This they did "with the veneration which they owed to the apostolic See".

They know, indeed, that no "deceit of the serpent can make any impression on the Rock of Peter, resting as it does on the stability of Jesus Christ", and hence they are sure that that cannot be true which false and silly rumors have set going, viz., that "by the decrees of the venerable Roman prelate, it has been permitted to baptized Jews to return to the superstitions of their religion".

In conclusion Braulio begs the prayers of the Pope.

It was most likely by the bearers of this letter, and of the acts of the council, that Chintila forwarded to Rome a covering or decoration (*pallium*) for the altar of St. Peter, on which was worked an inscription setting forth that King Chintila offered this gift to St. Peter, the first of the apostles, the chief of all Christ's disciples, and begged his assistance.

Fragmentary as is the character of this section on Honorius and Spain, it is still useful as showing the paramount position of the Pope in matters religious in that country.

So far, we have seen Honorius successful in all his undertakings, and in his dealings with others. And from what has been said already of his life, it may fairly be inferred that Honorius was an active-minded, businesslike man; and that, like a true Roman, he always looked at the practical side of things. If this estimate of his character is correct, it will serve to throw light on what has now to be treated of at some length, viz., his correspondence with Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, and his connection with the Monothelite heresy. If Honorius was over-reached by Sergius, it was because, being honest, practical, and straightforward, he thought that the wily Greek was approaching him in the same spirit. It never entered into the thoughts of Honorius that what seemed to be a plain letter asking for guidance was a trap to inveigle him, at least, into ambiguous language, on the question of the one or two wills in Our Lord. If Sergius is here spoken of as *wily*, it is because, though it is taken for granted, that at first, at least, he did not see the Monophysite bearings of the formula, 'one energy', or 'principle of work', and though, no doubt, at first he really imagined that the formula would properly serve to reconcile the Monophysites to the Church, it is difficult to believe that he continued to act straightforwardly and honestly in his advocacy of his ideas.

The Monothelite or 'one-will' heresy was but another phase of the Monophysite or 'one-nature' heresy which infected so many of the Easterns. Of course, if there was but one nature, and that divine, in Our Lord, *after* the union of the two natures of God and man had been effected, it follows that there would have been but one will in that one nature, and that a divine will. That is to say, the doctrine of *Monothelism* or 'one will' would have been true. But considering there were two natures in Our Lord *after* the hypostatic union (that is to say, considering that the union of the two complete natures of God and man in Our Lord did not destroy or absorb the nature of man in Him), there were, therefore, really two, what one might call physically distinct wills in Our Lord. Or, in the strict sense of the words, 'Duothelism', or 'two wills', was, and of course is, the proper term to express the truth relative to the number of wills in Our Lord. As, however, the two wills in Our Lord could not be at variance, there was practically, in action resulting from the application of will, but one will in Our Lord. Hence, were there question of *divergent* wills, one would say there was but one will in Our Lord; and, on the contrary, were there question of physically distinct wills, one must say that there were two wills in Our Lord. It is easy to see, therefore, that as, *in a sense* both expressions, 'one will' and 'two wills', are correct, a designing, or well-meaning, but illogical, individual, under cover of the ambiguity that arises from that fact, might insinuate false doctrine to an unsuspecting person. And so it will be seen that Sergius, putting forth in his letter to Pope Honorius the idea of divergent wills, taught

his Monothelite doctrine; whereas Pope Honorius, in his reply, though he seemed to indulge in Monothelite language, making use of the terms that Sergius had done, really taught the true doctrine of two wills, as is plain from his constantly insisting on the fact of the two *complete* natures in Our Lord, and their independent, though ever harmonious action.

To throw further light on the letter of the Pope, I will cite two apposite passages from Father Luke Rivington's *Dependence*: "Further, there is in Our Lord's human nature what is sometimes called the will of the reason, and the will of the senses, but between the two there is not, and there cannot be, contrariety. In the Agony the will of the senses expressed itself, but was incapable of disobedience, for it was not wounded by the fall, and it was the will of the Eternal Word. There was no triumph of the one over the other, for there was no rebellion, no faintest wish that it might be otherwise. In a word, the operation of the human will (with its two departments) is distinct from the operation of the divine in the selfsame Person of the Word; but, whilst distinct, incapable of contrariety ... Honorius discountenanced the expression *two energies*, which he applied to contrariant wills in Our Lord's human nature, whilst really Sergius and his followers were using it of the separate natures of Our Blessed Lord—in which sense it was a vital truth".

With the view of reconciling the Monophysites, Sergius, before the year 622, impregnated the Emperor Heraclius with his heterodox views, pointing out to him that, by simply insisting on 'one will' and 'one ruling energy or operation' , in Our Lord, he would probably be able to bring over the Monophysites, who, for that concession, would agree to acknowledge the two natures. To ensure the success of his schemes, he managed to get Athanasius, the Jacobite, who had adopted his compromise, made patriarch of Antioch (629) and Cyrus, another of his partisans, translated from the See of Phasis to that of Alexandria (630). On the basis of 'one theandric operation', Cyrus brought over a sect of Monophysites to the Church (633). Sergius would now have had all his own way, had it not been for the opposition of a monk Sophronius, who became patriarch of Jerusalem in 633 or 634. Before, however, Sergius had received any *official* information of Sophronius' election, he wrote to Pope Honorius a very artful letter, in which he begins by praising in an exaggerated way the labors of Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, by whom the people of Alexandria, and almost all Egypt, Libya, etc., had been brought into the one fold of Jesus Christ, on the basis of certain articles, among which was one on the 'one operation' of Our Lord. He then goes on to set forth how a certain holy monk Sophronius stepped in to spoil what had been accomplished by objecting to the article on the 'one operation', saying that there were 'two operations'. Even when he (Cyrus) had pointed out that, since the fathers had used the phrase 'one operation', it was not advisable, especially under the circumstances, to call it in question, even then Sophronius would not withdraw his opposition.

And, continued Sergius, when Cyrus in consequence wrote to him (Sergius), he thought it hard that the phrase 'one operation' should be removed from the articles of reconciliation, after so happy a union had been brought about. Accordingly he (Sergius) wrote to Sophronius asking to give the *very* words of any of the great Fathers using the *exact phrase* 'two operations'. When, as Sergius goes on to say, Sophronius could not do this, he (Sergius) wrote to Cyrus and pointed out to him that it would be better to

drop both phrases, as heresies had generally sprung from such-like disputes, and simply confess that Our Lord Jesus Christ wrought works both human and divine. Because some, he pretended, would think that the phrase 'one operation' had been introduced to attack the hypostatical union of the two natures in Christ; and the phrase 'two operations', as not used by the *'fathers'* would scandalize many. For the phrase would imply two *contrary* wills in Our Lord. And in the one person there cannot be two contrary wills on the same subjects.

At the request of the emperor, he had extracted and sent to him (Heraclius) the testimonies of the Fathers on the 'one operation' which Mennas had sent to Pope Vigilius. It is in accordance with the wish of the emperor that he (Sergius) is sending the account of this affair to Honorius, and in conclusion he (Sergius) begs the Pope by his charity and the grace given him by God, to amend what may be imperfect in his letter, and to write to him what seemed best to him (Honorius) on these matters.

This most diplomatic and apparently open letter was written in 634, after Sophronius had become patriarch of Jerusalem, but before either Sergius or Honorius had received the official synodical letter of Sophronius informing them of the fact. Honorius replied (634) at some length to Sergius by a letter in which, after approving of Sergius' wish to preserve silence in connection with a new phrase which might scandalize the simple, he emphasizes the great defined truth of there being two complete natures in Our Lord; and adds that Our Lord "wrought" divine acts through the *mediation of His humanity,* which was united hypostatically to the Word of God, and that the union took place "while the differences of the two natures marvelously remained unchanged". With much more to the same effect, he infers that the will of Our Lord Jesus Christ was but *one,* because He took, when "He was made flesh", a human nature that was *perfect,* one created before the *existence of sin.* He thinks it the more necessary to point that out, because in Scripture "flesh" often means "corruption". Whereas, of course, Our Saviour did not assume a corrupt nature, a nature that was at war with "the law of the mind" (Rom. VII, 23). For in Our Saviour there was "no other law in His members" or a will that was at war with Him. With regard to such expressions in the New Testament as "not My will but Thine be done", (St. Mark XIV. 36; St John VI. 38), they are not indications of a will at variance with the divine, but they are recorded to teach us by His example to follow the will of God rather than our own. The Pope thinks it not right to bring under the defined teaching of the Church either phrase, viz., either one or two energies, as these phrases have not been sanctioned by the Church in any way. And, therefore, although the Scripture teaches plainly that Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, "is one and the same person, performing *completely* both divine and human acts"; whether "on account of the *operations* of the divinity and the humanity we ought to speak of one or two operations", is to be left to grammarians to decide.

Again and again, before the close of his letter, and in a variety of different phrases, does the Pope insist on the Catholic doctrine of the One Person and the two complete natures, acting perfectly according to those natures.

There is extant also a fragment of a second letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius, written, perhaps, after the Pope had received the synodical letter of Sophronius

informing him of his election. This letter is to the same effect as the first; and writers, who cannot be suspected of partiality, allow that it is practically orthodox.

During the lifetime of Honorius his letters to Sergius were never made public by that patriarch, and the 'one-will' controversy seems to have slumbered. Sergius must evidently have regarded Honorius not as a supporter of his heretical views, but as one who would prove a most uncompromising and formidable opponent should he discover them. But on the death of Honorius and during the vacancy of the Holy See—to give an outline here of the Monothelite affair which will be filled in under the lives of the succeeding pontiffs—Sergius induced Heraclius to publish under his imperial authority a document which he had himself composed, and which is known as the 'Ecthesis'. This document, while enjoining silence as to the use of the terms 'one or two energies', asserts 'one will' in Our Lord, as usual, under cover of the pretext of avoiding two contrary wills in Him.

Sergius died soon after the publication of the 'Ecthesis', viz., in the month of December 638. His successor, Pyrrhus, continued to spread the Monothelite heresy. But John IV, having (641) condemned the 'Ecthesis', Heraclius, before his death (February 11, 641), renounced his own edict. After the short reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas, Constans II, an unworthy prince, at the wish of Paul, the heretical successor of Pyrrhus, issued as his own (648) an instrument drawn up by Paul, which went by the name of the 'Type'. This edict forbade mention to be made of either one or two wills or operations in Christ. In a synod in 649, Pope Martin I condemned this 'Type', an action that cost him his life. The Sixth General Council (680) practically extinguished this heresy, though we meet with a slight revival of it under the Emperor Philippicus, who reigned from 711-713. It is instructive to note that while the emperors were dogmatizing, they were losing their empire to the Saracens. Jerusalem was taken by the latter in 637, and Alexandria in 641. Africa was lost to the empire in 698, and the last flare-up of Monothelism (711-713) revealed the loss of Spain, as well of that part which remained to the empire as of that which was in the hands of the Visigoths, to the Mohammedan Moors.

Before leaving Honorius, a critical remark or two on his letters to Sergius, in their theological aspect, may be pardoned on account of the general interest taken in them. Theology is not the province of an historian, certainly, but these letters, especially the first of them, have been so much quoted in connection with certain Catholic teachings, that they can hardly be spoken of without a reference to their theological side. They are said by some to be a clear refutation of the doctrine of papal infallibility. This they could only be if, heretical in themselves, they were *ex cathedra* utterances; or if they were condemned as heretical *ex cathedra* pronouncements, by some authority that Catholics acknowledge to be infallible, viz., by a Pope, acting as head of the Church and teaching the Church, or by a general council. Now neither of these propositions can be established with reference to the letters of Honorius. Of the two letters of Honorius to Sergius, it must be noted that there are only extant Greek translations. The originals are lost. Further, as the second letter is acknowledged to be 'practically orthodox' by even Protestant historians, it is not to the point in the present discussion.

If the first letter be read together with the letter of Sergius, it will be clear to the careful and impartial reader, from the analysis of those letters given above, not only that Honorius *thought* correctly on the subject of the two wills, but that, taken with the context, there is not a single *heretical* sentence in his letter. There is indeed a sentence in his letter which is not wise—the sentence in which he doubts whether the new terms 'one or two operations' are useful or desirable. Subsequent adoption of the term 'two operations' showed its usefulness. And there is a sentence in his letter which, at first sight, seems heterodox, viz., where he agrees with Sergius that there is only 'one will in Our Lord'. But the very reason that he gives for his statement shows that he was referring to the *resultant* will of Our Lord, *i.e.*, to the will of Our Lord when reduced to action, and not to the number of wills in the second person of the Blessed Trinity after His incarnation. He says that Our Lord had one will, viz., one will in agreement with the divine will, because He assumed a *perfect* human nature, not one in which the 'law of the flesh' warred against "the law of the spirit" (Romans VII. 25). The Pope did not regard the question as one affecting the *completeness* of *the two natures* in Christ, but merely as one of words. He thought that neither phrase 'one or two energies' was desirable, inasmuch as St. Paul (1 Cor. XII. 6) used the phrase '*diversities* of operations', or '*energies'*. For the Greek translator of the Pope's letter uses *energeia*, as the *equivalent* of the Pope's '*operationum'*. This would seem to point to the fact that Honorius considered the two 'energies' or 'principles of action' of Sergius as simply equivalent to two resulting 'acts', or rather 'classes of acts'. This double use of the word *operation* might well lead the Pope to refer to grammarians the exact force of the word *energeia*—the more so that he was probably laboring under the same difficulty as St. Gregory I complained about, viz., a want of men able to translate the letters of the Greeks into Latin.

What should really be *final*, as to whether Honorius was really a Monothelite or not, should be the declaration of the man who wrote the letter for Pope Honorius. Such a statement is fortunately extant. The great champion of orthodoxy, the abbot Maximus, in a famous disputation which he had with Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, in the year 645, triumphantly asked his opponent, who had brought forward Honorius as teaching one will in our Lord, "Who is the more worthy interpreter of the Pope's letter, the one who wrote it in the Pope's name, and who is still alive, and has illuminated the whole West with his learning, or those at Constantinople who say what they wish?" Pyrrhus replied, "Certainly the one who composed the letter". "Then", retorted Maximus, "the same man, again writing in the name of a Pope (John IV), and to the Emperor Constantine, says, speaking of this same letter: When we spoke of one will in Our Lord, we were speaking of His human will only, as is plain from our arguing that there could not be contrary wills in Our Lord —viz., of the flesh and of the spirit" This answer silenced Pyrrhus on that point, which, from his ready dropping of it, he cannot have thought strong. In another place St. Maximus speaks indignantly of the impudence of Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, in daring to cite the great, the divine Honorius, the apostolic See itself, as a partisan of his heresy. In a letter to the priest Marinus, he declares definitely that Honorius, when he spoke of *one will*, did not deny the duality of wills in the two natures of Our Lord. He proceeds to show from the Pope's words that he was only arguing against the idea that there could be two *opposing* wills in the person of Christ. Towards the close of this letter, St. Maximus says that he is sure he

has taken the right view of the letter of Honorius from what he has been told by the abbot Anastasius, who has just returned from Rome. Anastasius told him, avers the saint, that when in Rome he asked the chief ecclesiastics of that great church, and the abbot John, who had drawn up the letter, why the phrase *one will* had been inserted. The Romans, continued the Greek abbot to St. Maximus, were very much put out at the meaning which had been given to the phrase, and declared that *numerical unity* of will in Our Lord had never been intended to be expressed, nor had there been any intention of conveying the idea that the human will of Our Savior had been annihilated. There had only been a wish to show that there was no *depraved will* in Our Lord as there is in us.

Hence, in conclusion, the saint expresses his unbounded astonishment at the deceitful tactics of the heretics, who, by interpreting his words as they chose, claimed as their supporter one who did not side with them in the least.

Finally, in the document known as the apology for Pope Honorius, which was addressed by the abbot John himself, in the name of Pope John IV, to the Emperor Constantine, the last-named pontiff asserts positively that his predecessor only objected to the idea that there were two wills (that is, of course, what is spoken of as a good and a bad will) in Our Lord as man. Hence, were the letter of Honorius, taken by itself, much more difficult to explain in an orthodox sense than it is, the evidence of the abbot John, and the other contemporary Roman ecclesiastics to whom the abbot Anastasius addressed himself, would compel its being understood in a sense adverse to Monothelism.

But even if the letter be allowed to be heterodox on the subject of the *one will*, and if it be allowed to be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement, it would not even then militate against the Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. For on the matter of the controversy Honorius formulated no decision. On the question of ‘one or two wills’, all that he really insisted on was *silence* on the part of those already engaged in disputing on the subject brought before him. Whatever that subject was, and whatever the Pope may have thought or written upon it, all he wanted was, *not* to instruct the Catholic world upon it, but to avoid (as he hoped) worse trouble, and that the Catholic world should not be stirred up on the matter, through the disputes which he wished his letter to end.

A word must here be said, in anticipation, about the action of the Sixth General Council (680) in condemning not only Monothelism but also Honorius, the heretic. It has indeed been contended that, the Council may not have anathematized Honorius in the same sense as it did Pyrrhus and Sergius. For it must be observed that the word *heretic* did not always denote one who “knowingly and willingly” taught error. It sometimes, as Bolgeni has conclusively shown, was applied to such as favored error in any way. And it would certainly seem, from the edict which Constantine issued at the close of the council regarding the observance of its decrees, that when the council included Honorius in its anathemas, it only did so in the sense of his having favored the spread of Monothelism by his letters to Sergius. The edict speaks of Honorius as “a confirmer of the heresy and as one who was not consistent with himself”.

It cannot, however, be denied that it is more natural to assume that all those condemned by the council were all condemned in the same sense. But is not this

admission fatal to the doctrine of papal infallibility? Does it not suppose that an authority (a general council), acknowledged by Catholics as infallible, declared that Honorius did teach heresy? In reply to this contention it must be borne in mind that it is Catholic doctrine that the decrees of any council only obtain force in so far as they are confirmed by the sovereign pontiff. And Leo II, in confirming the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, placed a limitation to their decrees (Sep.-Dec. 682). He anathematized Honorius certainly, but not for teaching error, but simply because "he permitted the immaculate faith to be stained", as the Greek original phrases it. And so, as one (Form. 84) of the formulas of the *Liber Diurnus* shows us, after the sixth general council the Popes in their profession of faith were wont to condemn Sergius, etc., "and Honorius, who gave encouragement to their heresy".

There is no need to go into what later popes or councils have said about Honorius. Their words are on the same lines as those respectively of the sixth council and of Pope Leo. For in the twentieth century one may say—with far greater reason than Anastasius, the librarian, in the ninth—that paper rather than matter would fail in an attempt to collect all that has been said in defence of Honorius.

With whatever degree of guilt he incurred from his action with regard to his letter to Sergius, Honorius went to meet his Maker in October 638. He was buried as usual in St. Peter's. By the non-Catholic Gregorovius he is regarded as "a pious and highly educated man, ... who distinguished himself in Rome by the building of churches, securing for his memory a place by the side of Damasus and Symmachus, and furthering the transformation of the ancient city".

SEVERINUS.

A.D. 640.

After the death of Honorius the chair of St Peter was vacant for one year and seven months. The cause of the delay, as we shall see presently, was a refusal on the part of the Byzantine authorities to confirm the election of Severinus, because he would not sign the '*Ecthesis'*.

The election of Severinus, a Roman and the son of Abienus, was proceeded with after the prescribed three days had elapsed from the death of Honorius, and the usual request for its confirmation duly made at once. But in place of the imperial act of assent to his consecration, Severinus received an act of faith to sign.

As an answer to the orthodox synodical letter of Sophronius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Sergius of Constantinople, had drawn up the *Ecthesis,* or exposition of faith, and on learning of the death of Honorius, he induced the emperor to issue this document as an imperial edict for all to accept (December 638). It was forthwith sent to the exarch Isaac, by the *magister militum,* Eustachius, to see that it obtained the Pope's adhesion. With its express declaration of *one will* in Our Lord, Severinus refused to sign it.

Isaac, therefore, determined to try the effect of a little violence. Perhaps without the knowledge of the emperor, he commissioned his *chartularius* (a high, military officer), Maurice, to plunder the Lateran palace. Forming a party in the first instance, Maurice then set himself to rouse the greedy passions of the soldiery of the 'exercitus Romanus'—now a local force and already in possession of considerable influence in the city. "What is the use", he asked, "of so much treasure hoarded up in the Lateran palace by Pope Honorius, when you get nothing of it, not even the donatives which have been sent you by the emperor? The *holy* man, through whom they were to have reached you, piled them up instead of distributing them to you". These words, of course, had their effect. A mob, and Rome especially has never lacked an idle, worthless crowd ever ready for sedition and plunder, rushed to the palace. Severinus was, however, prepared for them. They could not force an entrance. As the lion's skin failed, Maurice tried the fox's. This succeeded better. And after three days he managed to gain admission into the palace with the *judges,* whom he had won over to his side. They then sealed up the treasures which "Christian Emperors, Patricians and Consuls, for their souls' redemption, had left to Blessed Peter the apostle, to be given in alms at certain seasons, or for the redemption of captives". Word was then sent to the exarch that he might come and help himself. Isaac therefore at once came, exiled the principal clergy "that there might be none to oppose him", and for eight days plundered the Lateran palace. Part of the booty was sent to the emperor at Constantinople.

Meanwhile, at Constantinople, the papal envoys had been striving to obtain the confirmation of Severinus.

They were, however, plainly told that they would have come so far to no purpose unless they would promise to persuade the Pope elect to subscribe the *Ecthesis.* That the 'Queen mother' of all the churches might not have to remain widowed, the legates answered with great circumspection. They had come, they urged, not to make professions of faith, but to transact business. However, they were quite willing to put the document before the Pope, and, if he thought well of it, they would ask him to sign it. They deprecated violence, pointing out that in matters of faith no one can be forced, and that by violence even the weak are oft made firm. How much more, they asked, will this be the case with the clergy of the See of Rome, which, as the eldest born of all the churches, excels all. She has obtained from the apostles, and from councils and princes, that in matters of faith she be not subject to anyone, but that by ecclesiastical law all be subject to her.

True ministers were they, continues St. Maximus, of that firm and immovable rock, the apostolic Church. Their opponents admired their fidelity, and the legates returned to Rome with their request granted. What cannot prudence combined with firmness effect! Disarmed by prudence, opposition is then overcome by firmness. Severinus was at length consecrated (May 28, 640), and Isaac wisely withdrew to Ravenna.

During the short time that he was Pope, Severinus condemned the *Ecthesis.* He decreed, probably in synod, that as "there were two natures in Christ, so there were two natural operations".

As he was an old man when he was elected, we need not be astonished to read that Severinus was buried as early as August 2, 640, in St. Peter's, the mosaics in the apse of which he had renewed. Beautiful is the character given to this Pope in the *Liber Pontificalis.* Besides being described as a lover and benefactor of the clergy, he is set down as "holy, kind to all men, a lover of the poor, generous, and the mildest of men".

This account of Severinus may well be brought to a close by a quotation from the striking work of Mr. Allies—*Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood*: "Had Pope Severinus at this minute failed in his duty, the whole Church would have been involved in the Monothelite heresy. Not only Pope Severinus, but his successors during forty years, were the sole stay of the Church against a heresy—the last root of the condemned Eutychian heresy—which overthrew the true doctrine of the Incarnation, making our Lord Jesus Christ not God and Man in one Person, but a person compounded out of God and Man, and, therefore, not man at all" .

JOHN IV.

A.D. 640-642.

EMPERORS.

Heraclius, 610-641. Constantine III, 641. Heracleonas (alone for a short time, and then with Constantine (IV), generally known as Constans II), CONSTANS II (alone), 642-668.

KING.

ROTHARI, 636-652

EXARCH.

ISAAC, 625-644.

To succeed Severinus, there was elected one John, a Dalmatian, the son of Venantius, a *scholasticus* or advocate. He was consecrated December 24, 640, apparently. When he was elected he was archdeacon of the Roman Church.

With regard to the consecration of John IV, it is a matter of fact that, with the exception of that of Honorius I, it took place at a shorter interval after his election than that of any pope after Pelagius II (7th February 590). The same thing is true, as a rule, of the consecration of the popes who followed John IV. Some historians have therefore concluded—and I believe correctly—that from this time forth, either with or without the express approval of the emperor, the exarchs took upon themselves the principal share in confirming the papal elections.

The argument drawn from the diminution of the interval between election and consecration from the time of Pope John IV onwards, is supported by the further fact that of the six formulas which, treating of the election of the popes, come all together in the *Liber Diurnus* (58-63), five of them are directed to Ravenna. And that these formulas belong to this period seems more than probable from intrinsic evidence. From the regular mention in them of the three days' interval ordered by Boniface III, it is plain they were drawn up after the decree of that pontiff. In them is also regular mention of the *exercitus Romanus*, spoken of for the first time in the biography of Pope Severinus.

That on the other hand they belonged to a period before 684 would seem clear from this, that they are dispatched in the name "of the archpriest, the archdeacon and the primicerius of the notaries, holding the place of the apostolic See"; whereas in 684 St. Benedict II governed the holy See, in the interval between his election and consecration, as pope-elect. Finally, though at this time those elected to fill the chair of Peter were generally simple deacons, it appears from his letter to the Irish that John IV was the

archdeacon. And, strange to say, the formulas just cited from the *Liber Diurnus* record that an *archdeacon* has been unanimously elected. Possibly, then, the documents drawn up in connection with the election of John I may have served as formulas for the election negotiations of succeeding popes.

But as besides the five formulas sent to Ravenna, a sixth was still sent to Constantinople, I am disposed to believe that the emperor never wholly resigned his right to confirm the papal elections into the hands of his exarch. Constantine Pogonatus resumed the imperial right of confirmation claimed by the Byzantine emperors, only to give it up once and for all under Benedict II. For when the biographer of Conon says that after his election "messengers were sent to the exarch, as the custom (now) is" it may be that they were simply sent to inform the exarch as to who had been chosen. *It may be* for the subjoined note will show that the opinions of the learned on this whole subject are so conflicting that it is not safe to dogmatize on it.

NOTE

625. Honorius I, confirmed by exarch and not directly by emperor.

640. John IV, the first Pope confirmed by the exarch.

642. Theodore I, *possibly* first confirmed by exarch, according to Hodgkin, with Diehl.

682. Leo II again confirmed by the emperor, through the negotiations of Agatho with Constantine Pogonatus.

684. Under Benedict II, Constantine Pogonatus gives up right of confirmation.

685. Hence Rozière, etc., hold that John V was consecrated under the new act of liberty, granted by Constantine. Hodgkin, Diehl, and Duchesne, however, regard John V as the first Pope confirmed by the exarch. But it is scarcely likely that the popes would strive for confirmation by the exarch.

686. Conon and his successors again confirmed by the exarch—so Sickel.

741. Zachary elected immediately on death of Gregory III, and hence not confirmed by exarch.

751. End of exarchate. Hence 751-817 the election and consecration of the popes wholly though Pippin, Charlemagne and Louis naturally informed (by formula 82) of the election.

817. New agreement between Paschal I and Louis the Pious on the subject of the confirmation of elections.

Now that the ground has been cleared a little, the mode of electing the popes at this period may be briefly touched upon. The method was pretty well one and the same for many centuries, the same in the third as in the ninth century. Speaking of the election of Pope St. Cornelius (251), St. Cyprian says: "Cornelius was made bishop by the will of God and His Christ, by the almost unanimous consent of the clergy, by the

suffrage of the people then present, and by the college of old bishops and good men". In the third century, therefore, the papal elections, begun with prayer, were brought to a termination by the cooperation of both clergy and laity. The share of the laity was limited to an expression of wishes and to bearing witness to the qualifications or disqualifications of the candidates, as the case might be. The real power of choice, however, lay with the votes of the Roman clergy, as the decrees of the council of Rome, held under Pope Symmachus in 499, abundantly demonstrate.

In the seventh century also the election proceedings began with prayer, which, after the decree of Boniface III, lasted for three days after the death of the pope to whom a successor was to be chosen. Then there gathered together the clergy of all degrees, "the most eminent consuls and the glorious dukes", the citizens and the flourishing Roman army; and by the majority of the votes of the clergy, amidst the applause of the laity, a successor to St. Peter—at this period generally a deacon of the Roman Church—was elected. The assembly was held in the Lateran basilica.

In the earlier ages of the Church the consecration of the pope-elect was proceeded with at once. But from the time of the Gothic kings, or perhaps more strictly from the time of the establishment of the Byzantine *regime* in Rome under Justinian, to that of Constantine Pogonatus, the consecration had to be delayed until the election had been confirmed by the temporal power. This assumption on the part of the Gothic kings of Italy and the Eastern emperors was a great abuse, and, as might be expected, opened the door to great evils. It furnished another ladder by which the ambitious might hope to reach the chair of Peter; and it led to disastrously long vacancies of the Holy See and to the emperor exacting a sum of money from the pope-elect before he would confirm the election. In the course of eighty years, from the death of Gregory I to the accession of Benedict II (684-5) there were *interpontifical* intervals amounting to at least 3600 days, or about 10 years in 80. The emperors, too, used sometimes their assumed right of confirmation to endeavor to force the pope-elect to do their will. If there is one thing that the history of Christian Europe has shown clearly it is this, that where the State interferes to any considerable extent in the freedom of episcopal elections, fatal is the result first to that liberty which the Church needs to fulfill its glorious destiny, and then to the religious good of the people. For the State will always look out for men who will be its creatures, rather than for men who will be most fit to work for the spiritual needs of the people. Further fatal is the result to the State itself. It cannot be expected that State-elected bishops will have the requisite independence of spirit to raise a strong note of warning when the State is entering on dangerous courses, and the subjects of the State, not being properly kept in hand by those who should have most influence over them for good, will become, especially in times of difficulty, unruly, and cause the downfall of that State which thought to strengthen itself by getting all power, spiritual as well as temporal, into its hands.

To return to the Pope whom we have just seen elected in the seventh century. The election over, documents, setting forth the particulars of it, were drawn up and signed. The *decree* sent to the exarch was signed by the archpriest and by a *consul.* Generally drawn up in the name of the archpriest, the archdeacon and the primicerius of the notaries, "keeping the place of the apostolic See", they were sent to their various destinations in charge of a bishop, a priest, a regionary notary and sub-deacon,

certain *worthy burghers,* and, as representing the army, *a most eminent consul* and several *magnificent tribunes.*

One notice (formula 58) was sent to the emperor, their "most pious lord", who was asked to give an imperial order *(jussio),* for the consecration of the papal candidate, who had been elected on account of his worth. But, as it has already been said, the greatest attention was at this period paid to the exarch. Word was at once sent to him, after God their one hope, of the death of a Pope; and then a very full account of the election of his successor (formula 60). The document is addressed "to the most excellent and distinguished exarch of Italy" by "the priests, deacons and all the clergy of the papal Curia, the nobility, the army and the people of Rome, as suppliants". The exarch, as happily taking the place of the emperor, is earnestly asked to consent as soon as possible to the consecration of the pope-elect, on account of the great amount of business which awaits the attention of the "supreme authority"; and on account of the "ferocity of their neighboring enemies", which, owing to the reverence they have for the prince of the apostles, can only be softened by the words of his vicar. The document concludes as our petitions to parliament do today: And your petitioners will ever humbly pray, etc. Three other election notices (form. 61-3), were at the same time sent to the Archbishop of Ravenna, the civil authorities *(judices),* and the papal apocrisiarius there. All are exhorted to promote the cause of the pope-elect to the best of their ability.

When the needful act of confirmation had been brought to Rome and the day of the consecration of the pope-elect had arrived, another formula (57) of the *Liber Diurnus* lets us know that, accompanied by seven acolytes, he proceeded from the Lateran, where the consecration used to take place in pre-Byzantine times, to the *confession* of St. Peter; and thence, after the litany, to the episcopal chair with the bishops and priests. Then the bishop of Albano recited the first prayer and the bishop of Porto the second. The book of the Gospels was then produced and held by deacons over the head of the pope-elect. Then the bishop of Ostia consecrated him bishop. After the pallium had been presented to him by the archdeacon, the new Pope gave the kiss of peace to all the priests and entoned the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*. Thus was the Pope, like any other bishop, consecrated by three bishops and, even as far back as the seventh century, by the bishops of Albano, Porto and Ostia. Pagi has called attention to the fact that so strictly did the right of consecrating the Pope belong to the bishop of Ostia, that if he were elected Pope himself, or could not be present at the consecration, then the archpriest of Ostia took his place. Of course if the pope-elect were not a bishop, the archpriest could only give the blessing which was given to a bishop who might have been elected Pope.

When John IV became Pope, he did not forget his native Dalmatia, which, indeed, at this period stood in considerable need of his attention. We have seen how dread of the advances of the Slavs in Istria was one of the troubles of Gregory the Great. Their progress did not stop with his death. During the reign of Heraclius, Croats and Serbs extended their ravages into Dalmatia. To relieve the misery caused by these barbarians, the Pope sent the abbot Martin, with large sums of money, to redeem the captives they had taken in both Dalmatia and Istria. The abbot was also instructed to procure the relics of martyrs. And the *Book of the Popes* further informs us that John built and adorned an oratory, in connection with the basilica of St. John Lateran, to receive the relics "of the

blessed martyrs Venantius, Anastasius, Maurus and many others" which he received from his native land. This chapel still stands, and in it one of John's mosaics is still preserved. To the left of the Blessed Virgin stands John himself, with a model of his oratory in his hand, offering it to St. Venantius, who is also depicted in this rude, though most interesting, production. Among the other figures (twenty-four in all) of this striking picture—so useful for the study of ecclesiastical vestments—are those of SS. Maurus, Anastasius, Domnion, Septimus, and Asterius, as well as those of four soldier saints, Paulinianus, Telius, Antiochianus, and Gaianus. These names have been selected because excavations, begun in our own time (in the year 1874), in the cemetery of Manastirene, situated to the north of the ancient Salona, have brought to light various inscriptions bearing the names of Domnion and the last five of the martyrs' names just mentioned. The inscriptions show where the martyrs' bodies reposed before they were brought to Rome. The *Liber Pontificalis* notes that some of the relics came from Istria, and among the martyrs' names mentioned by it occours the name of Maurus. Explorations in the city of Parenzo in Istria have brought to light an inscription of St. Maurus. The stones of Rome and Dalmatia lend their strong voices to support the assertions of the *Book of the Popes.*

It seems to be the generally received opinion that John also Commissioned some of his envoys to preach the faith of Christ to the heathen Slavs. The emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who wrote about the year 950, says that Porga, prince of the Croats, sent to Heraclius for Christian teachers, and that, referred by the latter to Rome, the Croatian monarch obtained from the Pope (John) a bishop and priests, who baptized his people. The Pope took the newly-baptized people under his special protection, and would have them renounce their custom of indiscriminately invading and plundering their neighbors' territories, and be content with defending what was theirs. It must be borne in mind with regard to this account that the imperial writer does not specify to which member of the reigning house of Heraclius Porga was sent. It may have been to Heraclius Constans II; to Heraclius Constantine Pogonatus; or, as I think most likely, to Justinian II, the last ruler of the house of Heraclius, as well as to the emperor who is known simply as Heraclius, *viz.*, Heraclius I. In any case it was not till the close of the ninth century that we find Croatian bishops.

Whilst still pope-elect John shared in the government of the Church—as we shall see from fragments of a letter Roman which have been preserved by Venerable Bede—not as pope-elect, but because he was archdeacon of the Roman Church. For, as already noticed, during a vacancy of the Holy See or during the absence of the Pope, the Church was governed, from the sixth century, by the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius of the notaries. If one of these three were elected Pope, then a fourth was added, as the letter just referred to show. Pagi and others think that this arrangement lasted till the time of Benedict II; that from his time the power of the *triumvirate* ceased with the election of the Pope, who then, as pope-elect, governed the Church by himself; and that their power, thus curtailed, finally devolved upon the College of Cardinals, when in 1059 Nicholas II gave to the cardinals alone the right of electing the popes.

By the action of Pope Honorius, the south of Ireland had been brought into harmony with the rest of the Church Catholic in the matter of the time of celebrating Easter.

But the Church in the north of Ireland, and in the parts taken possession of by it, as the Isle of Iona, was still unsettled in this respect. Accordingly some of the principal ecclesiastics in those parts, in their endeavors to bring the Paschal controversy to an end, wrote to Pope Severinus. Their letter, now lost, reached Rome after the death of Severinus, and before John had been consecrated. This much we learn from the fragments of the answer of the heads of the Roman Church. Their reply begins : "To the most holy and well-beloved Thomian (Archbishop of Armagh), Columban, Croman, Dinnan (Bishop of Connor), and Baithan (of Clonmacnoise), bishops; Croman (abbot of Roscrea), Ernian, Laistran, Scellan, and Seghen (abbot of Iona), priests; Saran, and the other *Scottish* doctors and abbots—Hilary, archpriest, in place of the Holy and Apostolic See, John the Deacon, the elect of God, John the primicerius, in place of the Holy and Apostolic See, and John, servant of God and *consiliarius* (assessor) of the same Apostolic See". The writers begin by observing that the death of Pope Severinus has been the cause why hitherto no answer has been sent to the questions asked by the Scots. However, that such important matters as they have written about might not remain unattended to, the pope-elect and his coadjutors point out to them the mistakes they are making in their Easter calculations; and, in conclusion, exhort them to be on their guard against the Pelagian heresy, which was said to be reviving among them.

This letter, though written "with great authority and learning", did not apparently produce the desired effect. However, Adamnan, who was sixteen years old when this letter was penned, and who afterwards became abbot of Iona, brought the people of the north of Ireland back into Catholic unity on this vexed Easter question in the early years of the eighth century. The monks of Iona embraced the same blessed unity a few years later (716).

John was no sooner consecrated (December 24, 640) than he found it necessary to take measures against Monothelism. He had received a letter from the patriarch of Constantinople (Pyrrhus) in which the doctrine of the one-will was again plainly asserted. A synod was at once assembled in Rome. Monothelism and the *Ecthesis* were condemned, and Pyrrhus at once informed of what had been done. Thereupon the Emperor Heraclius made haste to disown the *Ecthesis.* It was not his. It was the work of Sergius.

On the death of Heraclius soon after (February 11, 641), he was succeeded by his sons, Constantine III and Heracleonas. To this Constantine, John addressed the long letter, generally known as his apology for Pope Honorius. He assured the emperor that the whole West was scandalised by the attempt that Pyrrhus was making to give credit to the new heresy by connecting with it the authority of Honorius; he denied that his predecessor had any thought of giving countenance to the one-will doctrine, and he begged the emperor that the *Ecthesis,* which bishops had been compelled to sign, might be withdrawn.

Before Constantine III, who was orthodox in faith, as we are informed by Zonoras (a late authority indeed, but in this respect undoubtedly accurate), had time to move in the matter, he was carried off by death, possibly poisoned by his stepmother (May 25, 641). Then for a time Heracleonas and Constantine, the son of Constantine III, and

generally known as *Constans II,* reigned together. But some time in 642, before September, the young Constans became sole ruler of the empire.

Although Constans II afterwards became an ardent supporter of the Monothelite heresy, he began his reign by so far complying with the wishes of the Pope as to burn the *Ecthesis,* as he himself notified in a letter to Pope John.

Other details in connection with this communication between Constans II and John IV, which we have from Eutychius who was not born till the days of Charles the Bald, may not be so authentic. When, according to the patriarch of Alexandria, Constans had perused the letter of that "distinguished man", viz., the Pope, he was profoundly impressed by the intellect therein displayed, and ordered a reply to be sent to Rome in which he accepted the doctrine of the two natures, two wills and operations of Our Lord, and of His one personality. He also intimated that he had committed to the flames the document which threw discredit on Pope Leo I, and the Council of Chalcedon; and averred: "We firmly maintain your teaching which is the truth". When the papal messenger Sericus returned to Rome, he found that John IV was dead, and that Theodore, an excellent man, was Pope in his stead. The new Pope at once wrote to congratulate Constans on using his power to propagate the orthodox faith, thereby differing from Heraclius, who, for deserting the truth, was unworthy of the name of emperor. Eutychius concludes his narrative of these events by telling us that Constans was deeply moved by the news of John's death.

Whatever of truth there is in these details, it may be safely inferred that John IV never read the letter addressed to him by Constans. For he was buried on October 12, 642—as usual in St. Peter's.

A decree *(Visis literis)* of a Pope John is attributed to this Pope, in which the decision was given that churches which had been entrusted to monks should be served by priests instituted by the monks themselves. Because this decree was addressed to one Isaac, Bishop of Syracuse, and because no such name figures in the list we have of the bishops of Syracuse, the editors of the second edition of Jaffé's *Regesta* are in doubt as to which Pope John to assign this decree. However, the list of the bishops of Syracuse, about the year 640, can scarcely be said to be so well known as to exclude the possibility of there having been a bishop Isaac in that year.

THEODORE I.

A.D. 642-649.

EMPERORS.

CONSTANTINE III, 25 MAY 641. CONSTANS II (CONSTANTINE IV), SOLE RULER FROM BEFORE SEPT. 642-668.

KING.

ROTHARI, 636-642.

EXARCHS.

ISAAC, 625-644. THEODORE CALLIOPAS, 644-6. PLATO, 646-9.

AFTER a short vacancy of the Holy See, Theodore, a Greek and native of Jerusalem, and son of a bishop Theodore, was consecrated November 24, 642. Pagi conjectures that the exarch confirmed the election so promptly because Theodore was a Greek. At any rate, he confirmed the election of a good man—a man who was "a lover of the poor, generous, kind to all, and very merciful". Heir of John's faith as well as of his See, his pontificate was one long struggle with Monothelism. In fact there is hardly an action of his known which was not connected with that heresy.

About a year before Theodore became Pope, there had been a change of patriarchs at Constantinople. Pyrrhus was said to have been concerned in the death of Constantine III, and had fled or had been expelled from the city (October 641), as obnoxious to the party in power on political but apparently not for dogmatical reasons. In the same month, as though the See were vacant, Paul was elected patriarch—a man who, as it afterwards transpired, was as little orthodox as Pyrrhus.

As soon as he ascended the throne of the Fisherman, Theodore wrote to the Emperor Constans II, inasmuch as God had been pleased to entrust to him (the Pope) in Church affairs "the management of matters which touch your Piety". While congratulating him on nominating orthodox bishops to the various Sees, he blames him for not taking *canonical* proceedings against Pyrrhus to deprive him of his dignity. He exhorts him to abolish the *Ecthesis* and to try and reclaim Pyrrhus and his followers, who have seduced the more unwary among the bishops to embrace the *Ecthesis* and thereby put themselves in opposition with the "common consent of the bishops who profess the true faith and sincere devotion to the Apostolic See". He is astonished that the emperor has not already issued a decree against the heresy. And while he would

bespeak the imperial favor for the bishops who have consecrated Paul, he would have had them anathematize Pyrrhus, and is not pleased that so far from speaking of him as deposed, they even call him a religious man. For if Pyrrhus was not deserving of anathema, then why was he driven from his See? If it be answered, from hatred, he would point out that the ill-will of men must not be suffered to override the rights of the clergy. In turn, if a bishop be justly deposed by the proper authority, no other power can reinstate him. With all this, it is not his intention to support the consecration and appointment of Paul for fear of some fraud. For he has some ground to fear that Paul has caused dissensions among those subject to his jurisdiction, and has even endeavored to stir up feeling against him (the Pope). But in us "there is none of that cockle which the enemy hath sown among men".

The Pope was evidently suspicious of the good faith, if not of the orthodoxy, of both the emperor and his new patriarch. That he was not satisfied with the way in which Paul had been elected he also showed by refusing to recognize him as patriarch until certain conditions had been complied with. In his synodical letter, indeed, to the Pope, Paul had so written as to lead Theodore to suppose he was orthodox at least. Here we cannot but note how frequently it happens with heretics that they use all their talents in trying to conceal their doctrines under a show of orthodox language. With all their professed regard for truth, a regard which they put forward as the reason which forces them away from communion with the Catholic Church, they at times do their very best to hide what they profess as truth, a proceeding the sincerity of which can scarcely be granted.

In his reply, then, to Paul's synodical epistle, Theodore rejoices that it shows that Paul has drawn the clear waters of his faith from the fountains of the Savior, but wonders how it is that Paul has not yet caused to be taken down the *Ecthesis* of Pyrrhus which is opposed to his (the Pope's) apostolic faith, and which his predecessor (John IV) and the emperor had alike condemned. It cannot be that Paul receives the *Ecthesis,* or he would have told him (the Pope) so in his synodical letter. The Pope also wonders why the bishops who consecrated Paul alluded to Pyrrhus as *most holy*, and is astonished that they aver that he had renounced the See of Constantinople on account of his unpopularity. "Thrown into doubt by this assertion, we have decided not to receive your synodical letter *(i.e.,* not to acknowledge you as patriarch) for a time, until Pyrrhus be deprived of his See. Tumult and unpopularity cannot deprive a man of his episcopal rank. A canonical sentence ought to have been passed on him that your consecration might be unassailable. It is written : A woman if her husband be dead is freed from the law of her husband. Therefore whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man (Rom. VII. 2, 3). They two shall be in one flesh. This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church (Ephes. V. 31, 32). Unworthy though I be, I fill His place in the Church. Accordingly as Pyrrhus still lives, and has not been convicted of a canonical fault, precautions must be taken against a schism. A council must be held against him. We have instructed Sericus, the archdeacon, and Martin, the deacon and apocrisiarius, who are to take our place in this matter, to inquire into the fault of Pyrrhus along with you". The Pope adds that, in the event of Paul's anticipating any trouble from the partisans of Pyrrhus, an order may be obtained from the emperor, in accordance with earnest representations that he (the

Pope) has made the emperor, that Pyrrhus may be sent to Rome to be tried by a council there.

To the bishops who had ordained Paul, the Pope also wrote. While rejoicing in his (Paul's) ordination, *i.e.,* in his being made a bishop, he exhorts them to see to the canonical deposition of Pyrrhus, so that Paul's right to be bishop of *Constantinople* may not be called in question. He also sent to the imperial city a declaration of faith condemning Pyrrhus and the *Ecthesis.*

The letter of the emperor to the Pope, discovered by Cardinal Mai, shows that the council he insisted on was duly held; but on the subject of the condemnation Pyrrhus not a word is said. There was evidently no sincerity in either emperor or patriarch. The substance of the emperor's letter to Theodore, which is as respectful as possible, is as follows: Acknowledging the receipt of the Pope's letter, which he regards as worthy of him on account of its declarations concerning the faith, Constans praises him for desiring that no novelty should be introduced into the Church, He has drunk of the pure waters by which the Pope has quenched the thirst of his soul. Not to fall into the mistakes of his predecessors (whom the enemy of souls had seduced from the faith erected on that rock against which the gates of hell will never prevail), he caused the Pope's letter to be "read in this large assembly in the presence of Paul, patriarch of this our God-protected Constantinople". To it all expressed their adhesion. "Your brother Paul has sent your Paternity—in the customary manner among bishops—an encyclical in conformity with what you had laid down". "Throughout the whole of our empire we have ourselves decreed" that no novelties be introduced into the Church beyond what had been taught by the apostles and by councils, and "beyond what your Paternity, Holy Father, has written". And if anything against the true faith has been done by the authority of any emperor in former times or "a short time before the death of the pious Constantine of happy memory—this we abolish". His wish is for the pacific increase of the Church and "perseverance in the doctrine of your Paternity".

Whether or not this specious letter satisfied Theodore, and whether or not the *encyclical* of Paul (which is lost) induced him to accept the situation, we do not know. But he could not, of course, be kept long in ignorance of the Monothelite views of Paul. His apocrisiarii may have sent him information of the real belief of the Byzantine patriarch. At any rate it is certain that a letter came (643) to him from Sergius, the metropolitan of Cyprus, apprising him of it. This document is headed, "To our most holy and most blessed Lord, the father of fathers and universal Pope Theodore, Sergius the lowly, health in the Lord".

The letter opens with a very strong expression of the pre-eminent position of the Holy See in the Church, and begs that the clouds of ignorance may be driven away by the light of its wisdom. It goes on to say that up to the present they, the metropolitan and his suffragans in Cyprus, have kept quiet about the heretical doings in the imperial city, but now, relying on the protection of the Pope, they cannot and will not do so any more, as the 'cockle' seed of error is being sowed over all the world.

There also appeared at Rome about this time Stephen of Dora, whose story also served to shed a flood of light on the doings of Paul. In connection with this bishop there occurred perhaps the most dramatic incident in the whole of the Monothelite

controversy. From a document presented by Stephen himself to the Lateran Council (649), we learn that when St. Sophronius, the first distinguished opponent of the 'one-will' heresy in the East, found that neither by word nor writing could he prevail against that error, he took Stephen, the first of his suffragans, to Mount Calvary, and there adjured him, by the account he would have to give to Him who died thereon, not to be found wanting to His faith. "And as I cannot go myself on account of the invasion of the Saracens, do you, as quickly as possible, go from the ends of the earth to the limits thereof, until you come to the Apostolic See, where are the foundations of orthodox teaching. Cease not to unfold to the holy men there what is being taught here, and cease not begging till they condemn the new errors". Deeply impressed with this solemn scene, and with the exhortations of the Catholic bishops and people of the East, Stephen thrice managed, despite the efforts of the heretics to prevent him, to reach Rome. He first came to Rome in the time of Pope Honorius, then in that of Pope Theodore, and lastly in that of Pope Martin. He came to tell Theodore how Sergius of Joppa seized the patriarchal chair of Jerusalem after the death of St. Sophronius, and how those whom Sergius had ordained, feeling the insecurity of their position, endeavored to maintain it, by giving their adhesion to the heresy, supported by Paul of Constantinople. The Pope thereupon nominated Stephen his legate in Palestine, and gave him power to depose those who had been nominated by Sergius, unless they expressed their sorrow in writing, and promised also in writing to observe the teachings of the fathers and the councils. Stephen executed the Pope's commission, and returned to Rome in the pontificate of Pope Martin, and presented to him the acts of submission of such as repented of their conduct.

Meanwhile, before Theodore acted on the information thus received, there took place (645) in Africa the famous dispute between the abbot St. Maximus and the patriarch Pyrrhus, who had finally betaken himself to Africa after his flight from Constantinople. The result of the discussion was that Pyrrhus acknowledged himself worsted by St. Maximus, who was in this controversy another Athanasius, and expressed a wish "to visit the Pope and give him a statement regarding his error". Pyrrhus, accordingly, in company with St Maximus, went to Rome, and, "before all the clergy and people, made a profession of faith, in which he condemned all that he or his predecessors had done or written against our immaculate faith" (645). The Pope treated Pyrrhus with the greatest kindness and respect, and allowed him an income for his proper maintenance whilst in Rome.

However, when he left Rome and came under Monothelite's influence at Ravenna, Pyrrhus, as Anastasius notes, "returned like a dog to the vomit", and again 647-648 professed the *one-will*. The Pope, naturally indignant, convened a synod in St. Peter's, and excommunicated and deposed the relapsed heretic. Theophanes, in his Chronicle, tells us that Pope Theodore, "standing by the tomb of St. Peter, the Corypheus of the Apostles, ordered a chalice to be brought to him; and, taking thence a drop of Christ's vivifying blood, mingled it with the ink, and then with his own hand wrote out the sentence of excommunication and deposition against Pyrrhus and his associates". By many this sensational story is doubted, and for the reason that it rests *altogether* on the evidence of Theophanes, who was not born till over a hundred years after the events we are narrating, and who is "extremely ill-informed as to

transactions in Western Europe". Under the circumstances the doubt is certainly justifiable.

Meanwhile the famous 'dispute' had roused the Catholics of Africa, and one council after another, in Numidia, Byzacena, Mauritania, and Carthage, condemned Monothelism, and sent letters to the emperor, praying him to put an end to the scandal caused by the new errors; to the patriarch Paul and to the Pope. These letters are to be found quoted among the acts of the Lateran synod under Pope Martin. In the name of their three synods the three primates of Numidia, Byzacena and Mauritania sent a synodal letter to Theodore, ''the bishop of bishops. No one, they say, is ignorant that your apostolic throne has in an especial manner been chosen to examine the sacred dogmas of the Church, and that the earliest canons have decided that nothing, no matter in however remote provinces, be looked into or received without being brought to the notice of the apostolic throne, in order that it may be confirmed by its authority, and that the other Churches may draw the truth from it as from a fountain and the faith remain incorrupt. Hence, with regard to the doctrinal difficulties that have sprung up at Constantinople, they have up to the present preserved silence, expecting they would be cleared away by the apostolic See. However, as the evil is increasing, they have written to Paul to exhort him to reject the *Ecthesis*, and they beg the Pope to forward their letter by his apocrisiarii. "If", they add in conclusion, "Paul will not return to the orthodox faith, let the authority of your apostolic See cut him off from the body of the Church, that it may become purer when its rotten member has been amputated".

This letter was supported by another from Victor, Bishop of Carthage, quite to the same effect in every point.

Urged by these numerous representations, the Pope wrote to Paul and begged him by his apocrisiarii also to return to orthodoxy. In vain. Paul replied, with great affectation of humility, that having no wish to give 'tit for tat', he has hitherto kept silence, but that now the time has come for him to do as the apocrisiarii wish him, viz., to explain his views on the One Will of Our Lord and to send them to the Pope. Under the pretence of following the Fathers in general, and Sergius and Pope Honorius in particular, he professes most absolutely that there is only One Will in the one person Jesus Christ.

Having thus, as the Lateran Council (649) observed, approved the *Ecthesis*in writing, Paul caused the Emperor Constans to issue the 'Type'. By this decree he meant to strike a blow at the Church none the less severe because indirect. The 'Type' ordered the *Ecthesis* to be taken down, and forbade anyone in future to speak of either one or two wills or operations in Our Lord. Of course this edict was not attended to by the Catholics. They saw perfectly well that it either meant to support 'indifferentism' on an important matter, or to render it impossible to speak of Our Lord's human nature otherwise than as a mere *block* like the gods of old, which, as the Psalmist mocks, had eyes and saw not, ears and heard not. "We are witnessing a deliberate attempt by successive patriarchs of Constantinople", writes Mr. Allies, in the seventh volume of his *Formation of Christendom*, p. 67, "to alter the faith of the Church as it had been laid down at the Council of Chalcedon. And not this only, but to make the mouth of their emperor the instrument for disseminating their heresy, and to use the whole material

power of that emperor to overthrow the defence of that faith by the Roman See, the superior authority of which, at the same time, neither emperor nor patriarch denied. This attempt continues during forty years from the death of Pope Honorius in 638, and ... it was the purely spiritual power of the successor of St. Peter ... which preserved the life of the Church, and foiled the Byzantine oppressor, together with the underplay of the Byzantine patriarch".

The 'Type' was promptly condemned by the whole West, and, as Pagi remarks, like its predecessor the *Exthesis*, it did not please even the Monothelites. When this last act of Paul was brought before the notice of the Pope, he felt that he could delay no longer, and declared Paul deposed from the patriarchal See.

Although the protection of the emperor freed Paul from any fear of actually losing his See, he was so enraged at the sentence passed against him by the Pope, that, in defiance of the law of nations, that holds the persons of ambassadors sacred, he sacked the private chapel that was reserved for the use of the Pope's apocrisiarii, and heaped all kinds of indignities upon them, and began to persecute them and others by imprisonment, exile and the scourge. To these penalties those rendered themselves liable, by the very terms of the 'Type', who refused submission to its dictates.

Theodore did not live to see the lengths to which the Monothelites were prepared to go in trying to propagate their errors. He died in the month of May 649, and was buried in St. Peter's. In the twelfth century Peter Mallius was able to read his epitaph, but he only transcribed the beginning of it.

The pontificate of Theodore is remarkable for this, that in it we have the first recorded instance of a translation of the bodies of the saints into the interior of Rome. The author of his biography tells us that the bodies of SS. Primus and Felicianus were translated from a catacomb on the Via Nomentana and placed in the basilica of St. Stephen, the protomartyr— the circular basilica on the Coelian. The chapel of these martyrs in this basilica still contains the mosaic work with which it was adorned by Theodore. But the inscription has gone.

ST. MARTIN I.

A.D. 649-654.

EMPEROR.

CONSTANS, 642-668.

KINGS.

ROTHARI, 636-652. ARIPERT I, 653-661.

EXARCHS.

OLYMPIUS, 649-652. THEODORE CALLIOPAS (SECOND TIME), 653-664.

IT is with strong feelings of mingled joy and sorrow that the historian takes in hand to write the life of Pope Martin I. Of joy, because he has to tell of the career of a man in all respects most elevated and edifying; of a Pope who "must be pronounced one of the noblest figures in the long line of Roman Pontiffs". Of sorrow because the reflection is once more borne in upon him that such is the perversity of man that his only reward for the very best of his fellows is death.

And when we see Pope Martin dragged from Rome to Constantinople by the order of Constans, are we not forcibly reminded that the popes from St. Peter in the first century to Pius VII in the nineteenth have often in their own persons fulfilled that prophecy of Our Lord's addressed to His apostles and to Christians in general: "Ye shall be brought before kings and governors for My name's sake?"

There is something appropriate in the eminently courageous Martin, having been born in 'warlike' Todi, in the province of Tuscany. According to Theodoric, he was of noble birth, a great student, of commanding intelligence and of surpassing learning. If his external appearance was admirable, his virtue was more so. And if Rome was remarkable for the strength of its walls, it was still more distinguished for the exceptional uprightness of its prelates. Martin was a new Sylvester, and in him God prepared "no unworthy dispenser of the bread of the Gospel". The same author goes on to tell us of Martin's charity to the poor, of his regular donations of corn, of his humility, and of his looking up to other bishops as his superiors "though he was the head of all of them". Whether or not Theodoric had grounds for any or all these statements, it is certain that, like so many other popes of this century, he had been apocrisiarius at Constantinople, and was one of those whom Pope Theodore sent to arrange for the canonical deposition of the patriarch Pyrrhus. The fact that Martin had been nuncio at Constantinople cannot fail to deepen our impressions of his courage. For when he allowed himself to be dragged to the Imperial City rather than sign the 'Type',

his previous stay at the capital of the empire must have let him know what sort of men he would have to deal with.

Before two months had elapsed from the death of Theodore, Martin was consecrated (July 5, 649 and that, too, without waiting for the required confirmation. Common prudence would dictate that no confirmation of the Sunday, election should be awaited from the hands of rulers who were deeply infected with heresy; and, that the dictates of prudence were followed, Muratori justly regards as established from the accusation of the Greeks that Martin possessed himself of the papal dignity covertly, irregularly and unlawfully.

As Constans had now fairly taken up the cudgels in behalf of Monothelism, and had commenced to use violence against the orthodox party, the Pope was called upon from all sides to condemn the 'one-will' heresy, and to excommunicate the patriarch Paul. Accordingly, encouraged no doubt by St. Maximus who was still in Rome, he summoned a council; and a hundred and five bishops assembled in the Church of St. John Lateran's, or, as it was then called, the Church of Our Saviour. The 'fathers' held their sittings in the sacristy of the church, and hence their meetings came to be known as 'secretarii'. The first sitting was held on October 5, 649, in presence of the Pope himself, who presided in person at all the five regular meetings of the synod. The council first listened to accusations of heresy against Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul. Then various extracts from their writings were produced, which the Pope showed to be opposed to the teaching of the Church, and full of absurdities and contradictions. In the fourth session the 'Type' was read. With regard to that edict the fathers observed : "Doubtless it is of great advantage to have no dispute on the faith, but the good is not to be rejected with the bad, the doctrine of the lathers with that of heretics. Such conduct rather fosters than extinguishes disputes. Ceasing to defend the faith is no way to put down heresy. We have indeed to avoid evil and do good, but not to reject both. We may praise indeed the good intention of the 'Type', but its terms we must reject. For they are altogether opposed to the spirit of the Catholic Church, which imposes silence indeed on error, but does not command truth and its opposite to be together asserted or denied!". In the fifth and last session, after various extracts from the 'fathers' had been read which established Catholic tradition on the two wills in Our Lord, the doctrine of the Church on the two natural wills and operations in Jesus Christ was unfolded in twenty canons. These canons, subscribed by the Pope and the bishops of the council, were at once sent to different Churches of the East and West, with a long synodal letter, in which all were exhorted to reject novelties, not to recognize "types or laws, or definitions or expositions" against the faith, and not to fear those who can only kill the body; and in which all were told that anathema had been called down upon the heretics and their wicked doctrines, and on those who defended the 'Type' or *Ecthesis.*

Martin lost no time in doing all he could to let the world at large know what had been decided at the council. In the month following that in which the council had been held, the Pope wrote (November 649) to the Emperor Constans, informing him of the holding of the council, sending him its acts with a Greek translation, and exhorting him by his laws to condemn the heresy that had been branded by the synod; truthfully

reminding him that the 'Republic' (as the empire was still delusively called) flourished in accordance with the condition of the orthodox faith.

The church of Africa is praised for its faith, when the acts of the council are sent to it; and when St. Amand, Bishop of Maestricht, received the decrees of the synod, he is asked to urge Sigebert II of Austrasia to send bishops to take a copy of those decrees to the emperor.

Realizing the importance of making head against Monothelism in its home, viz., the East, and the difficulties there would be in opposing it on account of the support it was receiving from those in "high places", Martin made Bishop John of Philadelphia his vicar in the East, because, as he tells him, he had had a very good account of him from Stephen of Dora and others. "We exhort your charity to fill our place in the East in all ecclesiastical affairs, and therefore to stir up the grace of God that is in you by the imposition of the sacerdotal dignity, and by the taking of our apostolic place... Boldly ordain bishops, priests and deacons throughout the whole patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch. This we order you to do by our apostolical authority, which has been given to us by Our Lord through St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles". After reminding the bishop that power had been given him to use rather in building up than in pulling down, and hence telling him to restore the penitent to the rank from which their heresy had caused them to be deposed, the Pope sends him the acts of the council to be everywhere promulgated.

This commission the Pope supported by letters to various bishops, abbots, nobles and cities in the East, begging them not to cease opposing the heretics, and to obey his vicar, John of Philadelphia, And because Paul, Bishop of Thessalonica, so far from recalling previous heretical letters he had sent to the Pope, which by his legates he had promised to do, not only remained in his heresy, but even corrupted the Pope's apocrisiarii, and wrote fresh heretical letters to the Holy See, Martin declared him excommunicated and deposed until such time as he should abjure his errors.

Seeing the energy with which Pope Martin was combating his heretical views, Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, suggested to the emperor that the time had come to use a little violence to bring the Pope to accept their doctrine. Accordingly Constans II sent a new exarch into Italy, Olympius, his chamberlain, with orders to compel all, bishops and laity alike, to subscribe to the 'Type'; and if the army in Rome could be depended upon, to seize Martin himself and make him do likewise; but that if the troops were not to be relied on, the exarch was not to take any steps till he could get together a large trustworthy force both at Ravenna and Rome, so that the emperor's orders could be executed with all possible speed. Olympius arrived in Rome, either whilst the council was actually going on, or at least while the Fathers of the council were still in the city. The exarch at first tried diplomacy, and endeavored "for a very long time" to foment a schism. In this attempt he completely failed. And as he apparently dared not try open violence, we find him determining to try perfidy and assassination. He seems to have expressed a pretended wish to become perfectly reconciled with the Pope, and induced him to promise to give him (the exarch) Holy Communion at the Church of St. Mary Major. Olympius then ordered his spatharius, sword bearer or armourer, to kill the Pope when he gave him (the exarch) Communion. But when the time for carrying out the

execrable order arrived, the armourer could not see the Pope, as he afterwards declared on oath to many persons. There seems no reason to believe that the armourer was miraculously deprived of his eye-sight altogether; but it would appear that, by the mercy of God, he was in some way hindered from seeing the Pontiff at the time when it was agreed he should kill him. Martin's enthusiastic Gallic biographer thinks it was not at all wonderful that he was protected, "seeing that, inasmuch as he was saying Mass, he was, like holy Simeon, carrying in his arms the Lamb of God who sits on God's right hand".

This episode made Olympius believe that Martin was under the special protection of heaven. He therefore became really reconciled to him, told him all he had been ordered to do against him, and then gathering the troops together, set out for Sicily to repel an invasion of the Saracens. He died there of some disease along with a great part of the army (653). The attempt to assassinate the Pope we may, with Muratori, refer to the year 652,

When Constans heard of this collapse of his schemes, his indignation may be easily imagined. To rectify it he resolved to send a new exarch to Rome who would not be troubled with the God-fearing ideas of Olympius. And so, on June 15, 653, Theodore Calliopas entered the Eternal City with orders to bring Pope Martin to Constantinople. When the approach of the exarch became known, the Pope and most of the clergy withdrew to the Lateran basilica. Some of the clergy were, however, sent by the Pope to greet the exarch, who told them he would come and "adore" *(i.e.* salute) the Pope the next day (Sunday). But when Sunday came the exarch, in fear of the numbers of people that flocked to the Lateran basilica, again put off his visit, saying he was fatigued, and again said he would come next day. On Monday morning early the exarch sent soldiers to say that he could not come to the Pope as there were arms and munitions of war stored up in the basilica. Of course when, at Martin's desire, the soldiers searched the place, they found nothing. About midday the exarch entered the church with a company of soldiers and found the Pope, who had been ill with gout for some months, on a bed in front of the altar with a large body of the clergy about him. To strike terror into the Pope, the soldiers initiated a scene of wild confusion, clashing their armour, extinguishing the candles, overturning the candelabra, and threatening the clergy with their drawn swords. After this display of violence, the clergy were informed by Calliopas that Martin had obtained the Papacy irregularly, and was unworthy of it, that another would have to be chosen in his stead and he himself sent to Constantinople. On this some of the clergy cried out that the Pope should not consent to go. But, as he himself says, fearing bloodshed, Martin simply asked that those of the clergy whom he wished might go with him.

"Those who themselves desire to go, may", replied the exarch; "I am not going to force any one".

When Martin thereupon exclaimed, "The clergy are dependent on me", some of the priests cried out, "With the Pope we live, and with him we die".

However, at the request of the exarch, the Pope went with him into the Lateran palace.

When he left the Church the clergy cried out: "Anathema to the man who says or thinks that Martin has changed or will change a title of the faith".

To this Calliopas: “Other faith than that held by Pope Martin there is none, and such is my own faith”. This, adds the Pope, he only said to soothe the feelings of the bystanders.

On the Tuesday great numbers both of the clergy and laity began hastily to make preparations to accompany the Pope, and there was great loading of lighters all day on Tuesday. This did not suit the exarch, and so on Tuesday night the Pope, with only a few pages to accompany him, and without being allowed to take any necessaries along with him, was hurried on board a boat, and conveyed to Portus, thence at once to Misenum. The city gates were kept barred, so that none could get to the Pope before he had been dispatched from Portus. Then followed for the poor Pope a cruel journey by sea for a year and three months, during the whole of which time he was suffering from gout, sea-sickness and dysentery. He was only allowed to land at one of the many islands at which the ship touched, viz., at Naxos, and only then could he get a bath. At the different places at which the ship, which was the Pope’s prison, cast anchor, the people came to bring Martin what they thought he would need. But the soldiers seized their presents and maltreated the people themselves, telling them that whoever loved Martin were enemies of the Republic. From Abydos his guards sent forward to announce the coming of the captive Pope, and to proclaim him to all a heretic and a rebel.

When the ship reached Byzantium (September 17, 654) the Pope was left on his bed on deck all day, “a spectacle to men and angels”—to be insulted by anyone, as the narrator of these events, who was walking about indignant on the shore at the time they were being perpetrated, informs us. In the evening, however, the Pope was conveyed to a prison, orders were given that the knowledge of where he was confined was to be kept secret, and he was left there for ninety-three days. Whilst in this prison the same vile treatment was meted out to the suffering Pontiff as he had received on board ship. Touchingly he writes : “For forty-seven days no water, whether hot or cold, has been given me with which to wash myself, and with the dysentery, which up to the present has never left me either on the ship or on land, I have gone quite cold. And in this hour of my dire trouble, I have nothing in my wretchedness to strengthen my broken frame, for my nature sickens at what I am given to eat. But I trust in the power of God, who sees everything, that when I am dead He will bring home their doings to those who persecute me, that so at least they may be led to repent and be converted”.

At length he was brought before the imperial treasurer. So weak was he that to make him stand two soldiers had to support him. Not to bring into prominence the real cause of the barbarous treatment he was receiving, viz., his refusal to sign the ‘Type’, the Pope was wildly charged with all kinds of political offences—with having been in league with the exarch Olympius against the emperor, with having been in treasonable communication with the Saracens, and most absurdly of all, with a want of proper faith with regard to the Mother of God. The witnesses made such a bungle of their work, contradicting themselves and one another, that the Pope could not forbear to ask with a smile: “Are these men your witnesses?” He further begged that for the sake of their souls they might not be required to give their testimony on oath. “Let them say what they want to say, and do you do what you wish to do without any oaths”. When in his defence Martin began to speak about the ‘Type’ being sent to Rome, he was not allowed

to continue, but was told there was no question of faith, but of treason! Seeing all the justice he was likely to get, Martin begged, as the greatest favor that could be granted him, that they would pass their death sentence upon him with as little delay as possible. Then in accordance with the express will of the emperor, the Pope was carried forth into an open space in front of the judgment hall, and in view of the emperor and in presence of an immense number of people, stripped of his cloak and handed over to the prefect, who was ordered to tear him in pieces. When the bystanders were ordered to anathematize him, only some twenty people raised their voices against him. The rest, "who knew there was a God in Heaven Who saw what was being done", withdrew in sorrow and with downcast looks. The executioners, however, stripped the Pope of his pallium and most of his garments, so that he was half naked, loaded him with chains, and dragged him through the city with a drawn sword in front of him, amidst the groans and tears of the greater part of the people. Finally, after leaving him for an hour in a prison with murderers, they cast him into the prison of Diomede, all bleeding and more dead than alive. In this place the Pope was confined eighty-five days. During this term, Paul, the Monothelite patriarch, died. When Constans told the dying patriarch what the Pope was being made to suffer, Paul groaned, and turning to the wall said: "Woe is me! This will greatly add to the dangers of my judgment before God". At the intercession of Paul, but to the great sorrow of the Pope, the emperor consented to spare his life. Pyrrhus, despite the objections raised against him by some, on account of his recantation of Monothelism before Pope Theodore, again became the recognized patriarch of Constantinople.

At length (March 24) word was brought to the Pope that he was to be sent into exile in two days. Most affecting is the description which the writer of the account of Pope Martin's sufferings at Constantinople has left us, of the parting between the Pope and those who were in the prison. After the Pope had said Mass and all had communicated, he called on one, who was especially dear to him, to give him the kiss of peace. At this, he who was thus called upon could not restrain his tears and sobs, and all present burst into loud lamentations. The Pope alone remained tearless, and bade them "Weep not. What I now suffer is a gain to me". "Our tears", it was said in reply, "are not that Our Lord has been good enough to make you suffer all this for His sake, but for our own loss".

After another long sea voyage, the Pope reached his place of exile, Cherson in the Tauric Chersonese, the May 15, 655, modern village of Eupatoria in the Crimea. According to Héfelé, in the rock grottoes of Inkerman, on the Black Sea, there is still shown the cavern where he lived. Here fresh troubles awaited the Pontiff, long since weary of life. He had to face a continual dearth of the barest necessaries of existence. "Bread", he writes, "is talked of but never seen". He has to write to a friend in Constantinople to ask him to see that provisions are sent out to him, so that he may be able to live. For at Eupatoria provisions could only be got from ships that came at rare intervals for salt. So rarely did they come, that the Pope, as he says himself, up to the month of September was only once able to purchase corn; and he had to pay at the high rate of one solidus for four bushels. The heathen and barbarous inhabitants also gave the unfortunate Pope much to suffer. In the midst of his sufferings Martin could not but feel keenly, and could not refrain from expressing his astonishment, that no help came to

him from Rome. Still he forgot not the Romans in his prayers. He begged of God that they might remain firm in the faith, and especially did he pray for the one who was ruling over them. Utterly worn out by his sufferings, Martin died in his place of exile, September 6, 655. He was buried in a church Our Lady called "Blachernae", about a furlong from the city of Cherson.

We are told that during his exile Pope Martin restored his sight to a blind man. The brothers Theodosius and Theodorus, monks, who wrote about the year 668, and had been to Cherson to venerate the remains of Pope Martin, were informed by a companion of the Pope's exile, of the many miracles wrought at his tomb, and were given, among other relics of the saint, one of his shoes, which it is interesting to learn were of a peculiar kind, only worn by the bishop of Rome. Furthermore, both Gregory and the papal biographer assert that up to their time miracles were still being wrought at St, Martin's tomb. From this evidence, therefore, it can scarcely be denied that miracles were not uncommonly wrought at the tomb of St. Martin,

There is a tradition that at least the greater part of the relics of St. Martin were brought to Rome and deposited in the Church of SS. Sylvester and Martin of Tours. Both by Greeks and Latins is Pope Martin I honoured as a saint—by the Latins on November 12, by the Greeks in the middle of April. The ninety-sixth formula of the *Liber Diurnus* shows that when it was drawn up, prayers were already being addressed to Martin as to a saint. For, as the author of the account of St. Martin's sufferings quaintly notes, "He was indeed a 'Type' to be imitated by all who have made up their minds to live well and to strive for the highest truth". With such admirable proportion, with such perfect coloring and shading does the figure of Pope Martin, with all his heroic, yet withal quiet, courage, stand out in the picture of him delineated for us by sympathetic contemporaries, that to attempt to touch it up or to add to it with any words of ours would be desecration. Who looks on this unvarnished portrait will go away with a sweet image on his mind of Pope St. Martin I which will never fade from his memory.

The *privileges* which Pope Martin is said to have given to various monasteries are, with one exception, set down by Jaffé and his continuators as spurious, and the one exception (a privilege in favor of Bobbio) is marked as of doubtful authenticity. In connection with these privileges we cannot do better than translate the reflections of Cardinal Pitra—reflections full of true historical criticism, and expressed with an eloquence of diction which only a learned Frenchman could throw around such a subject.

"With St. Martin there begins a series of monastic privileges of the great abbeys of Christendom : St Amand, St. Peter of Ghent, Rebais, St, Maur-des-fossés, St. Peter of Rouen; under Eugenius I, St. Bavon, St. Maurice of Agaune; under Vitalian, Stavelo, St. Michael of Gargan; under St. Agatho, St. Paul's in London, St Peter's on the Thames; under John V, St Benignus of Dijon, Notre-Dame of Arras (the cathedral); under John VI, Montier-en-Der. Thirty-five similar privileges are to be met with during the eighth and ninth centuries up to the days of Nicholas I. Like the preceding, they are one and all put down as forgeries in the *Regesta*. It is no matter that some have been inscribed on papyrus that the papyrus text of others is still extant, or that some are to be found

engraved on contemporary marbles. Another strange fact too: Isidore has not forged one of these 50 bulls; not a single privilege has come from his workshop, as though he had regarded monks as harder to impose upon than bishops. It has been found absolutely necessary to respect the privileges of the Aeduan monasteries (those of Autun) of Brunichildis, which could not be rejected without setting aside the register of Gregory the Great, without repudiating a whole series of documents which refer to them, without mutilating the monastic and feudal code of the Middle Ages. But when once the *Regesta* have admitted these sound muniments, with those of Bobbio, Farfa and Fulda, are they authorized to reject the diplomatic array which follows them in serried ranks with other great names: St. Medard, St. Colombe, Luxeuil, Glanfeuil, Fleury, Remiremont, Nonantula, etc.? The *Autun* example could not but be followed throughout the whole monastic world. The great abbeys, by the mere fact of their enduring existence, appeal to and prove these titles; they form the point of departure of our (the French) most ancient archives, and although defective in certain details, almost all are substantially authentic, as Dom. Coustant and Dom. Mabillon have always maintained, proved, demonstrated, with their well-known conscientiousness and authority. Why have the *Regesta* admitted other deeds which present no less; difficulties? How is it they have accorded a gracious reception to the letter of Hadrian I to Tilpin of Rheims, rejected by Hinschius and the Bollandists? Why has Jaffé bowed with respect before the privileges of Dover, Wearmouth, Medehamstead (Peterborough), Ripon, and Canterbury, which emanate, some of them, from even earlier popes? One reason is that they (the compilers of the *Regesta)* have been led on by the supercilious French critics, Germon, Lecointe, Launoy, Brequigny, and Pardessus, men who had no interest in the most ancient institutions of their country; whereas, in their Monasticon and Synodicon, Dugdale and Wilkins have respectfully registered the Catholic title-deeds of Old England. That was to show wisdom and patriotism. We blame neither Jaffé nor the new *Regesta* for not having risen to the idea. We do not indeed wish to defend all these documents. But we believe that the wholesale condemnation of such a large number of documents requires an appeal to a criticism better or newly informed".

Theoderic closes his biography of Pope Martin with a hymn in his praise. It consists of a number of Sapphics (verses composed of a dactyl and a spondee). If of no great merit, it may be worth quoting, if only on account of its antiquity.

Promere celsum

Te pater almus,

Voce canora

Natus agios

Hunc juvat herum

Pneumaque sanctum,

Organizando

Trinus et unus

Melle camoenae.
Rite beavit.
Doctor in orbe,
Nempe hierarcha
Praesul in urbe,
Clarus in aula
Tu quoque martyr
Regis olympi
Compote voto,
Munere fixus
Terque beatus.
Semper haberis.
Inde coronam Paste piacli
Perque decoram Jam miserere.
Perpete teste, Teque patrono
Morte sacrata Omnitenentis
Quam meruisti. Quo mereamur
Nunc rogitatus Visere laeti.
Sancte misellis Regna beata
Valde maestis Amen.

EUGENIUS I.

A.D. 654-657.

EMPEROR.

CONSTANS II, 642-668.

KINGS.

ROTHARI, 636-652. ARIPERT I, 653-661.

EXARCHS.

OLYMPIUS, 649-652. THEODORE CALLIOPAS (SECOND TIME), 653-664.

IT is by no means easy to discover what exactly took place at Rome after Martin was forcibly dragged away from it. At first, at any rate, the Church was governed in the manner usual in those days when the Holy See was vacant or the Pope was absent. From the same letter of Pope Martin's, from which we gather that fact, we know that the exarch Theodore Calliopas tried, and, at least for some time, in vain, to induce the clergy and people of Rome to elect a bishop to take the place of St. Martin. That is, up to the close of the year 654 the archpriest, archdeacon, and primicerius of the notaries were, as the saint thought, still acting for him. Further, when from his place of exile Martin wrote to his friend at Constantinople (in the summer—perhaps in July—of 654, there was again, as far at least as Martin seems to have known, still the same governing body in office at Rome. But when he wrote his second letter (September 654 to the same friend, the Church again had a single ruler, for Martin tells us that he especially prays for "the one who is now ruling over the Church".

Meanwhile in Rome, we learn from the *Book of the Popes* that the Holy See was vacant for one year one month and twenty-five days. Hence reckoning from June 17, 653, when Calliopas declared Martin deposed, we arrive at the conclusion that Eugenius was consecrated August 10, 654.

Knowing the date of the consecration of Eugenius does not enlighten us on other points connected with it. Was Eugenius an anti-pope elected in compliance with the will of the emperor, or was he elected by the clergy and the people, and consecrated, in reliance on the presumed Martin, consent of Pope Martin, as a defensive measure against attempts on the part of Constans to foist a Monothelite on the Church? It would seem that the latter is the correct supposition. It is in harmony with the two statements of Pope Martin, showing that the wishes of Calliopas for another Pope were set at naught, and that he (Martin) recognized Eugenius as Head of the Church. The second

conjecture has also in its favor the good character given to Eugenius by his biographer, and the fact that he did not display any signs of being a nominee of the emperor's. Indeed, from the coarse threat addressed to St. Maximus on the day (September 14, 656) when he was exiled to Salembria, it is abundantly evident that Eugenius was anything but a truckler to the imperial will. "Know, Lord abbot", said the emperor's officers, "that when we get a little rest from this rout of heathens *(i.e.* the Saracens), by the Holy Trinity, we will treat as we are treating you, the Pope who is now lifted up, and all the talkers there, and the rest of your disciples. And we will roast you all, each in his own place, as Pope Martin has been roasted".

The first act of Eugenius was to send legates to Constans to announce his election and to present to the emperor a profession of his faith. These apocrisiarii of the Pope must have been simple-minded men, as they received (655, summer) the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, Peter, into communion on the strength of his professing "one will upon two wills", or three wills in Our Lord! Thereupon they were sent back to the Pope, probably with the synodical letter which we know from the *Book of the Popes* that Peter dispatched to Eugenius, and which will be spoken of presently. However, as St. Maximus remarked, when to win him over to Monothelism he was told of the action of the Pope's legates, "their conduct did not in the least degree prejudice the Roman See, as they had not received any commission to the patriarch". Their business was with the emperor alone.

From the acts of St. Maximus, it appears that the emperor sent by one Gregory, "an offering to St Peter, and a letter to the Pope (whom we take to be Eugenius), begging him to place himself in communion with the patriarch of Constantinople. Both these things Gregory took to St. Maximus, then at Rome, evidently in the hope that the abbot would further the wishes of his master, the emperor. But the saint gave him to understand that, if the 'Type' was to be the basis of reconciliation, the Romans themselves would never tolerate such a union. Nor was he mistaken in his forecast.

According to custom the patriarch Peter addressed a synodical letter to the Pope. But as it was couched in obscure language, and avoided speaking of operations or wills in Our Lord, both clergy and people, indignant that such a letter had been sent, not only utterly refused in a most uproarious manner to accept it, when it was, apparently, read out in the Church of St. Mary Major, but would not suffer the Pope, to say Mass until he had calmed them by assuring them that he would on no account accept the letter. So that Constans, despite his cruelties to SS. Martin and Maximus, and to many other Western bishops, was no nearer than ever getting his 'Type' generally accepted.

For Englishmen, and especially for those of the north, a special interest attaches to Pope Eugenius. To Rome in his time came the young Wilfrid, who was ever to be so stout a champion of Rome and its ways, and who, from his early youth, felt drawn towards it, as towards the fountain-head of truth. Before his time it had never been known that any of our nation had ever gone to Rome. A mere youth though he was at this time, Wilfrid had come to the conclusion that the customs of the Celtic community of Lindisfarne, to which he had attached himself, were not as they should be; and so, with the full approval of his brethren, to Rome he went to study the ecclesiastical and

monastic rites in use there. Arrived in Rome (654), he was instructed by the archdeacon Boniface, one of the Pope's counselors, and by him presented to the Pope, who, we are told, "placed his blessed hand on the head of the youthful servant of God, prayed for him and blessed him"; and thus sent him home rejoicing, and feeling strong to begin his long and severe, but finally triumphant, struggle with the narrow views of his fellow Celtic monks.

Apart from the fact that he was buried at St. Peter's, on June 2, 657, we know nothing more about Eugenius, except that he had been brought up from his infancy for the Church and that he was a Roman and the son of one Rufinian, who belonged to the first or Aventine quarter of the city. This was the first of the seven ecclesiastical regions into which Rome had been divided by the popes from the very earliest times.

The history of Eugenius, short though it is, would seem to furnish us with another striking instance of the special watchful providence of God over the See of Peter. Even with the power of the exarch Calliopas hanging over Rome, a man was elected head of the Church who, whatever his leanings and sympathies might have been before he became Pope, showed, when the time came, the same immovable firmness in adhering to the revealed faith as the rock of Peter whence he was hewn.

The fate of Pope Martin did not deter Eugenius from following in his footsteps.

Here we may suitably bring to a close the first part of this volume on the Popes and the Lombards. With the martyrdom of Pope Martin and Maximus (who died a little later, 622) the heat of the Monothelite controversy passed off. To use the words of a contemporary, the waves of Monothelism dashed in vain against the courageous Pontiff of Rome. And when they had been thus broken, they were calmed by the oil poured on them by the diplomatic caution of Pope Vitalian. During his pontificate there succeeded to the empire Constantine Pogonatus, under whom the Monothelite heresy received its *coup-de-grace.* While in this first part there has been repeatedly brought before our notice what the popes have had to suffer from exarch and Lombard alike, in the next we shall see the rule of the fierce and rude Lombard ended for ever, and the court of the exarch, with all its base cupidity, against which Justinian vainly flattered himself that he had guarded Italy, swept out of the fair land which he and his subordinates had but oppressed. Some modern historians, indeed, led astray by their dreams about United Italy, have expressed regret that the Lombards did not capture Rome and subdue the whole peninsula, but not one among them has breathed a sigh of sorrow that the Byzantine was driven from Ravenna. But if Rome and Italy had not been saved by the popes from the uncultured Lombard, the history of Europe would have had a very different complexion. For certain it is that in the days of the Lombard, Rome was the centre of such civilization as there was in the West. And had it fallen beneath the lance of the Lombard, it may well be doubted whether there would now be a number of distinguished Western historians to rejoice over that happy event!

VITALIAN.

A.D. 657-672

EMPEROR.

CONSTANS II, 642-668

KINGS.

ARIPERT I, 653-661.

PERCTARIT and GODEPERT, 661-662.

GRIMWALD, 662-671.

PERCTARIT (second time), 679.-688.

EXARCHS.

THEODORE CALLIOPAS, 653-664.

GREGORY. 664-677.

IN the first part of this volume we traced the careers of the popes through the first half of the seventh century. Of this century, through the dearth of records, very little is known in either East or West. It is a century which, while for this reason to us now dull and dark all over the civilized world, was in the West, politically speaking uneventful, monotonous and quiet, and in the East violent and perturbed. For the Orient was agitated by the heresy of Monothelism and the sword of the Saracen. In the West it was the darkness of the mist, in the East the blackness of the storm.

This second part of the volume will see the dullness of the seventh century give place somewhat before the coming of the great popes of the eighth century and the dawn of the age of Charlemagne. It will see Monothelism swept into oblivion, the disappearance of the last shreds of the *Three Chapters,* the rise and fall of Iconoclasm; it will witness the expanse and collapse of the Lombard power in Italy; it will contemplate the definite passing of Roman power in the peninsula from the nerveless fingers of the exarch, whence it had long been slipping, into the hands of the Sovereign Pontiffs; and it will view with satisfaction the consequent strengthening of the position of those who, with lasting honor to themselves, and with enduring benefit to the nations, were to take the proud position of Head of the Christian Commonwealth of the Medieval States of Europe.

Considering the fact that Vitalian reigned for fourteen years and a half, we know but little of his doings; absolutely nothing, for instance, of the first six years of his pontificate. Of what we do know, however, it is interesting to Englishmen to discover that a considerable portion has reference to this country. And to him we owe a debt of gratitude for having sent us one of the greatest men that have adorned the Church in this country—the Greek Theodore.

The son of one Anastasius, a name, it will be observed constantly recurring m the history of the Church at this period, Vitalian was born at Segni, a town of the Campagna, on the 'Latin Road', at the thirtieth milestone from the city, picturesquely situated on a height, and, as remains show, once possessed of extensive and massive fortifications. This town is also famous in history for having resisted the Volscians of old, and as the birthplace of that centre figure of the Middle Ages, Innocent III.

Vitalian's first act as Pope was to send his nuncios to Constantinople as bearers of his synodical letter 'to the most pious princes', for Constantine was now a partner in the empire, to notify his consecration, and to proclaim his faith. And we learn from the acts of the thirteenth session of the Sixth General Council that the Pope also wrote to the patriarch Peter to exhort him to return to the orthodox faith. The results of these letters were, on the part of the Letters to emperor, a present for St. Peter in the shape of a copy of the gospels written in letters of gold, and with its binding all adorned with fine jewels of exceptional size; and on the part of the patriarch a letter to the Pope, beginning: "The letter of your fraternity has given us spiritual joy". The Fathers of the Sixth Council found that the passages of the ancient writers quoted by Peter in this letter in support of his doctrine of the One Will had been strangely mutilated.

It is very hard to understand this change of front towards the See of Rome on the part of Constans. Whether it was that his son Constantine had any influence over him; that he was overawed by the determined stand of the Pope and his legates, who, we are informed, reasserted the privileges of the Church; or whether it was that, in view of the expedition he made later on against the Lombards in Italy, he thought it advisable to make a friend of the Pope, we do not know. Of one thing, against certain writers, we are certain, and that is that there was no truckling to Constans on the part of the Pope in the matter of Monothelism, though his letter may have been conceived in a very conciliatory tone. This we may conclude on both positive and negative grounds; from the firmness of his administration, and from the fact that, despite the real or pretended opposition of Constantine Pogonatus, the name of Pope Vitalian was at length struck off the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople; and that, too, though no Pope's name but his own had been inserted in them from Honorius to the Sixth General Council under Pope Agatho. The attitude of the Pope on the One Will question may also be gathered from the fact that the orthodox patriarch, Thomas II, who succeeded Peter in 667, at once endeavoured to put himself in communication with Vitalian. The synodical letter he wrote to the Pope, which the Fathers of the Sixth General Council pronounced quite sound on the matter of the two wills never got despatched to Rome owing to the troubles caused by the Saracens. Two more orthodox prelates (John V, 669-674, and Constantine I, 674-676) succeeded Thomas. John inserted Vitalian's name in the diptychs, and Theodore I (676-678), a Monothelite, succeeded in getting the name removed.

We do not hear of Vitalian again till the approach of Constans to Rome. In the year 662 Constans, for reason, determined to transfer the seat of empire from Constantinople to Rome. His main object may have been a wish to recover Italy from the grasp of the Lombards, but Theophanes avers, and *a priori* reasons would render likely, it was unpopularity at home that caused Constans to make the attempt to divert ill-feeling from himself, by concentrating public attention on enemies abroad. His unpopularity was caused, says the chronicler, by the murder of his brother Theodosius *(c.* 660) and his treatment of Pope Martin, St. Maximus and many other orthodox men, who would not approve of his heresy. Landed in Italy, he soon found he was no match in arms for Grimwald and his Lombards. He fell back on Rome, and, as "he could do nothing against the Lombards, he raged against the defenseless Romans". However, as far as his relations with the Pope were concerned, Constans was amicable enough. On receiving news of his approach the Pope and clergy went out (June 5, 663) to the sixth milestone on the Appian Way to meet him. For twelve days the emperor remained in Rome, making offerings to the various churches, and living apparently on the best terms with the Pope. On his side Vitalian, either making a virtue of necessity, or because he believed that a mild answer turns away wrath, showed no hostility to the emperor. If Constans was considerate to the Pope, he was not so to Rome. He carried off all the bronze, ornaments of the city, and even stripped the Church of Our Lady 'ad Martyres', or the Pantheon, of its gilt bronze tiles! With this plunder, this protector of his people withdrew to Naples, and thence in the same year (663) to Sicily. Here for four years he did nothing but wring over into taxes from the people of Sicily, Calabria, Africa and Sicily, Sardinia, rob the very churches of their sacred vessels, and sell the people into slavery for money; so that well might the chronicler add that life was not worth having. Like so many other persecutors of the Church, he died a violent death, being assassinated in a bath (July 15, 668). At his death the army and the officialsin Sicily elected an emperor of their own, one Mizizius or Mecetius. And now we cannot but read with surprise that the Pope used his influence with considerable vigor in helping to put down the rebellion. Troops poured into Sicily from Italy, Africa, etc., and when the young Constantine arrived from Constantinople, he found that the usurper was no more. When he had returned to Constantinople, the Saracens made a descent upon Sicily (669), and captured Syracuse, and with it the plunder Constans had taken from Rome. So little does property sacrilegiously acquired ever permanently profit its dishonest possessors.

We must now retrace our steps to the year 664. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells how Peada, the first Christian king of the Mercians, and Oswin, King of Northumbria, "came together and agreed that they would rear a monastery to the glory of Christ and the honor of St. Peter. And they did so, and named it 'Medeshampstede' (Peterborough), ... and committed it to a monk who was called Saxewulf". Wulfhere, the brother and successor of Peada, resolved, with the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Deusdedit, and "by the counsel of all his 'witan', both clergy and laity", to finish the work begun by his brother and to endow the monastery. "And he did so". And after the monastery had been blessed by the archbishop, in presence of the king and all his bishops and nobles, the king declared : "And thus *free* I will make this minster that it be subject to Rome alone". Wulfhere understood well enough what so many, even Catholic bishops, have to their own cost often enough failed to understand, viz., that a

Church is then most *free* when it is most subject to the See of Rome; and, of course, the less subject to the See of Rome the less free, the more the slave and creature of the State. But Wulfhere was anxious for his soul's redemption, and he prayed that "the heavenly gateward (viz. St. Peter) would take in heaven from the man who took from his gift and the gifts of other good men"; and he confirmed the charters granting all the presents and privileges to the monastery (*AD* 664), "I, King Wulfhere, with the kings and earls and dukes and thanes, the witnesses of my gift, do confirm it, before the Archbishop Deusdedit, with the Cross of Christ". "When", adds the chronicler, "these things were done, the king sent to Rome to Vitalian, who then was Pope, and desired that he should grant by his writing and with his blessing all the before-mentioned things". The wished-for bull was granted, the Pope praying that St. Peter would exterminate with his sword or open with his keys the gates of heaven, according as what he decreed was contravened or obeyed.

Later on the monastery was destroyed by the Danes, and we are told by the *Saxon Chronicle* that when its site was visited by Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester, "he found nothing there but old walls and wild woods. There found he, hidden in the old walls, writings that Abbot Headda had erewhile written, how King Wulfhere and Athelred his brother had built it, and how they had freed it against king and against bishop, and against all secular services, and how the Pope Agatho had confirmed the same by his rescripts, and the Archbishop Deusdedit".

All these details, however, in connection with the foundation of this monastery are only to be read in one MS. of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.* This MS. (Bodleian, 636) seems to have been transcribed in the year 1122; and, from the numerous entries in it that relate to Peterborough, it is thought to have belonged to that monastery. It is further supposed that the charters we have just quoted also first saw the light in the twelfth century. No doubt, as they now appear in the Bodleian MS., they are not exact copies of the deeds of Wulfhere and Vitalian. Still, as there is no doubt that the monastery of Peterborough was founded about this time; and as there is no doubt that, as early as the beginning of the seventh century, the custom of placing monasteries under papal protection had begun, it is far more likely that the Peterborough documents of the *Saxon Chronicle* are more or less faithful copies of genuine originals than that they are absolute forgeries. It is in this belief that they have been cited here—the more so that comparatively little is urged against them even in the form in which they now exist

The archbishop (Deusdedit), in whose presence the consecration of the monastery of Peterborough is said to have taken place, died soon after (July 14, 664), and by the joint action of Oswin or Oswy, the powerful king of Northumbria, and Bretwalda ("who, though educated by the Scots, perfectly understood that the Roman was the Catholic and Apostolic Church"), and Egbert of Kent, one Wighard, who had been trained by the apostles whom Pope Gregory had sent to England, was sent to Rome to be consecrated archbishop of Canterbury. On arriving at Rome, Wighard made known the occasion of his journey to the Pope. But unfortunately, "with almost all who went with him," he was cut off by a pestilence. This Vitalian notified Oswy in a letter, written probably in 665, in which he praises his faith, exhorts him to follow the traditions of those two great lights of the Church, Peter and Paul, not only with regard to the Easter question, but in all other points, tells him that he has not been able to find a man

suitable, “in accordance with the tenor of his (Oswy’s) letters”, to be consecrated bishop for England, but that he will send the first proper person he can find, and thanks the king for the presents he has sent him. “We therefore beg your highness to make haste to dedicate all your island to Christ our God ... who will prosper it in all things, that it may bring together a new people of Christ, establishing there the Catholic and Apostolic faith”. Truly the Pope, being the high priest of that year, prophesied. After having Theodo made every effort to secure a proper person, Vitalian finally fixed on a Greek monk who was in Rome, and who was as distinguished for his good life as for his learning, both sacred and profane. This monk, named Theodore, resembled St. Paul not only in having been born at the same place, viz. Tarsus in Cilicia, but also in many points of his character. Both were learned, both men of fiery energy (though Theodore was nearer seventy years of age than sixty when he landed in England), and both eaten up with zeal for the glory of God. Such was the man whom Vitalian in his wisdom ordained (March 26, 668) for the English Church, to whom he subjected all the churches in Britain, and whom, he sent off to England (May 668) with letters of commendation to John, metropolitan of Arles. It is not for the historian of the popes to tell of the doings of Theodore in England. Suffice it to say that to him, and so to Pope Vitalian, who sent him, the English people owe the deepest debt of gratitude. By his energetic efforts to establish ecclesiastical unity in England, he did more than any other man to make us the united people we afterwards became. He inaugurated the golden age of England; “for our kings, being very brave men and very good Christians, were a terror to all barbarous nations, and the minds of all men were bent upon the joys of the heavenly kingdom of which they had just heard, and all who desired to be instructed in sacred reading had masters at hand to teach them”. Theodore ranks with those other great archbishops of Canterbury, Anselm, Lanfranc, and St. Thomas a Becket, to whom Englishmen owed the establishment and propagation of such religious maxims and practice as made this country known to the world as the ‘island of saints’, and to whom Englishmen of the present day even are largely indebted for being the freest people on God’s earth.

In the history of every widely extended empire we read of attempts, more or less successful, on the part of subordinate rulers to throw off or lessen their dependence on the supreme authority, and to make themselves as far as possible independent. It has been with the Church as with temporal kingdoms. The subject powers in the Church who carried matters to the greatest extremes were the patriarchs of Constantinople. Bishops of a city second to none in the empire, they thought that they themselves should be second to none in the Church, that they should be in the Church what the emperor was in the State. At the period of which we are now treating, Maurus, Archbishop of Ravenna, began to entertain somewhat similar views. To him the residence of the exarchs made Ravenna politically the first city in Italy, and himself at least as important as the other great bishops of Milan and Aquileia. He would therefore, like them, be more his own master; would be, as it was then grandly called, ‘autocephalous’. In 649 Maurus was submissive enough, and came, or rather sent, his legates to Rome when summoned to the Lateran synod by Pope Martin. But in 666, despite the canons of the council of Nice and everything else, he refused to come to Rome to tender his respects to the Holy See. Encouraged, perhaps inspired, by Constans, Maurus replied to a letter of the Pope excommunicating him, by insolently attempting the excommunication of

the Pope. Both Vitalian and Maurus wrote to the emperor. As might have been expected, an imperial edict, dated "Syracuse, March 1st, the 25th year of the reign of Constans", was straightway issued to Maurus, in which the emperor stated that orders had been sent to the exarch Gregory in favor of Maurus, and in which he decreed that the Church of Ravenna should in future not be subject to any ecclesiastical superior, especially to the patriarch of 'Old Rome', but should be 'Autocephalous'. It is believed that this is the document which contemporary mosaics on the left wall of the 'mighty basilica' of St. Apollinaris in Classis (a sort of suburb of Ravenna) exhibit as being handed to Reparatus, the successor of Maurus, and marked 'Privilegium'. To as many as are not Erastians, but are lovers of justice and respecters of Canon Law, this act of Constans will be correctly set down as tyrannical, and fully justifies the reflection of Muratori: "Ma di che non era capace quest' empio ed infelice Augusto!". Though Reparatus "again subjected the Church of Ravenna to the Apostolic See", there was more or less friction till the Pontificate of Leo II, when Constantine Pogonatus (the Bearded) undid the work of his father, and the bishop of Ravenna had to give up his 'Privilegium'.

To prevent any misconstruction as to the meaning of the decree of Constans, which has reached us only in a very corrupt condition, or any misapprehension as to the aims of the bishop of Ravenna, and to prevent it being thought that he had any intention of becoming a schismatic and cutting himself off from all subjection to Rome, a few facts connected with the various degrees of ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the Pope must be borne in mind.

Before the middle of the fourth century, the direct and immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, as a primate or metropolitan, extended over all Italy. All matters concerning the election of bishops, for instance, in the parts subject to his metropolitical jurisdiction, had to be referred to him directly. But before the middle of the fifth century the direct and immediate jurisdiction over northern Italy had passed into the hands of the metropolitans of Milan, Aquileia and Ravenna. The position of Ravenna, however, among the other metropolitans was peculiar. His metropolitical jurisdiction extended only over Aemilia, which was, therefore, outside the sphere of the Pope's authority as primate. The complex nature, then, of the position of the bishop of Ravenna lies in this, as Duchesne explains. In the *primatial* province of Rome, in which his See of Ravenna was situated, he was but a simple bishop; whereas over Aemilia he was a metropolitan. To be thus inferior to his brethren of Milan and Aquileia did not suit the bishop of Ravenna. He, therefore, aspired to be *autocephalous, i.e.*, to be in all respects like the bishops just named. And this he sought for and obtained at the hands of Constans.

This difference will be noted between the results of the revolts of subordinate princes in temporal empires and in that of the Church. In the one case the dismemberment of the earthly kingdom has sooner or later inevitably been the consequence. In the case of the Church, the one result has been to strengthen the position of its Head, the Pope. The great ones in the supernatural realm of the Church, such as the patriarchs of Constantinople, who, from time to time in the course of its history have endeavored to free themselves from subjection to the See of Peter—where are they now? So insignificant are they, that they are scarcely names in the civilized world.

For some cause, which is nowhere stated, John, Bishop of Lappa in Crete, had been condemned by his metropolitan Paul, Archbishop of Crete, and his suffragans. John appealed to Rome, and begged the Pope that, "in accordance with the sacred canons and the institutions of the Holy Fathers", he would enquire into his case and pass sentence according to his deserts. The Pope accordingly summoned a synod (December 667); and, very indignant at the high-handed manner in which John had been treated, especially at the effort Paul had made to prevent the execution of John's appeal to Rome, the synod declared John innocent, annulled the sentence that had been passed upon him, and ordained that reparation should be made him for the losses he had sustained. Paul was exhorted by the Pope to carry out his sentence that he (Paul) might not experience the rigor of the canons. Vitalian also wrote to Vaanus, the emperor's chamberlain, and to George, Bishop of Syracuse, to see that John was restored to his See. Where are we to find a part of the Church from which appeals have not been directed to the Holy See from the time that that part has had any Christian history at all? In all ages of the Church the wronged and the oppressed have ever felt that they had still a source of comfort and strength, and that hope was not dead for them as long as they had Rome to appeal to. To a Christian the appeal to the See of Peter is, and ever has been, as the appeal to Caesar for the Roman.

Vitalian was buried in St Peter's, January 27, 672, and is on that day commemorated in the Roman Martyrology.

ADEODATUS.

A.D. 672-676.

EMPEROR.

CONSTANTINE IV (or V) (POGONATUS), 668-685

KING.

PERCTARIT (second time), 672-688

EXARCH.

GREGORY, 664-677.

Popes Adeodatus and his successor Donus, it may besaid in a word that we know nothing of them or their acts, save that they were good men, made a few improvementsin the fabrics of some of the churches, and, with more or less wisdom, exempted a monastery or two from episcopal control.

Adeodatus was a Roman, and the son of Jovinian. Sofar resembling St. Gregory I, he was called to be Popefrom being a monk in a monastery on the Coelian Hill (viz., that of St. Erasmus). He was consecrated April 11, 672.

Of such a gentle and kind disposition was this Pontiffthat he allowed everyone, great and small, ready access to himself, was most affable to strangers, made everyone feel that they would get from him whatever they wanted and increased the allowance or donativethe popes were in the habit of making to the clergy and others.

Apart from additions he made to his monastery on the Coelian, he restored the Church of St. Peter in the Campus Meruli, on the Via Portuensis, between the ninth and eleventh milestones from the city. The same locality is still known as the Campo di Merlo. His monastery of St. Erasmus was originally established in the house of the Valerii, perhaps the most honored of all Rome’s great patrician families. Adeodatus endowed it with the revenues of many estates, concerning which an inscription, some marble fragments of which were found by De Rossi, still exists.

Wilkins, in his collection of British Councils, and other editors of Councils, have preserved for us a decree of this Pope (*c.* 674), forbidding, at the request of Hadrian, the abbot and companion of Archbishop Theodore, the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Canterbury to be harassed by anyone, whether cleric or lay, and forbidding anyone to be foisted on the monastery as abbot but the one lawfully elected by the monks themselves.

About the same time the Pope addressed a letter to all the bishops of Gaul, informing them that, though the Holy See was not wont to exempt monasteries from episcopal control, still, as Crotpert, the bishop of Tours, had himself exempted the

monastery of St. Martin, he would confirm the exemption of this house from the jurisdiction of the ordinary.

In this connection we may remark that, however advantageous it was, not only for themselves but for civilization at large, that at times the monks should be freed from dependence on the local bishop, there is no doubt that the general acquisition of this privilege was fatal to the best interests of the monks themselves. It is with communities as with individuals. They cannot think too highly of the good they do, nor too lightly of the harm. And it was much easier to hide a diminution of virtue and a growth of worldliness from the distant Bishop of Rome than from the local 'ordinary'. Hence, when with the lapse of time the degeneration, which overtakes everything of this earth, fell upon the monastic orders, the exemptions they had secured, ensured their ruin.

Adeodatus was buried in St. Peter's, June *16,* or 17according to Duchesne.

DONUS

A.D. 676-678.

AFTER an interval of 138 days, during which, we are told, took place the most fearful storms in the memory of man, there was consecrated as bishop of Rome, Donus, himself a Roman, and the son of one Maurice.

During his short reign, of about a year and a half, Donus flagged the atrium or quadrangle in front of St. Peter's with great pieces of marble, and restored the Church of St. Euphemia on the Appian Way, a church that no longer exists, and the basilica of St. Paul on the Ostian Way, or, according to the very probable conjecture of Duchesne, the little church on the left of the road going to St. Paul's, *outside the walls,* where tradition tells that SS. Peter and Paul parted on their way to martyrdom. Discovering in a monastery, which was called after Boethius, that there were a body of Nestorian Syrian monks there, Donus dispersed them through the various monasteries in Rome, to do penance or to prevent them from spreading their tenets in the city, and gave over the monastery to Roman monks.

As we have noted above, Reparatus, Archbishop of Ravenna, just before his death submitted to Pope Donus. But if one great bishop showed himself dutiful to the Pope,it was not the case with Theodore, the patriarch of Constantinople, who, succeeding three successive Catholic prelates, became patriarch in the same year that Donus became Pope. A letter concerning the settlement of the Monothelite question, which Constantine Pogonatus addressed to Donus, but which was delivered to Agatho, as Donus was dead when the letter arrived, informs us that Theodore, the patriarch of Constantinople, did not send a synodical letter to Pope Donus. "He feared", adds the emperor, "that it would be rejected by the Pope, like those of his predecessors had been". The patriarch confined himself to sending a letter exhorting to peace. Whether Donus returned any answer to this letter, or whether even he was alive when it reached Rome, is not known.

The very little that his biographer tells us of Donus terminates with the usual, "he was buried at St. Peter's" (April11,678). His portrait, with that of Honorius,wasonce to be seen in a mosaic which he himself erected in the Church of St. Martina, in the Forum. The present Church of St. Martina stands on the site of the mediaeval Church, and that, again, stood on the site of the offices of the Senate House.

ST. AGATHO.

A.D. 678-681.

EMPEROR.

POGONATUS, 668-685.

KING.

PERCTARIT, 672-688.

EXARCH.

THEODORE, 677-687.

Though Pope Agatho reigned but for a short time, his name is conspicuous in the history of the Church,not only because he is honored as a saint both by the Greeks and Latins, but because in his pontificate was celebrated the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the third of Constantinople (680), in which one more of the errors (Monothelism) that arose from a false view of the nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ was condemned.

As what is known of the actions of Agatho practically centres round this country and the General Council, his doings in connection with the Church in England, and then with the Council, will here be treated of after a little has been said of the Pope himself.

A Sicilian by birth, and by profession a monk, Agatho was a man of remarkable affability and generosity. He had a cheerful word and a smile for everybody, and was especially kind to his clergy. He would seem also to have had a turn for finance, as, contrary to custom, when he became Pope, he took into his own hands the office of treasurer of the Roman Church, and, with the aid of a *nomenclator*, himself transacted the business of the treasury. Ill health, to which he alludes in his letter to Constantine, forced Agatho to appoint a treasurer with full powers as usual.

It is not quite certain whether Agatho was consecrated in June or July, as the data in the *Book of the Popes* do not tally. We are, however, disposed to agree with Pagi and Duchesne, and to assign that event to Sunday, June 27, 678.

For the fifth time the indefatigable abbot of Wearmouth, Benedict Biscop, appeared in Rome in the early days of the pontificate of Agatho to obtain “for the ornament and defence of his Church” what he could not find even in Gaul. Acting in accordance with the wish of Egfrid, King of Northumbria, who had given the land for the Wearmouth monastery, Benedict obtained from the Pope a charter of privileges for the said monastery, and leave to take back with him to England John, the arch-chanter of St. Peter’s, to “teach in his monastery the method of singing throughout the year, as it

was practiced in St. Peter's at Rome". John had, moreover, been commissioned by the Pope "carefully to inform himself concerning the faith of the English Church, and to give an account thereof on his return to Rome". "For", continues Bede, "the Pope was desirous of being informed concerning the state of the Church in Britain, as well as in other provinces, and to what extent it was chaste from the contagion of heretics". To satisfy the Pope, the famous synod of Heathfield or Hatfield was summoned by Archbishop Theodore (September 17, 680). The faith in England was found to be sound on all points. A profession of faith was drawn up and sent to Rome, "and most thankfully received by the Apostolic Pope and all those that heard or read it".

It issaid that there was also read at this same synod a letter of Pope Agatho, confirming, at the request of Ethelred, King of the Mercians, Archbishop Theodore and others, for the abbey of Medehampstede (afterwards known as Peterborough), of which we have spoken before, exemption from payment of taxes or military service to king, bishop, or earl; and forbidding the 'ordinary' or 'shire-bishop' to perform any episcopal functions within the monastery except at the request of the abbot. "And it is my will", says the Pope, "that the abbot (of Medehampstede) be holden as legate of Rome over all the island, and that whatsoever abbot shall be there chosen by the monks, be consecrated by the archbishop of Canterbury. I will and concede that whatever man shall have made a vow to go to Rome, which he may be unable to fulfill through sickness or any other cause, let him come to the monastery of Medehampstede and have the same forgiveness of Christ and St. Peter, and of the abbot and of the monks, that he should have if he went to Rome". "This decree", says our earliest English chronicle, "Agatho and 125 bishops sent to England by Wilfrid, Archbishop of York".

But, as was noted under the *life* of Vitalian, full reliance cannot be placed on these details in connection with Medehampstede, as they are only to be found in the twelfth century *Peterborough* MS. of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.*

What brought Wilfrid to Rome in the days of Pope Agatho will now be ours to set forth as clearly as may be, but shortly, as the career of this glorious Englishman and servant of God belongs rather to the history of the Church in this country than to the *Lives of the Popes.* Besides, his heroic life, his long undaunted struggle in the cause of freedom, have been well written of in books that are easily accessible to the English reader. But as Wilfrid came to Rome and the popes three times; and as, towards the close of his days, he "thought of returning once again to that See of Peter whence he had received justice and freedom, to end his life there", he cannot be passed over in treating of the popes from Eugenius to John VI. Nor indeed should we care to leave unnoticed him whom that noble Frenchman, the Count de Montalembert, so great an admirer of our nation, in the warm glow of his beautiful and eloquent language, calls "the eldest son of an invincible race, the first of the English nation"; the first of "that great line of prelates, by turns apostolic and political, eloquent and warlike, brave champions of Roman unity and ecclesiastical independence, magnanimous representatives of the rights of conscience, the liberties of the soul ... a line to which history presents no equal out of the Catholic Church of England; a lineage of saints, heroes, confessors and martyrs, which produced St. Dunstan, St. Lanfranc, St. Anselm, St. Thomas a Becket, Stephen Langton, St. Edmund the exile of Pontigny, and which ended in Reginald

Pole". Would that in detailing in brief Wilfrid's splendid course we might be filled with the inspiring powers of expression of the illustrious author of the *Monks of the West!*

Of a noble Northumbrian family, born about 634, Wilfrid at the early age of fourteen joined himself to the monks of Lindisfarne or Holy Island. We have already seen, under the pontificate of Eugenius I, how his expanding mind led him to Rome to seek for truth at its source. Returned thence convinced of the importance of unity even in small matters, such as the shape of the tonsure to be worn by clerics, let alone in such graver questions as the time of celebrating Easter, and with his heart full of love for Rome and all its ways, he began at once to oppose the Roman to the Celtic customs. He was able to do this with the more effect that he was called to be the tutor of Alchfrid, the son of King Oswin or Oswy, the powerful sovereign of Northumbria. By his abilities, his address, and the natural attractiveness of a handsome person, he soon obtained great influence, and succeeded in bringing about the famous assembly of Whitby (664), in which the 'Easter question' was settled for Northumbria. Naturally many of the defeated adherents of the traditions of Columba never forgot Wilfrid's share in their discomfiture at Whitby; and, acting on the proverb that all is fair in love and in war, never lost an opportunity of opposing him. On the death of Bishop Tuda, Wilfrid was elected to succeed him as bishop of Northumbria. To be quite free from any taint of schism, nothing would suit Wilfrid but that he should go to France and get consecrated (665) by Agilbert, Bishop of Paris. But during his absence a reaction had set in; and King Oswy, gained over by the Celtic party, had one Ceadda or Chad consecrated bishop of York. On his return Wilfrid made no protest against this unkind and tyrannical act, but retired to the famous monastery of Roman observance he had founded at Ripon. "Thus the saint begins to be visible in his character". But in the year 669 there came to England, as we have seen, sent by Pope Vitalian, the heroic old Greek Theodore to be its metropolitan. And the old man, who was afterwards to do so much wrong to Wilfrid, began his ever-memorable pontificate in our island by restoring Wilfrid to the bishopric of York, with the consent of Oswy, who yielded to the apostolic commission. After this, till the death of the great *Bretwalda* (670), Wilfrid was again in full favor with Oswy, and for some years with his son and successor Egfrid. Wilfrid was, however, destined again to remember that "faith was not to be put in princes". The dislike which Egfrid had begun to entertain for Wilfrid, on account of an intricate and delicate cause, with which this work has nothing to do, was augmented by his (Egfrid's) second wife Ermenburga. Jealous of the wealth and influence of Wilfrid, this Jezabel, as the saint's biographer calls her, contrived, by constantly harping on the one theme, to inspire her husband with the same base passion. The pair, in their resolve to degrade Wilfrid, had the art to engage Archbishop Theodore on their side. The archbishop had long been rightly convinced that one bishop for each of the eight Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was utterly inadequate to the spiritual needs of England. Up to this time, however, he had done nothing in the matter. Now, gained over by Wilfrid's enemies, he greatly curtailed his jurisdiction (678); and out of his diocese formed three new ones, for each of which he consecrated a bishop. Against this high-handed measure, which he denounced as "mere robbery", Wilfrid protested, and declared that he would appeal to the judgment of the Holy See. To Rome accordingly Wilfrid journeyed; and there, after escaping many snares which his enemies had caused to be laid for him, he arrived in 679. There also arrived, with letters from Theodore, full of violent accusations against Wilfrid, a monk

Coenwald. To examine the Council at affair thoroughly, Agatho summoned a council, and at which he presided in person. Feeling that the proceedings of the court that listened to the first appeal to Rome from England must be of special interest to Englishmen, we will give them, as far as our sources will allow us, at some length.

The council was held in the Lateran basilica, and was opened by the Pope himself. Then the bishops of Ostia and Portus arose, and, after laying down that the "regulating of all the churches was in the hands of the Pope, who was in the place of Peter", and declaring that they had carefully read over the charges made against Wilfrid by Theodore and others, and Wilfrid's defence, found that he had not been canonically deposed, and, on the contrary, had evinced his moderation by keeping clear of broils and quietly appealing to the Apostolic See, in which Christ founded the primacy of the priesthood. At the command of the Pope, Wilfrid was brought before the assembly, and his (Wilfrid's) petition read before the synod. It begins : "I, Wilfrid, the humble and unworthy bishop of the English, have come to this Apostolic eminence, as to a tower of strength. And I trust that I shall get justice, whence flows the rule of the sacred canons to all the Churches of Christ". The memorial then goes on to show how uncanonically its author had been treated, though no accusation is made against Archbishop Theodore, "because he had been commissioned by the Apostolic See". In conclusion, Wilfrid declares that he will abide absolutely by the decision of the Holy See; "to the equity of which he has come with fullest confidence". Full of admiration at the spirit that animated Wilfrid, the Pope and the synod decreed that he should be restored, that the bishops who had replaced him should be expelled; but that the archbishop should ordain as coadjutors to Wilfrid, such men as the saint thought proper to select himself in a synod assembled for that purpose. All bishops and princes alike were commanded to obey this decree, under pain of different penalties. Various other decrees were also passed at this synod for the better governing of the Church in England. We can well understand that Wilfrid made no haste to return home. The journey to Rome was a very serious undertaking in those days, and there was much to be seen there, even at a time when the city was going to decay; and much to interest and astonish an enlightened man coming from this country. Wilfrid collected relics of the saints, and purchased a large variety of things for decorating his churches on his return.

Wilfrid stayed long enough in Rome to be present at the synod of 125 bishops (March 27, 680), assembled by Pope Agatho (which will be spoken of presently), to select deputies to be sent to Constantinople to assist at a general council to be held against Monothelism. Wilfrid subscribed as Bishop of York, who had appealed to and had been absolved by the Apostolic See, and who, sitting as judge in synod with 125 other bishops, confessed by his signature the true and Catholic faith, in the name of all the northern parts of Britain, Ireland, and the islands inhabited by the Britons and the Angles, the Scots and the Picts.

By the order of the Pope, Wilfrid returned to England after this council, and humbly showed to Egfrid the decrees in his favor. But the king and his councilors, pretending that they had been bought, had Wilfrid imprisoned. In vain the king tried to bribe Wilfrid into acknowledging that the Apostolic briefs were forged. But, full of trust in the authority of the Holy See, Wilfrid declared that he would sooner have his head struck from his body than make such a declaration.

After some months' imprisonment, Wilfrid was released from prison, but banished the kingdom of Northumbrian. After having been driven from one kingdom to another, he was engaged in improving his exile by laboring for the conversion of the pagan inhabitants of Sussex, when Archbishop Theodore, made to examine into his conduct by the consciousness of approaching death, realized that he had, in his treatment of Wilfrid, been false as well to him as to the authority of the Holy See. He became perfectly reconciled to him, and procured for him from Aldfrid, the successor of Egfrid, the restoration of his See (686).

But Wilfrid's old opponents, the upholders of the Celtic traditions, had only been scotched, not killed. They excited enmities between Wilfrid and the king; and after some years of bickering, Wilfrid was again an exile (691). Archbishop Brithwald also, the successor of Theodore, turned on Wilfrid; and at a great council at Ouestraefelda (703), probably Austerfeld, a little village on the borders of Yorkshire and Notts, and near Edwinstow in Sherwood Forest, Wilfrid was required to resign his bishopric. But asking them how they dared to resist the decrees of Popes Agatho, Benedict and Sergius in his behalf, and pointing out what he had done for the Church of Northumbria during his forty years' episcopate, he again appealed to Rome. Arrived in Rome, "as it were at his mother's breast", he was summoned before a synod presided over by Pope John VI (704). In seventy sessions the points in dispute between the envoys of Brithwald and Wilfrid were thoroughly sifted. Wilfrid urged that now for the third time had he come to Rome for help, and asked for a favorable hearing, as he had received verdicts in his behalf from Popes Agatho, Benedict and Sergius, and as the action of the Apostolic See was wont to be even and consistent. In the course of the proceedings, the assembly learnt with amazement from the testimony of the oldest among them that the venerable septuagenarian in their midst was the same Wilfrid who twenty-four years previously had subscribed to the decrees of the Roman council against the Monothelites! With one voice the astonished multitude expressed their sorrow that one who had for over forty years been a bishop should be treated with the indignity that Wilfrid had been. Whereupon the Pope, having declared that in all the careful examinations they had made of the case, the synod had found no crime in Wilfrid, declared him absolved from the charges brought against him.

He then put into Wilfrid's hands a letter for Ethelred, King of the Mercians, and Aldfrid, King of Northumbria. He tells them how grieved the whole Church was at the discord in their midst, exhorts them to be obedient, points out the care with which the case had been gone into at Rome, and orders Brithwald to summon a synod, to bring before, it Wilfrid and the usurpers of his See, and to settle the difference between them. If that cannot be done, they are to be sent to Rome to be tried, under penalty, if any refuse to come, of being deposed and excommunicated. At the command of the synod, Wilfrid set out for England. The archbishop and King Ethelred promised obedience to the Pope's orders. But Aldfrid declared that what he and the archbishop "sent from Rome" had decided, he would never, while he lived, change on account of what it had been thought fit to call the decrees of the Apostolic See! But, quietly adds the biographer, from whose spirited pen we have all these most interesting details: "Afterwards he completely changed his decision, and was truly sorry for his conduct". Taken suddenly ill, he confessed the sin he had been guilty of against Wilfrid and the

Apostolic See, but died before he could make reparation (705). Eadwulf, the successor of Aldfrid, was even more violent than Aldfrid, but his reign was limited to a duration of two months; and under his successor Osred, the dying wishes of his (Osred's) father Aldfrid were carried out.

Brithwald summoned the synod (705) the Pope had ordered to meet, at the village of Nidd, on the river of the same name, south of Ripon. In the presence of the bishops, of the king, and his nobles, the decrees of the Pope were read and explained. The bishops, after some consultation, became reconciled with Wilfrid, and his two great monasteries of Ripon and Hexham were restored to him; and he was restored to the See of Hexham. "And thus he lived in peace four years, *i.e.,* until the day of his death" (709).

In this sketch of the life of St. Wilfrid, there is one fact that cannot fail to impress itself on the reader. In the histories which have come down to us of the struggle for liberty on the part of the people in the earlier days of the countries of Europe, Rome and the popes are always to be seen as most useful and trustworthy allies of its champions. The history of St. Wilfrid gives us a striking instance of this truth. In his long contest for his rights as a bishop, Wilfrid was really fighting for the rights of every citizen against the arbitrary tyranny of kings. He was doing battle for that personal freedom we English value so highly; and his allies were the popes of Rome. With their power behind him, he finally triumphed over despotism; and in his victory the nation shared. Especially did they reap its fruits in the freedom he won for the episcopacy. "Thanks to him, until the Norman Conquest, four centuries later, no English king dared arbitrarily depose a bishop from his See". In a bid for liberty, what chance have the people, when the king has the clergy at his beck? Is it not hence strange to find freedom-loving Englishmen railing against men like St. Dunstan and St. Thomas a Becket? It is due to the heroic resistance of such men against would-be absolutism that we are the free nation that we are today.

But we must return to Pope Agatho and the principal event in his reign—the Sixth General Council. Victor over the Caliph Muaviah (or Moawyah) (678), and at peace with the Avars, thus causing "a universal state of security both in East and West", Constantine determined to try and bring about the same universal peace in the Church. He accordingly wrote (August 12, 678) a letter, already several times quoted, to Pope Donus, "Archbishop of Old Rome and Universal Pope". It was received by Agatho, and begins by observing that the Pope knows that he (the emperor) has been often asked to have a discussion on the question in dispute between the two Sees of Rome and Constantinople. He has never agreed, because partial discussion only made matters worse, and the times had hitherto been unfavorable for the holding of a general council. As, therefore, the times will not permit the summoning of a general council to end the unfortunate discussion, the emperor begs the Pope to send learned men, furnished with the needful books, and with full powers to speak in the name of the Pope and his council, in order to confer with the patriarch of Constantinople, and Macarius, patriarch of Antioch; and by the grace of the Holy Spirit to agree upon the truth. The emperor will show no favor to either party, but will receive the papal legates with fitting honor. He suggests that the Pope might send as deputies three clerics to represent the Roman Church, and some twelve bishops and metropolitans, with four monks from each of the

four Greek monasteries in Rome, to represent the rest of his patriarchate. The letter concludes with the assurance that the emperor has ordered the exarch Theodore to do everything for the safety and convenience of those who should be sent to Constantinople.

Agatho at once fell in with these views of the emperor; and to give the greater weight to the words of those who were to be his legates at Constantinople, he ordered synods to be held in the different countries of the West, so that his deputies would speak with its united voice. We know of synods being, in consequence, held at Milan, and at Heathfield in England. And in Rome there met together in synod 125 bishops, in the Easter week of 680. After this assembly broke up, the priests Theodore and George, and the deacon John, who was afterwards to be Pope (John V), representing the Pope, and three bishops, to speak for the whole West, set out for Constantinople bearing two long letters for the emperor, one from Pope Agatho himself, and the other from the bishops of the Roman synod.

In his letter to Constantine, Agatho says he would have sent the deputies before, but had been prevented, not only by his own illness, but chiefly by the time he had had to wait for the assembling of the bishops from the more distant parts of his patriarchate. The deputies he is now sending are not to be estimated by their scientific attainments. For how, asks the Pope, can men who have to live in the midst of enemies and who have to earn their daily bread by the labor of their hands, find time for acquiring learning? Still they would be found men well able to hand on inviolate the deposit of faith they had received from their ancestors in the faith. He then lays down the doctrine of the two wills and operations, as he has received it from his predecessors. This, he adds, is the true belief of Christianity, taught not by human wit but by the Holy Ghost through the princes of the apostles. This is the confession of him who was pronounced "blessed", in that he received his revelation from heaven, and of him to whom the Redeemer of Mankind thrice committed His sheep and under whose guidance this Church has *never* swerved from *the way of truth in any particular*—this Church, whose authority, as that of the prince of all the apostles, the whole Catholic Church and all the ecumenical councils have ever embraced and followed, and whom heretics have on the contrary ever attacked with falsehood and hatred. The rule of the true faith, the Apostolic Church will preserve perfect to the end in accordance with the prayer of Our Lord that Peter's faith might not fail.

Hence, continues the Pope, when the patriarchs of Constantinople endeavored to introduce heretical novelties into Christ's unspotted Church, my predecessors never ceased exhorting them to desist from their errors, at least by keeping silence, (a clear allusion to the attitude of Pope Honorius towards Sergius). Agatho then proceeds to enlarge upon the "two natural wills and operations", adducing in support of his explanation testimonies from the writings of the Greek Fathers. He shows how Sergius and his heretical successors varied even in their errors, from which the Church must be withdrawn and all must "with us" confess the truth founded on the firm rock of that Peter who preserves his Church from error. In conclusion, the Pope earnestly begs the emperor to see that all be allowed freedom of speech at the forthcoming council.

The synodal letter, signed by the Pope and the 125 bishops present at the council, is quite to the same effect, insisting just as strongly and repeatedly on the infallibility of the See of Peter. The bearers of these letters reached Constantinople on September 10, 680, and were honorably received by the emperor, who, the very same day, addressed a mandate to the patriarch George, in which he gave his sanction to his summoning to Constantinople the bishops subject to his jurisdiction, for the purpose of discussing the question of the "wills" in Our Lord. George was also informed that the emperor had given the same sanction to Macarius of Antioch.

In consequence of this energetic action on the part of the emperor, the Sixth Ecumenical Council was opened, November 7, 680. Theophanes assures us that 289 bishops and "fathers" took part in it, but the minutes of the council only give us forty-three bishops as present at the first session, and 174 at the last. The council was held in a hall of the imperial palace, known by the name 'Trullus', from being furnished with a cupola or dome.

The proceedings were opened by the Papal legates; and they signed first the minutes of the last session. The emperor was present in person at many of the sessions.

The Fathers, in council assembled, pronounced that the Monothelites had forged various documents; decreed the restoration of the name of Pope Vitalian to the diptychs; condemned and declared degraded Macarius of Antioch for his obstinate adhesion to Monothelism; anathematized, in their thirteenth session, Sergius, Cyrus of Alexandria and the other Eastern leaders of Monothelism, and moreover Honorius, who was formerly Pope of Old Rome; and in their eighteenth and closing session (September 16, 681) issued their decree relative to the two wills in Our Lord. The Fathers of the council, after declaring that they received with full trust, and greeted with Uplifted hands the letter of Pope Agatho to the emperor, and the synodal letter of the bishops assembled under him, and that they followed the five preceding general councils, unfolded at length, and with great perspicuity, the Catholic doctrine of the two wills and energies in Our Lord.

At the close of the synod a letter was presented to the emperor, in which the bishops inform him that, inspired by the Holy Ghost, in full agreement with one another, and following the dogmatic letter of their most holy father Agatho, and that of the synod held by him, they declare the two wills in Christ, and that they condemn Sergius, etc., and Honorius, as he followed them. They point out that the zeal of the Pope or the synod is not to be blamed, as they were merely acting on the defensive, and that in their behalf fought the prince of the apostles, inasmuch as his imitator and successor is their supporter, and in his letter explained to them the divine mysteries. Peter spoke through Agatho.

A letter was also dispatched to Pope Agatho, "the wise physician granted by Our Lord to banish disease from the Church and to restore health to its members". To him, as to the bishop of the first See in the universal Churchand as standing on the firm rock of faith, the fathers of the council leave what has to be done. In accordance with the sentence previously passed upon them in the Pope's letters, they had anathematized the heretics, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, etc., and, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and with the Pope's instructions to guide them, had proclaimed the doctrine of

the two wills. And as with the Pope they have shed abroad the light of the orthodox faith, they beg him to confirm their action in writing.

The emperor, on his side, issued an edict enjoining all, whether cleric or lay, under pain of punishment to accept the decrees of the council. And with the returning papal legates, he also sent a letter to Pope Leo II, as word had reached Constantinople, before the Roman legates left it, that Pope Agatho had died (January lo, 681). Leo was informed of what had been done by the council, and of the contumaciousness and subsequent deposition of Macarius and others, who refused to receive the letters of Pope Agatho, thus flying in the face, as it were, of Peter, the leader and prince. However, as Macarius and his supporters had all in writing begged him (Constantine) to send them to the Pope, he has done so, and leaves their case in the Pope's hands.

Leo in his reply (after September 682) confirmed the decrees of the Sixth General Council, and, as we shall see in his *life,* notified them to the West. In his letter of confirmation to the emperor, Leo said that as the acts of the council were in agreement with the faith of Pope Agatho and his synod, he therefore assented to what had been defined, and by the authority of Blessed Peter confirmed its decrees and received it as he did the five preceding general councils, Leo proceeded to condemn Theodore, Cyrus, and the other Monothelite leaders, and Honorius, who, by his teachingobscured the Apostolic See, and by a profane surrender would have overthrown the immaculate faith;or, following the Greek version, permitted the spotless to be stained.

With regard to Macarius and his followers, the Pope had up till then not been able to effect much.

The definitions of the Sixth General Council were practically the death-knell of Monothelism. The names of the heretical patriarchs from Sergius to Peter were removed from the diptychs, and their portraits from wherever they were to be found either in the churches or in the public places. Deprived of State support, and receiving no encouragement from the higher clergy, Monothelism soon "died the death"; for its attempted revival by the Emperor Philippicus partook of the ephemeral nature of the reign of that prince.

What caused the emperor's proposed 'conference' to become an ecumenical council is not known. Perhaps it was because it was found that deputies from all the five great patriarchal Sees had arrived in Constantinople, and it was felt that the decisions of a general council would put an end to the 'one-will' heresy at once.

The Pope's legates at Constantinople were successful in their mission not only from a doctrinal, but also from a temporal point of view. They induced Constantine to lessen the tax the popes had to pay at their ordination—an impost first levied by the Gothic kings. He also did away with the delegated power by which the exarchs of Ravenna had confirmed the papal elections, again reserving that right to the emperors. He even waived that right later on. It must not be forgotten, however, that, as already noticed, the exact meaning of this decree is not established. Those who believe that papal confirmation by the exarch did not begin till the time of John V (685), hold that this decree of Constantine simply proclaims that, while he remitted the money payment for the imperial ratification, he made it clear that he only did so on the understanding

that there was to be no alteration in the ancient custom of seeking for imperial assent to the election.

In the history of the intermittent struggle of the Archbishops of Ravenna for increased independence, we read that Theodore (677-691) followed in the footsteps of his immediate predecessor (Reparatus), submitted to the Pope Agatho, and assisted at the Roman council of 680. We are assured by Agnellus, the episcopal historian of his predecessors in the See of Ravenna, that Theodore made an arrangement with Pope Leo II (682), that the archbishops of Ravenna were not to be obliged to stay in Rome more than eight days at the time of their consecration, nor to come to Rome themselves afterwards, but were each year to send one of their priests to do homage to the Pope. However, it was during the same pontificate that Constantine Pogonatus decreed the restoring of the Church of Ravenna to subjection to the See of Rome, and that the archbishop elect should, in accordance with ancient custom, go to Rome to be ordained. And the Pope himself decreed that the anniversary of Maurus, the first rebellious archbishop of Ravenna, should not be observed. For a time we shall hear no more, after St. Leo II, of the autonomy of Ravenna.

The *Book of the Popes,* after telling us that Agatho gave a large sum for lights for the churches of the apostles and St. Mary Major, adds that he was buried in St. Peter's, January 10,681. A fearsome plague had devastated Rome during the summer of 680, and it is possible that Agatho may have died from its effects, direct or indirect. He is depicted on a painting (which Gregorovius assigns to the fifteenth century) on the walls of St. Peter ad Vincula, as taking part in a procession for the cessation of the pestilence.

ST. LEO II.

A.D. 682-683

EMPEROR.

POGONATUS, 668-685.

KING.

PERCTARIT, 672-688.

EXARCH.

THEODORE, 677-687.

ST. LEO II, like his predecessor, a Sicilian by birth, and the son of a certain Paul, though elected, according to custom, soon after the death of Agatho, was not consecrated till August 17, 682, an interval of 584 days. Probably the business of the Sixth General Council and the negotiations carried on by the papal legates to obtain freedom from imperial *confirmation were* the causes of the emperor not confirming the election in good time. The *Book of the Popes* has bestowed a very beautiful character on this Pontiff. It depicts him as a man of learning, great eloquence, as possessed of a good knowledge of the Scriptures, as well versed in Greek and Latin, and in the theory and practice of music. Not only was he learned himself, but he was an earnest teacher of others, and he was at once a preacher and a doer of good works. For he was a lover of poverty and the poor. In a word, he was both pious and hard working. The fact that Leo is praised for his knowledge of Greek is a further proof not only that it was no longer the common possession of 'society' in Rome, as it was in the days of Rome's power, but that individual knowledge of it was becoming rare in the West. The barbarians on the one hand, and religious differences on the other, were rapidly severing the last bonds that united the Latin-speaking portion of the empire with the Greek. We have already seen different popes complaining of the difficulty of getting Greek documents translated. The time was approaching when almost all knowledge of it was to be lost in the West.

On his election, Leo wrote to the emperor, probably to notify his election and to ask the imperial confirmation. As we saw under Pope Agatho, Constantine wrote to the Pope—his letter is dated December 13,681—and sent him, along with the letter, his approval (dated December 23, 681) of the Sixth General Council. The legates of Pope Agatho, who were to be the bearers of these letters to his successor, would seem to have spent the winter at Constantinople. At any rate they did not reach Rome till July 682. After his consecration in the following month, Leo sent off to the emperor his confirmation of the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council some time before the end

of the year 682. He then took steps to have thedecrees of the council published throughout the West, there are still extant four of his letters which he sent into Spain by the notary Peter. One was addressed to the Spanish bishops in general, another to Bishop Quiricus, one again to King Ervig (though some MSS. ascribe this letter to Benedict II), and another to Count Simplicius,

These four letters are practically all to the same effect. Leo knows that those to whom he is writing are anxious about the purity of the faith, for which the apostolic See, the mother of all the churches, has ever toiled, and for which it would be ready to suffer the last extremities rather than see it defiled. He then tells of the doings of the council at Constantinople, at which there were bishops from all the world, what was defined and who were condemned. He explains most carefully that Honorius was condemned for not at once extinguishing the flames of heresy, as became his apostolical authority, but for rather fanning them by carelessness. He sends the 'definitions' of the council and one or two of the letters in connection with the council; that is, such portions of the acts as had up to that time been translated into Latin, In his letter to the bishops he exhorts them to subscribe the decrees of the synod.

The result of these letters was the fourteenth council of Toledo, which met in November 684, and which heartily accepted the faith of the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

Mention has already been made of how Leo obtained from Constantine the revocation of the decree of Constans II, making the bishops of Ravenna "autocephalous".

Before speaking of the Pope's death, mention has now only to be made of the fact that he dedicated (February 22, 683) to St Paul a church, which he built near that of St. Bibiana, and in which he placed the relics of many martyrs. He also built, near the 'velum aureum', a church which he dedicated to SS. Sebastian and George—the Church of St. George in Velabro, a church of great interest to Englishmen, as it was the titular church of the late venerated Cardinal Newman. It is close to the arch of Janus Quadrifrons and the Cloaca Maxima. "The building of Leo II (the entrance hall is of later date) still preserves its original outlines, and is a small basilica of three naves, with sixteen ancient granite or marble columns. Scarcely any other church within the city is so pervaded by the atmosphere of early Christian times. The original form of the church—that of a basilica—its simplicity, its sculptures, its inscriptions, some of them in Greek, dating from the first centuries of Christianity, its air of spell-bound tranquility, its situation in the valley between the Capitol and the Palatine, hallowed by so many historic associations, combine to form a powerful impression on the mind of the beholder!"

Leo was buried in St. Peter's, July 3, 683. According to Butler, he is commemorated as a saint in the Roman and other martyrologies on the 28th of June. For on that day his body was translated (688) into the church proper of St. Peter.

ST. BENEDICT II

A.D. 684-685.

EMPEROR.

POGONATUS, 668-685.

KING.

PERCTARIT, 672-688.

EXARCH.

THEODORE, 677-687.

AFTER another long interval—over eleven months—Benedict II, a Roman, the son of one John, was consecrated June 26, 684. He had served the Church from his infancy, and both as a youth and a priest, says his biographer, had shown himself worthy of his name. For in him abounded the grace of heavenly 'benediction'. Like his predecessor he was skilled in the sacred Scriptures and in music. He was also a lover of poverty, humble and gentle, patient and generous. What matter for regret that the pontiffs of this period, with the charming characters which history has handed them down as possessing, should have reigned for such short periods, and that the records of their deeds should occupy such little space in the world's history!

Mention has already been made of the formalities whichpreceded the consecration of a pope in the days when imperial confirmation, direct, or indirect through the exarch, had to be awaited before the consecration could take place. The formulas used for the dispatch of the necessary business in connection with the affair were given at the same time.

The 'liberation' decree of Constantine the Bearded necessitated the drawing up of fresh formulas. It was, of course, necessary to send information to the emperor as to the result of the papal elections, even if his consent to the papal consecration had now no longer to be asked. Hence in the *Liber Diurnus* we find another set of *forms* (82-85) in connection with the election of a new pope. In the construction of the new *forms* the old ones were not unnaturally brought into requisition. Consequently many portions of the new productions are like the old ones. There is, however, this important difference between the two sets. There is no request for confirmation in the new *forms.* Many of the phrases of these new forms point to the conclusion that they were drawn up for Benedict II. The Sixth General Council (681) is alluded to as recently over; and

Constantine (IV) the Bearded (*d.* September 685) is still spoken of in them as alive. We may suppose that these formulas were in use to proclaim the election of the new pope till the compact of 817 between the Papacy and the new empire in the West.

The first of the formulas is described as *Decretum Pontificis.* It is the decree of election which, duly signed by *N.*, humble priest of the Holy Roman Church, and all the clergy, nobility and soldiery (or honorable citizens), was deposited in the archives of the Lateran. After a preamble about the goodness of God in turning their sorrow for the death of their late pastor into joy for the new one He has given them, the decree records how, after long prayers for heavenly guidance, all met together, and, on account of his merits, unanimously elected the deacon (Benedict).

Before his consecration the new Pope-elect made a public profession of faith—*Indiculum Pontificis,* formula 83. He declared that even to death would he guard the faith given by Jesus Christ, and handed down to him by the successors of St. Peter. He professed his adhesion to the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, and the other doctrines of God's Church, as they have been unfoldedby the ecumenical councils, the constitutions of the popes, and the writings of the approved fathersof the Church. With the other general councils he acknowledged the sixth, latelycalled together by his predecessor Agatho, under the Emperor Constantine "of pious memory". Particularly would he stand by the decrees of his predecessors; preserve the discipline, rites and goods of the Church, and never alter the *tradition* he had received from those who had gone before him. The profession was signed with his own hand by the Pope-elect.

When consecrated, the new Pope announced (form. 84) his accession "to the whole people of God, his most reverend brethren and most well-beloved children". He would beg the prayers of all to assist his unworthiness, would guard the faith (which is professed at considerable length), and condemn those whom the councils had condemned, viz., Sergius, Paul, etc., "along with Honorius, who gave encouragement to their profane doctrines". A copy of this public profession of his faith, also signed by the Pope's own hand, was deposited in the *confession* of St. Peter.

The last of the formulas in question (85) takes the form of a homily addressed by the Pope to the faithful assembled in St. Peter's on the day of his consecration. After an exhortation to Christian peace, it concludes with a profession of faith, like those of the preceding formulas, and with prayers for the prosperity of the empire.

As no Spanish bishops had been present at the Roman council under Pope Agatho, we saw how earnest Pope Leo II was to inform them of the definitions of the Sixth General Council, and to secure their adhesion to them. St. Benedict followed in his footsteps, and one of his first acts, though only "a priest, and in God's name the elect of the Holy See", was to send a letter to the notary Peter, urging him to fulfill to the best of his ability the commands of St. Leo, "and procure with all zeal the subscriptions of the bishops to the decisions of the Council". Whether or not in consequence of greater activity on Peter's part King Ervig summoned the fourteenth council of Toledo (November 684). The council discussed the business for which, in accordance with the papal letters, they had been assembled. Monothelism was condemned. St. Julian, the Archbishop of Toledo, who presided at the council, drew up in its name and sent to the

Pope an “Apology” of their faith. It was sent to Rome by the notary Peter, and consisted of four parts. The document itself is now lost. Benedict was not satisfied with some of the phrases used by the Spanish bishops in their “Apology”. He did not care for the expression: “will begot will”, or that there were “three substances in Christ” and he accordingly sent back the “Apology” for revision. At another council of Toledo (the fifteenth), at which both bishops and nobles took part, and which met May 11, 688, the Spanish bishops defended the expressions the Pope had complained of. They explained them in an orthodox sense, and urged that similar phrases were used by the fathers. And, nettled apparently at being considered heterodox even in language, they concluded their defence of their first “Apology” with the tart remark that they would not dispute with any who chose to dissent from their doctrine, founded as it was on that of the fathers; and that if their doctrine seemed objectionable to ignorant rivals, it would seem, they *modestly* add, “sublime” to lovers of truth! However, St. Julian drew up a second Apology and sent it to Rome in charge of some very learned men. This was accepted as orthodox by Pope Sergius.

This Pope seems to have had as good an understanding with Constantine the Bearded as his predecessors. Heobtained a decree from that just prince that the Pope-elect might be consecrated at once, without having to wait for any imperial confirmation.

It has already been noted that the question with regard to the confirmation of papal elections by emperor or exarch is a most complicated one. The meaning of this decree of 684 or 5 is, as previously stated, disputed. According to some, in doing away with confirmation by the emperor it substituted that by the exarch, while others contend that by it all necessity of applying to any secular authority for confirmation was abrogated. Certainly that is the more obvious meaning of the decree, and is the one maintained by those who hold that the exarch had confirmed papal elections before the year 684. The supporters of this view, however, have further to suppose either that this decree was modified almost immediately after its publication, or that, when in the *Book of the Popes* there is mention in the life of Conon (687) of acustomary deputation to the exarch after Conon's election, it is only meant that thereby official notice of the accession of the new Pope was given to the imperial government. While, therefore, it is clear that the decree of Constantine effected some change in the existing custom as to imperial confirmation of papal elections, the reader must decide for himself what he supposes that custom to have been.

Whether we consider the princes who arrogate to themselves this right of confirming the election of the popes or the candidates for the sacred office of supreme pastor of Christendom, it must be confessed that, generally speaking, the interference of the secular power in these elections can only be fraught with evil; and this, if only on the general principle of the detrimental effect produced on any business or corporate body when outside influence can be brought to bear unduly on its concerns or deliberations. The door is at once opened to bribery and corruption of all sorts. Certainly the history of the Church has proved this abundantly. When secular influence in the papal elections has been greatest, the rulers of the Church have been the most indifferent. The Papacy was never at a lower ebb than it was in the tenth century, and the interference of the powerful in papal affairs never greater.

Constantine gave the Pope another proof of his regard for him. He would have the Pope adopt his two sons,Justinian and Heraclius. This he effected by sending locks of their hairto the Pope, who receivedthem in State accompanied by the clergy and the army, *ie.,* the commanders of the army. In the early Middle Ages, it was the custom that those who first cut the hair of children, or to whom such first-cut tresses were sent, adopted the said children. Muratori thinks that this act would also signify the submission and obedience which kings professed towards the successors of St. Peter, after the manner of slaves, whose hair used to be cut. And he quotes the famous Anastasius, who tells of a king of the Bulgarians, in his devotion to the Holy See, with his own hand cutting off his hair and handing it to the legates of the Pope, saying : "Know ye, nobles and people of Bulgaria, that from this day forth I am the servant, after God, of Blessed Peter and his vicar!".

It may be remembered that Pope St Leo II failed to make any impression on Macarius of Antioch and his heterodox views. On the death of Theophanes (685?), who was appointed to fill the See of Antioch in place of Macarius, Benedict made an effort to induce the heretical bishop to subscribe to the orthodox faith, with a view of having him restored to his See. For forty days the Pope caused Macarius to be visited by one of his special advisers. But Macarius died, as he had lived, in obstinate heresy.

A brief list of this Pope's church restorations may be read in the *Liber Pontificalis.* He was very good to the clergy. The *Book of the Popes* notes three classes who received the last dying gifts of the Pope, viz., the various orders of the secular clergy, the monasteries which were deaconries and the *mansionarii* or lay sacristans. From the letters of Gregory the Great, it is clear that there were deaconries not only in Rome but in other cities as well, and that their object was to distribute corn and other necessaries of life to the needy and to look after the poor generally. Evidently some at least of the deaconries were monasteries, and some of them were presided over by monks. The one who presided over the deaconry was known as its *dispensator;* and so the recent (1900-1) excavations in the forum have brought to light an inscription of one Theodotus, *primicerius defensorurn,* and *dispensator* of the deaconry of St. Maria Antiqua. Whether or not there was at this period more than one deaconry to each region is not known. Under Hadrian I (772-795) two more were added to the sixteen he found already in existence, scattered, in irregular proportion, throughout the different regions.

After then, in accordance with custom, bestowing various favors on the clergy on Easter Day, March 26, of 685, he fell ill, and died a short time after. He was buried (May 8, 685)2 in St. Peter's.

His epitaph ran as follows (Duchesne, *L. P.,* i. 365).

Magna tuis, Benedicte pater, monumenta relinquis

Virtutum titulos, O decus atque dolor!

Fulguris in specimen mentis splendore coruscas

Plura sed exiguo tempore coepta fluunt.

Cuncta sacerdotum praestantia munia comples

Et quo quisque bono claruit unus habes.

Quippe quod a parvo meritis radiantibus auctus

Jure patrum solium pontificale foves.

Non hoc ambitio rapti tibi praestat honoris

Indolis est fructus quam comitatur honos.

Et quia sollerter Christi regis agmina pastor

Percipe salvati praemia celsa gregis.

The *jure patrum* would seem to imply that it was after passing regularly through the various degrees of the clerical state that he at length reached the rank of supreme pontiff.

JOHN V.

A.D. 685-686.

EMPEROR.

POGONATUS, 668-685.

KING.

PERCTARIT, 672-688.

EXARCH.

THEODORE, 677-687.

NOTHING very important marks the reign of John, the Syrian, of the province of Antioch, the son of Cyriacus. As a deacon he was one of those who represented the See of Rome at the Sixth General Council. Elected some time between May and the close of July, he was consecrated (July 23, 685) by the bishops of the same three Sees that consecrated his predecessor—*viz.*, Portus, Ostia and *Velitres*. We may suppose for the same reason, viz., the vacancy of the See of Albano. In his election there was, as the *Liber Pontificalis* expressly informs us, a reversion to the earlier mode of proceeding in the matter of electing the popes. Elected by the people 'at large' in the Church of St. John Lateran, John was thence taken to the adjoining palace and enthroned *at once*, without having to wait for any imperial confirmation. This was, of course, in virtue of the decree of Constantine just obtained by Benedict II; though, as we have seen, not a few authors of repute hold that his election had been confirmed by the exarch in the emperor's stead.

John V is set down by his biographer as a man of great energy and learning, but withal as a very moderate man. This last exceptional good quality may account, to some extent at any rate, for the success of John's dealings with the Emperor Constantine. His biographer attributes to his exertions, while at Constantinople, the obtaining of imperial rescripts from Constantine, by which the taxes that had to be paid by the 'patrimonies' of the Church in Sicily and Calabria, and other imposts that weighed very heavily on the See of Rome, were reduced.

The step of the greatest moment taken by this Pope, at least so far as history has recorded his doings, was his action in bringing back the Church of Sardinia to his direct jurisdiction. This direct jurisdiction the popes had handed over, at least to some extent, to the archiepiscopal See of Cagliari. Pope Martin I had, however, to withdraw this concession, as it was being abused. Notwithstanding this, Citonatus, the Archbishop of

Cagliari, without asking any permission of the Pope, calmly consecrated Novellus for the See of Torres (Turris Libisonis, now Porto di Torre). To this insolence the Pope replied by summoning a council, and by a special bull, which in the days of the Pope's biographer was still to be found in the archives of the Roman Church, placed Novellus under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See.

After a long illness, and so severe a one that he could scarce perform the customary ordinations, Pope John died in 686, and was buried in St. Peter's (August 2).

From the short reigns of the popes of this period, we can only conclude that it must have been usual then to elect very old men. Indeed, the age of Conon and Severinus is especially mentioned, as are the great infirmities of Agatho, John, etc. And if there is any truth in the conjecture of some, that Pope Agatho was no other than the Agatho about whom Pope St. Gregory I wrote to Urbicus, the abbot of the monastery of St. Hermes at Palermo, he must, as we have already noted, have been a centenarian when he became pope.

In John's epitaph, of which we quote a few lines, hisposition at the Sixth General Council as Agatho's legate is commemorated.

Hic et in extremis sellers fidusque minister

Claruit et primus jure levita fuit.

Missus ad imperium vice praesulis extitit auctor,

Hunc memorant synodus pontificisque tomus.

CONON.

A.D. 686-687.

EMPEROR.

POGONATUS, 668-685.

KING.

PERCTARIT, 672-688.

EXARCH.

THEODORE, 677-687.

ON the death of John V there was disunion among the electors on the question of his successor. The clergy favored the archpriest Peter, the army the priest Theodore. As the gates of the Lateran basilica were in the hands of the soldiers, the clergy had to meet outside that noble church. The leaders of the army held their assemblies in the curious circular church of St. Stephen, with its very striking, if not very beautiful, frescoes. After message after message had passed to no purpose between the two parties, the clergy at length, entering the Lateran palace, unanimously elected Conon. The grey hairs and the angelic beauty of Conon, combined with the well-known beauty of his character—his candor, his simplicity, his piety, his freedom from secular concerns—produced a powerful impression. The judges and the military commanders at once recognized Conon, and offered the usual salutation and acclamation. Some think that Conon was a soldier's son, and that this had some weight in the eyes of the military. They suppose that the remark of Anastasius, that Conon was "oriundus ex patre Thraceseo", does not mean that he was born in Thrace, or that his father's name was Thraceseus, but that he was a son of an officer of the Thracesian troop. Wherever he was born, Conon had been educated in Sicily. He afterwards came to Rome and was ordained priest.

When the rank and file of the army saw the unanimity of the clergy and their own leaders, they also acknowledged Conon after a delay of a few days. Then, in conjunction with the 'clergy and people', they sent off to the exarch Theodore notice of the election of Conon 'according to custom'.

As to the meaning of these words of the *Book of the Popes*, enough has already been said. It may therefore suffice to remind the reader that those who believe that Constantine Pogonatus gave absolute freedom of choice to the electors of the popes think that this notice in the life of Conon merely signifies that official documents were sent to the exarch, as the emperor's representative, to let him know who the new pope

was. The opponents of this view maintain, on the contrary, that the documents were sent to seek for the exarch's confirmation of the election. Certain it is, at any rate, that the interval between the election and consecration of a pope now becomes uniformly shorter than before, and that Conon was consecrated October 21, 686.

Mention has already been made of the mode of electing the popes from the third to the ninth century, and of those who had the right of election. It was then stated that throughout those ages the right of electing the popes lay with the clergy and people. However, as at this period there is frequent mention of the 'army' as a sort of third electing body, it will be convenient here to add a few more remarks on the same subjects. We are of opinion that the distinction between the ''army' and the 'people', at the period of which we are now treating, is more apparent than real. Just as in the days of the Roman republic, the 'people', except the youths and old men, were the 'army'. During the 'Decline' of the empire the Roman 'people', by the wholesale introduction of conquered nations into the forces of the empire, and the disinclination of ''Roman citizens' to serve in the army, became a class quite separate from an army composed, for the most part, of foreigners. Hence in the first centuries the popes were said to be elected by the clergy and people. After the 'Fall' of the empire, the inhabitants of Rome—Romans we cannot now call them—had to look to themselves for protection against enemies from without. The emperors at Constantinople were unable to send troops for the protection of the old capital of the Roman empire. Consequently the 'people' of Rome had again to become soldiers, and by the close of the seventh century it would seem that 'the people', 'the citizens'were completely organized; and, with the universal exception of youths and old men, were all soldiers, were the 'army'. Hence in the *Liber Pontificalis* mention is made sometimes (generally indeed from the close of the seventh century) of the 'clergy, army and people', and sometimes of the 'clergy and army'. After what has been said as a proviso, it may be correct to speak of the 'three electoral bodies' that took part in papal elections in the earlier Middle Ages. From all this, it may be concluded with Mabillon, that the order of electing and consecrating the popes before the eleventh century was as follows. First they were elected by the clergy; then followed the salutation and acclamation of the judges and nobles, the consent of the army, and, in fine, before the decree of Constantine IV, the subscription of all to the notice of the election, which was sent to the emperor (or, for a time, to the exarch) for confirmation. When the election was confirmed, the Pope-elect was consecrated in the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, and enthroned in the Lateran basilica. In some cases, however, the enthronization preceded the consecration.

This Pope received an imperial rescript of Justinian II, writes Anastasius, in which the emperor says that he has recovered the acts, i.e., the original copies, of the Sixth General Council. This letter is still extant in a poor, scarcely intelligible Latin translation, and was addressed to Pope John V, though dated February 17, 687, a circumstance which may be used to show once again how slowly at times news travelled to Constantinople. "We have learnt", runs the rescript, "that the acts (viz., the original copies) of the Sixth Ecumenical Synod have been sent back to some of our Judges who had lent them. We had not indeed imagined that anyone would be bold enough to keep possession of them, without our consent, for God, of His abundant mercy, has made us the guardians of the immaculate faith of Christ". The rescript adds

that the emperor summoned together the patriarchs, the papal apocrisiarius, the metropolitans and bishops who were staying in the city, the senate, and various State officials and officers of the various army corps, stationed in different parts of the empire. Then he (the emperor) caused the copies of the council to be read before them, and then caused all to sign them. The documents were then handed over to the emperor's care, that "it might never be in the power of those who do not fear God, to corrupt or change them". This decree had been sent to the Pope, that he might know what was being done.

This imperial letter is particularly interesting as showing the great care taken by the ancients to preserve intact the decrees of the general councils.

It would almost seem as if, for a time at least, some of his father's good feeling for the Roman See must have found its way into the rude breast of Justinian. For, by two decrees, he remitted two hundred measuresof corn which the 'rectors'of the 'patrimony' in Bruttium and Lucania had to pay every year; and he ordered the serfs belonging to the same patrimonyand of Sicily, and who were held in pledge by the military, to be restored. Duchesne observes that this patrimony is not expressly mentioned in the letters of St. Gregory I. But it is clear from several of them that the notary Peter and the sub-deacon Sabinus, who are spoken of in these letters, or to whom they were actually addressed, were evidently 'rectors' of a 'patrimony' in those parts.

Age, it appears, does not always bring that experience and prudence which is looked for from it. And so we read in Anastasius of the aged Conon neglecting to follow the safe custom of taking advice of the clergy; being deceived by designing men; appointing, in spite of the opposition of his counselors, a certain Constantine, a deacon of the church of Syracuse, as 'rector' of the important 'patrimony' of Sicily, and granting him an exceptional privilege, viz., the use of the coveted 'mappulum'(horse trappings or cloth) for riding. But it was not long before this 'sly and wicked man' got into trouble. His extortions raised seditions, and the governor of the province had to step in and send Constantine to prison. "So dangerous is it", moralizes Pagi, "for popes and bishops, without taking counsel, to promote to ecclesiastical offices and dignities men who have not been sufficiently tried".

If Conon got no glory from the deacon Constantine, the same cannot be said of his connection with St. Kilian and his companions. At the time when Conon mounted the Throne of the Fisherman, most of Germany was still pagan, especially in the North. Round about the Rhine, through the action of the Franks, who had accepted Christianity in the course of the preceding century, there were Christians, as there were, too, in the countries Helvetia, Noricum, Rhoetia, south of the Danube—the remains of the Christian churches which were there when the frontier of the Roman empire was the Danube itself. And no doubt in other parts of Germany there were Christians also, but isolated, and in many cases infected with pagan superstitions or with the Arian heresy. But throughout the seventh century missionaries from the Franks, Irish, and Anglo-Saxons brought the faith of Christ to different parts of Germany, and, particularly in its southern half, undermined the power of paganism.

About the year 685 there arrived at Herbipolis, now Wurzburg on the Maine, in Franconia, a band of missionaries, among whom were SS. Kilian and Colman, priests,

and Totnan, a deacon. They were a division of that great company of missionaries who left Ireland in the century of the greatest glory of the Church in that country (the seventh), and overran the continent of Europe, spreading everywhere the hope-kindling faith of Christ. When the saint and his companions arrived in Franconia among the Eastern Franks, his biographer, who seems to have lived about the end of the ninth century, tells how Kilian was greatly struck by the beauty of the country and its inhabitants, but correspondingly saddened by the reflection that they were in the power of "the old enemy".

"My brothers", said he, "you see how charming is this land, and how fair its people, in error though they are. If you think it well, let us do as we decided whilst at home! Let us go to Rome and visit the thresholdof the Prince of the Apostles. Let us present ourselves before the Blessed Pope John; and then, with the advice and leave of the Apostolic See, let us return here and preach the faith". To this exhortation all agreed, and betook themselves to Rome to obtain the Pope's sanction that they might preach the Gospel with authority. Arrived in Rome, they found that John V, whom they had set out to see, was dead. They were, however, most kindly received by the venerable Conon, who ordained Kilian bishop, without assigning him any particular See. Armed with the papal permission to preach and teach, back to Wurzburg returned this noble band, feeling strong in the mission that Christ's vicar had imparted to them. Great success attended their efforts, and the Duke of Franconia himself, Gosbert, was baptized. But when Geilana, whom Gosbert had taken to wife, though she was the widow of his deceased brother, learnt that Gosbert was preparing to dismiss her at the exhortation of the missionaries, she had them secretly slain in 689. But the work of conversion went steadily on under the son and successor of Gosbert, and in later times the descendants of Kilian's converts venerated his relics. For his biographer tells how his sacred remains were translated to an honorable place by the joint action of St. Boniface and Burchard, first bishop of Wurzburg, and at the command of Pope Zachary.

After a long illness, which was so severe as almost to prevent him from holding the usual episcopal ordinations— a trial which is also related to have befallen his predecessor John V—Conon died and was buried in St. Peter's, September 21 (22 according to Jaffe), 687. The donation to the clergy, which, to the same amount as his predecessor, Conon had set aside for them, we shall see, in the life of his successor, they never got.

ST. SERGIUS I

A.D. 687-701

EMPERORS.

JUSTINIAN II, 685-695 (first time).

LEONTIUS, 695-698.

TIBERIUS III (Apsimar), 698-705.

KINGS.

PECTARIT, 672-688.

CUNINCPERT, 688-700.

ARIPERT II, 700-712.

EXARCH.

JOHN PLATYN, 687-702.

AGAIN we have to chronicle election troubles. Menthere will ever be whom the hope of 'thirty pieces ofsilver' will lure on to sell their friends, their country and their God. And, on the other hand, the temptation to offer bribe is much intensified by the known willingness of the person to be gained over to accept it. The subsequent conduct of the exarch John Platyn will show that he was a man with an 'itching palm'. All this thearchdeacon Pascal understood well. While Cononwaslying on his death-bed, Pascal sent off to the exarch topromise him money, if he would secure his election as Conon's successor. Gold was bait enough for Platyn. Instructions were at once issued by him to the 'judges' he had appointed in Rome, to make order that Pascal should be the next Pope. Through their efforts Pascal was accordingly elected by a certain section of the people. It would seem, however, that he was not the first candidate in the field. Whether Pascal's proceedings during Conon's lifetime had been discovered, and good men were anxious to thwart them, or simply because the party that had elected the archdeacon Theodore, before Conon's election, were faithful to him, and very wishful that he, now archpriest, should be Pope—at any rate, a party elected Theodore. From the fact that his party occupied the *interior* section of the Lateran palace, where were the Pope's private apartments, it may perchance be inferred that Theodore was first elected. Pascal held the 'exterior' portion of the palace. To explain these terms 'interior and exterior', we may cite the following from Duchesne. The Lateran palace was divided into two groups of buildings. The one to the west occupied more or less the site of the modern palace; the

one to the east, beginning at the facade of St. John Lateran, extended to the existing 'Sancta Sanctorum'. On the north this latter range of buildings projected beyond the former; and on the north facade of this more easterly group, towards its northwest corner, was the grand entrance staircase. Now Theodore had 'the interior portion', *i.e.*, the left of the grand staircase; Pascal, the right of the staircase, *i.e.*, the site of the modern palace, embracing the oratory of St Silvester and the Julian basilica, and which abutted on the nave of the great Lateran basilica.

To put an end to the deadlock produced by the obstinate refusal of both candidates to yield their pretensions, the least factious, and consequently more numerous and sounder portion of the community, met together in the palace of the emperors, and, after much discussion, chose a third candidate in the person of the priest Sergius. They first took him into an oratory (that of St Cesarius M.) in the imperial palace, and then by force established him in the Lateran palace. The archpriest Theodore at once submitted and did homage to Sergius; and Pascal was made to do likewise. No sooner, however, was Pascal left to himself than he spared no promises of money to induce the exarch to come quickly and secretly to Rome. Quite unexpectedly, accordingly, Platyn arrived in Rome. So secretly did he come, that the usual procession, with crosses and standards, which went out of the city some distance to greet the exarch on his coming to Rome, was only able in this instance to get just outside the city by the time Platyn was upon it. And though he did not feel himself strong enough to set at naught the wishes of the people at large in their choice of Sergius, he insisted that the100 lbs. of gold promised him by Pascal, should be paid by Sergius. It was to no purpose that Sergius declared that he had given no such undertaking, and that he had not the money to give. The exarch would have his bond. As a guarantee that the sum should be ultimately paid, Sergius offered to pledge the 'canthari' and crowns which for ages had hung before the altar and confession of St, Peter. In vain, Platyn would have his pound of flesh, no more or no less. And not until the money was actually raised and paid over would the exarch permit Sergius to be consecrated (December 15, 687).

Not long after, for certain magical practices, Pascal was deprived of his archdeaconate, and shut up in a monastery, where he died impenitent in 692 or 693.

The priest that picked out like a brand from the burning to rule the Church of God was a Syrian of Antioch. His father, Tiberius, had apparently emigrated to Sicily, perhaps in consequence of the Mohammedan incursions; and Sergius was educated at Palermo. Coming to Rome he was received into the ranks of the Roman clergy by Pope Adeodatus. And, because he was zealous and clever at music, he was handed over for training to the 'head cantor'. At that time he must have reached man's estate, as he became Pope about sixteen years after his arrival from Sicily. And though the 'schola cantorum' was at this period reserved for youths in the *minor orders*, it is supposed that the phrase in the *Book of the Popes* just quoted means that Sergius was attached to that school. He was at length ordained priest (June 27, 683) by Leo II, for the 'title' (Church) of St, Susanna 'ad duas domos' on the Quirinal. Whilst a priest he was distinguished by his love for saying Mass in the catacombs. For in this century pious interest in these cemeteries of the early Christians seems to have fallen off considerably.

Passing over his reception (688) of St. Julian's secondapology on the orthodoxy of certain phrases used by thefourteenth council of Toledo, we will review in succession his relations with this country. Sometime in the latter half of 688, Caedwalla, 'the strong-armed', the powerful king of the West Saxons, "quitted his rule for the sake of Our Lord and His everlasting kingdom", and went, the first of our royal pilgrims, to the successors of St. Peter, to Rome to be baptized "in the church of the apostles". His conversion was one of the results of the indefatigable exertions of St. Wilfrid. Arrived in Rome, he was baptized by the Pope, taking, "at Father Sergius' word", the name of Peter (April 10, 689). And while "still in his white garments", he fell ill and died (April 20); thereby having had fulfilled for him his wish of immediately passing to the joys of heaven in his baptismal innocence. We can only imagine the interest and joy with which Sergius looked on this barbarian prince, whom religion had changed so rapidly from a revengeful warrior into a gentle and tender follower of the crucified Lamb of God. The Pope ordered the remains of the royal convert to be buried in St. Peter's, and an epitaph to be placed over his tomb, so that men might be induced to be imitators of his virtue.

Sergius was one of the many popes who favored St. Wilfrid in his long struggle against the 'Celtic customs'. And he supported him, not only by ordering that his dignity should be restored to him, but by approving of Brithwald as St Theodore's successor in the See of Canterbury. For Brithwald showed himself a friend to Wilfrid. In the new archbishop's behalf the Pope wrote two letters. The first was addressed to "Ethelred, Alfrid and Aldulf, kings of the Angles". In it Sergius bids them rejoice that the first of the apostles and the most firm rock of the faith, Peter, is mindful of them, and bids them gladly receive Bishop Brithwald, the primate of all Britain, bestowed on them by his (St. Peter's) authority. In his letter to all the bishops of Britain, Sergius rejoices in the good repute in which they are, informs them that Brithwald has, on account of his merits, obtained from him, that is from Blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the primacy of all the churches of Britain, and exhorts them to receive and obey their new primate as they would the Pope himself.

Among the many Englishmen who went to Rome inthe days of Pope Sergius were certain monks of the monasteries of SS. Peter and Paul of Wearmouth. They had been sent by their abbot, the wise and energetic Ceolfrid, to obtain a charter of privilege for his double monastery, such as Benedict Biscop had obtained from Pope Agatho. Doubtless from these monks Sergius would hear more particulars of the great learning of their fellow-monk, Bede. At the mention of the name of this noble Englishman, the glory of the Saxon Church, and the most enlightened man in Europe in his day, which of his countrymen does not feel a glow of just national pride? And what English writer, when he has occasion to mention his name, but feels a strong temptation to leave his subject and dilate on the transcendent merits of this simple northern monk? We must, however, resist our inclinations and refer our readers for information regarding him to any of the historians of England. For whatever their religious belief, one and all have a good word for Bede, the father of English History. The enthusiasm which, after the lapse of so many centuries, the name of Bede arouses in Englishmen today was apparently felt by his contemporary Pope Sergius. At any rate, William of Malmesbury has preserved for us a letter, addressed by Pope Sergius (about the year 701) to abbot Ceolfrid, in which he asks him to send Bede to Rome, so that he (Sergius) may consult

with Bede. That Bede, however, never went to Rome seems certain, as he himself tells us that he never left his monastery. But there does not seem sufficient reason to doubt with some that he was summoned there. Possibly the reason why Bede remained at home was that the Pope who summoned him died very soon after sending off the letter to Ceolfrid. In his letter to the abbot, Sergius says that certain difficult questions have arisen, and he is in need of learned men to aid him in looking into them; and therefore he asks Ceolfrid to send him without delay "that religious servant of God, Bede, a priest of your monastery". The Pope undertakes that Bede shall return as soon as the business is finished for which he was summoned, and points out that what Bede may do for the Church will redound to the credit of the monastery. Some have doubted of the authenticity of this letter, because in a copy of it that is older than the work of Malmesbury the name of Bede is not found, but the letter N in its stead. All, however, that that proves is that the one who transcribed the letter could not clearly make out the copy he had before him. And as Bede's name is found not only in Malmesbury, but in a MS. copy of the whole letter, of which Malmesbury only professes to give us extracts, we find the letter now accepted by such an authority as Jaffé. Hence if Bede did not go to Rome, he was probably summoned there.

From the number of distinguished Englishmen who went to Rome in his time, it may be argued that Sergius must have been one of the many popes who have had and displayed great love for this country. Among the rest who visited Pope Sergius was the most popular Englishman, not only of his own time, but of many succeeding years, the abbot Aldhelm, afterwards Bishop, of Sherburne, and the practical founder of Malmesbury Abbey. The present abbey church of Malmesbury, which, partly in ruins and partly in use, does so much to deepen the old-world aspect of that quaint old Wiltshire town, well typifies, with its massive yet comely Norman pillars, the strong, yet most attractive character of the monk Aldhelm. Having obtained large grants of land for his monastery from the kings of Mercia and Wessex, he went, with their consent, to Rome to obtain from Pope Sergius a charter of privilege for his beloved abbey. William of Malmesbury tells us with pride how well Aldhelm was received by the Pope, who made the abbot stay with him in the Lateran palace, and was delighted to find in the Anglo-Saxon as well learning as piety. Charmed with his virtue, Sergius made no difficulty in granting Aldhelm (about 701) a brief, placing his monasteries of Malmesbury and Frome under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome.

The love and respect for the See of Peter with which our forefathers were animated, and which, despite the difficulties and dangers of the way, urged them to Rome in these centuries to visit the Popes, was, of course, of a practical kind, of a kind which moved them to try to bring others to the same way of thinking as themselves. And so, wherever they came into contact with any want of proper submission to the Holy See, they at once endeavored to subdue it. And while St. Wilfrid in the North of England endeavored to bring the Celts into line with the Roman Church on the Easter question, St. Aldhelm did the same in the South-West. Urged by a West Saxon synod, Aldhelm wrote (705) to Geraint (Geruntius), King of the Britons of Dyfnaint (Devonshire and Cornwall), and to the priests of his kingdom, to conform to the practices of the Roman Church in the matter of the tonsure and Easter. After unfolding the questions to them, he implored them "no longer contumaciously to turn their backs

on the doctrine and decrees of Blessed Peter, and not, relying on the obstinacy of might, arrogantly to despise the tradition of the Roman Church cm account of the ancient decrees of their forefathers. For Peter, when, with happy voice, he had confessed the Son of God, deserved to hear: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, etc.; and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (St. Matt. XVI. 18). If then the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given by Christ to Peter ... who that sets at naught the principal decrees of his Church will enter the gates of heaven ...? But perchance some wily book-worm or smart analyst of the Scriptures may offer some such defence as this: 'With all the sincerity of a believing heart do I venerate the doctrines of both the Old and New Testament. I confess the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., and by virtue of this faith I shall be accounted a Catholic' ... 'Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well. The devils also believe and tremble ... Faith without works is dead' (St. James II. 19). For Catholic faith and the harmony of fraternal charity go hand in hand. And to sum up all in one conclusion, to no purpose do they boast of their possession of the Catholic faith, who do not follow the doctrine and teaching of St. Peter. For the foundation of the Church and the support of the faith, resting in the first instanceon Christ, and thenon Peter, will never be shaken by tempests. As the apostle notes: 'For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid which is Jesus Christ' (I Cor. III. 11). And to Peter has truth itself thus assigned his position in the Church: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church'."

This letter caused many to conform to the Catholic celebration of Easter, says Bede.

But it is time to retrace our steps and treat of mattersthat concern the Universal Church. The first of these affairs of general interest that calls for our attention is the so-called 'Quinisext' Council of 692, well described by our first historian Bede as "erratic". The "cruel and presumptuous" Justinian II, in the year 692, reflecting that the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils had issued indeed important dogmatic decrees, but had not published any disciplinary canons, summoned a synod to supply this omission. As a sort of complement to the fifth and sixth councils, this synod received the extraordinary name of 'Quinisext'; though it is sometimes called the Trullan synod, because it was held in the same 'domed' hall as the Sixth General Council. From the extant subscriptions to its canons, it appears that some 211 Eastern bishops took part in this council, so fraught with important results both in the history of the Church and in that of Europe. By legalising a *married* clergy the fathers of this council so far at least degraded the whole body of the Eastern clergy as to render it, by that very concession, less powerful for good; and, drawing such a sharp line of demarcation between Eastern and Western custom on such an important practical question, made a still further step in the direction of the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches—a separation fatal to Christianity in the East. The attempt on the part of this synod to place the See of Constantinople on a level in ecclesiastical matters with that of Rome was of course another advance towards schism. And anything that tended to produce isolation of the Eastern Church meant isolation and destruction for the Greek empire. The council "in Trullo", remarks Finlay, was "an additional cause of separation, when the strictest unity of religious opinions was necessary to maintain the political power of the empire".

Of the 102 canons decreed by the Quinisext Council, some consist simply of the renewal of ancient canons; some, again, were liturgical; while others treated of monks and nuns, fasting and superstitions. Many of the decrees were made in direct opposition to the custom of the Roman Church. Among others, one of the canons on clerical celibacy (the thirteenth), after setting forth the opposite discipline of the Roman Church, adds: "We, however, allow them (priests and deacons) to continue in matrimony", and forbid them to send away the wives they had before their promotion to Sacred Orders.—Thus did these infatuated Greeks cast away the salt that preserves the Church, a celibate clergy. By their thirty-sixth canon also, the Orientals aimed a blow at the See of Rome that only recoiled on themselves, and left them more than ever the slaves of the emperors of Constantinople. "We define", runs the canon, "that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal rights with that of Old Rome, shall be exalted in ecclesiastical affairs as it is, and shall be second after it". It may be noted in passing what a striking acknowledgment that canon was of the preeminent position in the Church of the Roman Pontiff at that time. While endeavoring to snatch the crown, it showed on whose head it was.

These canons were signed by the emperor, and by all the great patriarchs but the Roman, whose place, immediately after the emperor's, was left unfilled. If Archbishop Basil of Gortyna, in Crete, signed the decrees, adding, after his name, "holding the place of the whole synod of the Holy Church of Rome", just as he did at the Sixth General Council, it was not that he had received any special commission from Rome to represent it at the council, but that he acted on his own responsibility. And when the *Book of the Popes,* in its life of Sergius, says that the 'legates' of the Pope subscribed, deceived by the emperor, it means the papal *apocrisiarii* resident at Constantinople. For it is quite certain that no legates were dispatched by the Pope to represent him at the council. And when Nicholas I, in a letter to the Emperor Michael, speaks of the emperor's predecessors, in the time of Pope Conon, leading into error those who wanted to save them, Hefele believes he refers to these very *apocrisiarii,* who had at least been sent to Constantinople by Conon.

Justinian, however, knowing well that without the signature of the Roman Pontiff the decrees of his council would have no force in the West at any rate, straightway sent them to Rome, and required the Pope, as "the head of all the bishops", to sign them. But though many of the decrees were excellent, it was not to be expected that the Pope would sign them as a whole. And indeed he boldly declared that he would die rather than put his signature to them; and he would not allow them to be read. As usual with the rulers of Constantinople, Justinian at once had recourse to violence. "And well was it for the Roman See", says a non-Catholic writer, "that a strong man filled the chair of St. Peter". Finding that carrying off two of the Pope's councillors to Constantinople had no effect in daunting Sergius, the emperor sent Zacarias, his protospatharius, or captain of the bodyguard, to Rome with orders to drag the Pope himself to Constantinople.

But "a change had come over the spirit of the dream" since the days of Pope Martin. Mingled with the scant residue of the Italian citizens of the Roman Empire, the barbarians, who broke that empire to pieces, and had settled down in Italy, its fairest province, were beginning to form a new and vigorous Italian people. Italy, or those parts of it in which they dwelt, was now beginning to be regarded by them as their country.

They were organizing themselves for its defence. They were beginning to see that it was not the emperor of Constantinople that had their interests at heart; they could see that their money was all he cared for. On the other hand, it was equally plain to them that the only one of any position who had any care for their concerns, and who was any manner of protection to them against the tyrannical Greek official or the Lombard, was the Bishop of Rome. Around him, then, would they rally! No longer would they allow him to be carried off with insult to Constantinople. Accordingly, no sooner did the errand of Zacarias become known, than the "army of Ravenna and of the Duchy of Pentapolis" marched toRome. In terror Zacarias begged the Pope to have the gates of the city shut; and with tears besought him not to allow anyone to lay hands on him. But soon the troops of Ravenna were thundering at the gates of the Lateran palace. The guardsman took refuge under the Pope's bed, and Sergius showed himself to the soldiers. The people were somewhat appeased when they found that, contrary to the report, the Pope had not been carried off during the night and placed on board ship for Constantinople. Calmed by the Pope's word, they spared the guardsman's life, but drove him in ignominy from the city. "And", adds the papal biographer, "by the action of Divine justice, he who sent the guardsman was at this time deprived of his kingdom". The reference is to the uprising of Leontius (695), who, by a successful *coup de main,* seized the imperial throne, and sent off the cruel Justinian with his nose slit as an exile to Cherson. Thus did one more angry wave beat but to break itself into impotent spray and foam against the rock of Peter.

The country lying between the Rhine and the Elbe, and bounded on the north by the ocean, and which, at this period, bore the name of Frisia, had received already the first seeds of Christianity from St. Eligius and our own St. Wilfrid. But it was reserved for another Anglo-Saxon, sent by Pope Sergius, to complete the conversion of Frisia. Willibrord, one of that large number of devoted English and Irish saints that won to the faith of Christ the whole of Central Europe, arrived in Frisia about the year 691; and when Eddi was writing his life of Wilfrid, was, as that biographer noted, still continuing the work of his master (Wilfrid) in converting the people of Friesland. Trained in St. Wilfrid's monastery of Ripon, and in Ireland, Willibrord conceived a great desire to labor in a vineyard, wherein some of his fellow-monks had gone to toil, but had gleaned but little fruit. As soon as Willibrord landed, he found that the prospects of preaching the faith with success were greater than before, owing to the fact that Pippin of Heristal had made Radbod, duke of the Frisians, acknowledge the suzerainty of the Franks. Accordingly he made haste to get to Rome, that he might begin his wished-for labor of preaching the Gospel to the heathens, with the leave and blessing of Pope Sergius, who was then Pope. He also, adds Bede, wanted thence to learn or procure various things which so great a work required.

Great success attended the labors of Willibrord and his fellow-workers. With the consent of all, Willibrord was sent to Rome by Pippin, with the request that he might be made archbishop of the Frisians. Very willingly did Sergius consent, and Willibrord was consecrated (November 21, 695) in St. Cecilia's. The Pope on that occasion changed his name to Clement, and sent him back to his bishopric fourteen days after his arrival in Rome. A most interesting document has preserved for us the true date of the consecration of Willibrord. It is ordinarily stated, on the authority of Ven. Bede, that he

was consecrated November 22, 696, which was a Wednesday. But in the National Library at Paris there is preserved a MS. Calendar (a part of which has been published in *facsimile),* which was used by St. Willibrord himself. In the margin of this calendar he has written that he came from across the seas into France in the year 690; that, though unworthy, he was ordained bishop by the Apostolic Pope Sergius in 695; and that "now", in the year 698, he was still at work. The day, indeed, of his consecration is not marked by the saint himself, but an apparently contemporary hand has added, in the margin of the calendar, to the 21st November the words, "The consecration of our lord Clement". The 21st November, a *Sunday,* is then clearly the true date. All this is told us by Duchesne in his notes to the biography of Sergius in his edition of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

By the time of his death (739) the Frisians, as a nation, had become Christian. It is surely scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact that the history of the missionary work of the apostle of the Frisians is another proof that in the West the Gospel was only preached by those "who were sent", that is, received their mission, from the successors of St. Peter.

Mention has already been made of the success of Pope Sergius in extinguishing the schism of Aquileia. Comparing the accounts of this affair that have been left us by the *Liber Pontificalis,* by Bede and Paul the Deacon, with the contemporary poem edited by Bethmann, it would appear either that a synod was first held at Aquileia, in which the schism was reaffirmed, and that then afterwards, by the efforts of Pope Sergius and King Cunincpert, who summoned a synod at Pavia about 700, the schism was quashed for ever at that council. Or else, which seems more likely, that what Bede and the others call the 'synod of Aquileia', simply meant, as it often did in the language of those times, the collection of suffragan bishops under the patriarch of Aquileia. Hence we may conclude that the king of the Lombards, acting in unison with the Pope, invited the bishops of the schismatical patriarchate to a synod at Pavia. They came, and amidst tears of joy on their own part and those of the spectators, they declared their wish to be restored to the unity of the Church. The joyful news was sent to Sergius, who blessed the king with the words, that "he who converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins" (St. James V. 20). At the same time he ordered that all the works treating on the errors of the late schismatics should be burnt, lest the new converts might be again troubled with the same evil doctrines.

The name of Sergius is also connected with another famous city in the north-east of Italy, with Venice, or, to speak more accurately, with the Venetians, who at about this time inhabited the various islands, on some of which Venice was founded later on (about 710). Driven, willingly or unwillingly, from the mainland by Huns, Goths and Lombards, the inhabitants of the old province of Venetia took refuge on the numerous islands that lie in the midst of the muddy shallows or lagunes situated between the rivers Adige and Piave. There, protected by the shallows from the mainland and from the sea by the intricate channels between the outermost encircling islets, the Venetians maintained a practical, if not always nominal, independence from the days of the Goths until the days of that arch-destroyer Napoleon, called the Great.

Up to the period now being treated of, the different isles and cities of which the rising republic was formed were more or less independent of one another, each under its own 'tribune'. The result of this system of government was, of course, weakness both at home and abroad. Accordingly, about the year 700, there assembled in the city of Heraclea, Cristoforo, patriarch of Grado, his suffragans, the clergy, the tribunes, the nobles and the people. The outcome of their deliberations was the election of a duke or 'doge', with authority over all the 'lagune state'. The first doge of Venice was Paoluccio Anafesto. It is also said by Hazlitt that the promoters of this new constitution asked and obtained from Pope Sergius his confirmation of their action. On this Hazlitt remarks: "In a newly-formed society like that of Venice, placed in the difficult situation in which the republic found herself at the close of the seventh century .... it ought to create no surprise that the patriarch Christoforo and his supporters should have formed a unanimous determination to procure the adhesion and consent of the Holy See before any definite steps were taken to carry the resolutions of the popular assembly into effect. The mission, which was immediately dispatched for this purpose to Aquileia, where the Pope was then holding a council, consisted of Michele Participazio (or Badoer) and two other Venetian citizens of good family. The result was eminently favorable". As, however, the beginnings of all great states are always more or less obscure, and as the principal authority for this account of the foundation of the Venetian republic is apparently the Chronicle of the Doge, Andrea Dandolo, which, though a great work, was not written till the close of the first half of the fourteenth century, we must conclude that the origin of the Venetian Republic is not known with any great degree of certainty.

While thus occupied with such great external works as conversion of nations, the extinction of schisms, and the foundation of states, Sergius did not neglect affairs at home of lesser moment. St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and other basilicas he repaired and adorned, and furnished with new and splendid vessels of marble, gold, and silver. He also richly endowed and adorned the church of St. Susanna on the Quirinal, of which he had been parish priest, and which was in a very struggling condition, as both Anastasius and a marble inscription pieced together by De Rossi, recording the deed of gift to the Priest John, inform us. He also discovered in an out-of-the-way corner of the sacristy of St. Peter's a silver box, which proved to contain a portion of the true cross enclosed in a beautifully jewelled cross, which relic, say the historians of this discovery, has ever since that time been 'kissed and adored' by all the people on the feast of the 'Exaltation of the Holy Cross' in the basilica of Our Saviour (the Lateran). While searching about in the sacristy, Sergius also came across the body of St. Leo the Great. This he transferred (June 28, 688) to a splendid tomb which he caused to be erected in a prominent position in the interior of the basilica itself, as again we have on the authority not only of the *Book of the Popes* but of the inscription still preserved, set up by Sergius on the occasion.

In connection with the service of the Church, he ordained that "at the time of the breaking of Our Lord's body (in the Mass) the Agnus Dei should be sung by clergy and people". He also decreed that on the feasts of the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Dormition or Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and of St. Simeon (or the Purification), litanies should be recited from the Church of St. Adrian to St. Mary.

This great and holy Pope was buried in St. Peter's (September 8, 701). The epitaph which Baronius gives as belonging to this Pope really belongs to Sergius III. But we may cite as his epitaph what Alcuin says of him in *his* metrical life of St. Willibrord :

Pontificalis apex, Petri *dignissimus* heres,
Sanctus apostolicam tenuit tunc Sergius aulam
Vir bonus et prudens, *nulli pietate secundus.*

We have now set forth the history of the popes for areview ofhundred years; and, considering the number of biographiesthat have had to be written, it must be confessed that not very much has been said about them. The reason of that, however, is, that there is very little to be said. Of all the centuries of the Middle Ages, we know least about this their first century, at any rate as far as the popes are concerned, with the possible exception of the tenth century. In the dearth of historical records, practically all that is to be told of the popes of the seventh century has now been told.

From what the genuine records of history have made known to us, we see that during this seventh century the Seeof Rome was occupied by an unbroken succession of good men. It opened and closed with the fourteen years' reign of a saint. So bright are their characters that it would be to degrade them to contrast them with, we will not say, the secular princes of their time, but even with their would-be rivals, the ambitious patriarchs of Constantinople. There are, indeed, a number of modern historians who, to serve their ends or to indulge a habit, have supplied from their imaginations the lacunae of contemporary authorities. With material thus derived, they have endeavored to detract from, or to dull the bright characters of some of the popes of this seventh century, by attributing more or less disreputable 'motives' to their actions. We have tried to steer clear of such an unscientific and unsatisfactory course, and to let the plain facts of history speak for themselves. And again we assert that these facts tell us that if Honorius I was a little weak in theological acumen, the aged Conon somewhat wanting, on one occasion, in economical foresight, the popes of the seventh century were model men, and a credit to the high position they occupied.

Abroad we have seen the popes materially assisting in the conversion of nations to the faith of Christ, in the foundation of states, in extinguishing schisms, and combatting heresies backed by imperial power; and, by their influence over the barbaric kings of the Lombards, saving Rome for the empire and for its citizens. And though we have seen the Holy See kept vacant for months, the palace of the popes plundered, themselves assailed with violence and sent off to exile and to death, in what condition do we find them at the close of the century? Stronger than they were at the beginning. The schism that weakened their power in Italy has been closed, and they have become so strong in the affections of the people that the despotic power of the Eastern emperors has broken against them. By the end of this century the popes have become safe from Oriental tyranny, and, we may add, their temporal power is assured. For in the next century we shall see that temporal power an accomplished fact, and Italy freed, by the action of the

popes, from the incubus of the Lombards, as it was practically freed in this century from the Eastern emperors.

In this century, then, it is asserted that the foundations of the temporal power of the popes were strengthened to the point of being ready to receive the superstructure. While we find Gibbon, Milman, and Greenwood, in their calmermoments, asserting that it "was the circumstances of the times" that forced temporal power into the hands of the popes, we find many at all times roundly proclaiming that it was by their own ambitious exertions that such power ever fell into their hands. Their proof of their proposition would seem to be that the popes did acquire temporal power, and *therefore* it must have been the result of their ambition. As historical data are wanting to them, they fall back upon *logic*. The records of the history of the popes of the seventh century show, however, that the popes owed their temporal power to the manner in which they attached to themselves the people of Italy, by the unexceptionable arts of defending their civil liberties against emperor and Lombard, of expending the wealth of the Holy See on the poor and the captive, and of upholding even to death the rights of conscience.

May it be ours now to write the history of the popes of the eighth century, and to unfold the causes which developed the temporal power of the popes, such as we have seen it in the hands of St Gregory I, Honorius etc., into full and perfect independent regal sovereignty.

Before, however, entering upon the biographies of the eighth century pontiffs, it may be convenient to bring together the brief scattered notices that are to be met with—chiefly in the letters of St. Gregory I and the Ordo Romanus—concerning the officials through whom the pope governed his local See of Rome in the seventh century.

For purposes of spiritual administration the city was divided into parishes, in each of which was a *titular* church, presided over by a cardinal priest. At their head was the important archpriest.

For the temporal needs of the people, and for other purposes generally, the city had at a very early period been divided into *seven* regions, partly, perhaps, because the fourteen civil regions of the city could be easily divided into seven fresh divisions; partly, perhaps, for some mystical reason; and again, perhaps, that there might be, a fixed set of officials each day to attend the pope at the various *stations*. It is certain that in the first ages of the Church, seven notaries had been appointed to take down the acts of the martyrs. When the centuries of persecution passed away, the notaries remained now in charge of the Papal Chancery, and at their head in the seventh century was one of the most distinguished members of the officials of the pope, viz., the primicerius of the notaries.

In connection with the seven regions were seven deaconries, *bureaux* as it were, where all that concerned the poor (hospitals, orphanages, etc.), was managed. At the head of these establishments, as their name implies, was a deacon. And over the deacons themselves was a great functionary, the archdeacon, who is spoken of in the *Ordo Romanus* as the Vicar of the Pope. Of all the Roman officials of the seventh century, the regionary deacons were the most important. From them were selected the apocrisiarii who were sent to Constantinople, and from their ranks were chosen the

successors of St Peter. Their orders were carried out by the regionary subdeacons and acolytes.,

By all these functionaries was the pope assisted at the *stations,* and, during the vacancy of the Holy See or during the absence of the pope, the Roman See was governed by the archpriest, the archdeacon and the primicerius of the notaries.

We have already seen how, equally in connection with the seven regions, Gregory the Great established a college of *defensors,* with a primicerius at their head, for the management of the patrimonies of the Church in Rome and elsewhere—the patrimonies whence were drawn the means by which the work and charities undertaken by the Roman Church were able to be carried on. The *dispensator ecclesiae* seems to have been the head permanent official connected with the administration of the patrimonies.

In the documents of the seventh century there is also frequent mention of the *schola cantorum,* again subject to a primicerius. It was there, apparently, that the young aspirants for the ranks of the Roman clergy received their general as well as their musical education. They are said to have left it when they had received the minor order of acolyte.

Many other officers of the Roman Church are also not unfrequently mentioned in our sources. There was the *Vicedominus,* whom some would distinguish from the *Majordomo,* assigning to the first the charge of the papal palace, and to the second the functions of a guest-master. The *nomenclator* was a sort of gentleman-usher; the *arcarius,* the treasurer, chief of the papal exchequer; and the *saccellarius,* the paymaster, though Ewald rather regards him as an almoner.

Among the lay assistants of the pontifical administration of high standing was the *consiliarius* (possibly legal adviser) of the Holy See. This official, several times met with in the letters of Gregory the Great, is first noticed by Pope Vigilius. Of the minor laymen in the service of the Church were the *mansionarii,* who had to look after the churches, much as the modern sacristans do. It only remains to be stated that as time went on we shall find the sphere of action of some of these officials diminished and that of others extended. Temporal power, too, will bring with it new officers.

The centre of papal government during the seventh century was the Lateran palace, whither in the course of that period the documents relating to the Church were removed from the library of Pope Damasus. For a short time during the next century a palace at the foot of the Palatine Hill was to be the centre of papal activity.

JOHN VI.

A.D. 701-705.

EMPEROR OF THE EAST.

TIBERIUS III (Apsimar), 608-701.

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

ARIPERT II, 700-712.

EXARCHS OF RAVENNA.

John Platyn, 687-702.

Theophylact, 702-709.

AFTER a vacancy of one month and twenty-three days, John, a Greek, was consecrated Bishop of Rome (October 30, 701).

Probably sometime during the year 702 there came from Sicily to Rome the new exarch Theophylact, Chamberlain and Patrician. Why he came to Rome we do not know. Many modern authors are prepared to tell us. But the cause assigned is of their own making, and consequently in accordance with their prejudices. Theophylact may have been simply passing through on his way to Ravenna. However, whatever may have been his reason in coming to Rome, supposing he had any particular reason at all, his advent was viewed with suspicion by the friends of the Pope, that is by all Italy, by all at least not subject to the Lombards. Accordingly, on hearing of the exarch's visit the troops of the whole of Italy marched tumultuously to Rome, encamped outside the city, and made their ill-will to the exarch particularly evident. The Pope, alarmed for Theophylact's safety, ordered the city gates to be shut, sent priests to the camp, and through their exertions quelled the sedition. Though the rioters spared the exarch, they took vengeance on some of his would-be creatures, and inflicted grievous punishment on certain informers who had taken advantage of the exarch's presence to impeach certain worthy citizens, that they might have an opportunity of fingering wealth that was not their own. Amid the obscurity that surrounds this incident, one thing stands out clear, and it is the loyalty of the popes to the rule of the emperors, a loyalty that one act of tyranny after another against themselves has not shaken, at least in them. But the action of the local militia towards the Life Guard officer Zacharias and towards the exarch Theophylact shows that submission on the part of their Italian subjects to the

Eastern emperors' rule—a rule impotent and tyrannical at least in Italy —was rapidly becoming a thing of the past. This eighth century will see the end of it over by far the greater part of the territory that in the preceding century rendered a more or less full obedience to the exarch of Ravenna.

For some cause or other, the Lombards begin again during this pontificate to give trouble to the Duchy of Rome, and hence to the popes. Whether the Lombards were now more than ever convinced of the weakness of the exarch, or whether their own power was by this time more consolidated, they were at this period engaged in extending their frontiers in all directions at the expense of those of the exarch. Gisulf I, Duke of Benevento (686-706), increased his sway by getting possession of the towns of Sora, Arpinum and Arx from the Duchy of Rome, thus advancing the border of his own duchy to the river Liris; and bursting into the Campagna, perhaps in the year 702, advanced as far as a place which the *Liber Pontificalis* calls 'Horrea', and which Dr. Hodgkin thinks to be the great granary of Puteoli, and there pitched his camp. He advanced, plundering, burning, and carrying off captives; and, pathetically adds the papal biographer, "there was no one who could resist him". But, as usual, there was one able and willing to come to the succor of the poor Italians—the Pope of Rome. John VI sent to the camp of Gisulf several priests furnished with large sums of money, and they redeemed all the captives he had taken, and induced the warlike duke to return to his own country. Such *arts* as these are the only ones known to *history* by which more and more temporal power was acquired by the Popes, or rather forced into their hands.

His exertions in behalf of St. Wilfrid have already been set down. To Brithwald, "whom by the authority of the Prince of the Apostles we have confirmed as Archbishop (of Canterbury)", John VI sent the pallium.

Except that he held the usual ordinations of priests, deacons and bishops for various places, and made certain additions or improvements to a few of the churches, we know no more of John VI but that he was buried at St. Peter's on January 11, 705.

JOHN VII.

A.D. 705-707.

EMPERORS.

TIBERIUS III. 698-705.

JUSTINIAN II (RESTORED), 705-711.

KING.

ARIPERT II, 700-712

EXARCH.

THEOPHYLACT, 702-709

ON March 1, 705, was consecrated as Bishop of Rome John VII, another Greek, of an illustrious family, the son of Blatta and Plato, who had held the high office of *Cura Palatii,* an office which, in Constantinople itself, was often held by the son-in-law of the emperor. Plato had in that capacity presided over the restoration of the old imperial palace at Rome, which was now the ordinary residence of the exarch's lieutenant. The epitaphs to his father and mother, composed by John himself, when rector of the patrimony on the Appian Way (687), have come down to us. They were inscribed "with a broken heart to a most loving and incomparable mother, and to the kindest of fathers, by their son John". The care which Plato bestowed on the restoration of the old palace of the Caesars on the Palatine, a building all too large for the residence of the *Dux Romae,* his son, as we shall see, devoted to the repair of Rome's churches. And to this work, besides experience gained from his father, he brought a well-trained mind. For, as his biographer assures us, he was a man of very profound learning and great eloquence, but, as is not infrequently to be observed in learned speakers, his courage was not on a par with his oratory. This Pope was remarkable for his devotion to the Mother of God. The title he was most proud of was "Mary's servant".

Soon after John became Pope the cruel Rhinotmetus (Justinian II) succeeded in again obtaining possession of the imperial throne. By lavish promises he won over to his cause Terbel, the king of the Bulgarians. He effected an entrance into the Blachernae quarter of Constantinople through an aqueduct. His rivals, Leontius and Apsimar, were beheaded after being exposed to the greatest ignominies. The patriarch Callinicus, who, to his credit, had shown his hate of the cruel character of the tyrant, was deprived of his eyes and sent to Rome. When he had glutted his appetite for revenge with the blood of his enemies, the brutal Justinian, either in the year 706, or perhaps more likely in the

early part of the next, sent to John by the hands of two metropolitan bishops the same *Tomes* (tomi), six in number, which he had sent before to Pope Sergius; and in which, adds the *Book of the Popes* "were contained various points against the Church of Rome". Through the bishops, and through a letter which he dispatched to the Pope at the same time, Justinian adjured John to assemble a council, to examine the decrees of the Quinisext Council, and to approve what he thought fit and to reject the rest. Whether it was that the report of the unbounded cruelty and fierceness of the 'Slit-nosed' emperor had struck terror into John, his biographer says that, "timid through human frailty", the Pope sent back the 'Tomes' without attaching any note at all to them. If he dared not condemn them, he would not approve them; for from the little we know of the affair it would be scarcely fair to argue that here silence gave consent. Perhaps John felt he had not the requisite strength to enter into a contest with Justinian, for we are told that he did not live long after this incident.

If we may trust the old eleventh century chronicler Herman Contractus, it was in the year 707 that there took place the restoration of the 'patrimony' of the Cottian Alps to the See of Rome, spoken of by Bede and others. According to Paul the Deacon the fifth province of Italy went by the name of the 'Cottian Alp' and included the western part, at least, of the ancient province of Liguria. In this province the Roman Church had of old large possessions, which had been seized by the Lombards. St. Gregory speaks of property belonging to the Roman Church in the neighborhood of Genoa. It was all confiscated when Rothari laid waste with fireand sword the whole littoral from Tuscan Luna to the territories of the Franks, and ordered the cities he had dismantled to be called villages! Of these lands Aripert II made restitution, sending notice thereof to Rome in a deed written in letters of gold. The exact nature of the rights possessed by the popes of this period over these and their other possessions is not easy to define. But there is no doubt, as it has been remarked before, that they (the popes) had more than mere rights of ownership over their 'patrimonies'. They had a considerable amount of jurisdiction in them, which they exercised, indeed, in submission to the emperor. Still, however, it was there; and it greatly facilitated the passing of many of the said patrimonies under the complete power of the popes in the course of this century.

Jaffé quotes a very interesting fragment of a letter of the Pope to the English bishops and clergy, which shows the well-known love of the Anglo-Saxons in general for fine apparel, and the consequent disinclination on the part of the Anglo-Saxon clerics in particular to renounce the secular dress and to adopt the more sober ecclesiastical costume. John describes how, on one occasion, when all the Anglo-Saxon notables who were then in Rome came to meet him, what he said had such weight with his hearers that, on the vigil of St. Gregory, all the Anglo-Saxon clerics laid aside their ample lay garments and put on the cassock according to the Roman custom. He concludes by exhorting those to whom he is writing to go and do likewise.

This Pope's name is connected with two of Italy's, we might say the world's, most famous monasteries: the monastery of Farfa, situated on the Salarian road, and on the high ground between the valleys of Tibur and the Velino, and the monastery of Subiaco, built on that wild spot on the Anio, where St. Benedict went to pass his youth in solitude, and on which was afterwards built, by the saint, one of those Benedictine monasteries to which European civilization owes so much. It was at the request of

Faroald, Duke of Spoleto, that John confirmed the possessions and gave various privileges to the monastery of Farfa (June 30, 705). The monastery of Subiaco, like its offshoot of Monte Cassino, destroyed by the Lombards (601), and abandoned for over one hundred years, was restored by this Pope, who sent thither the abbot Stephen for the purpose.

In his short reign John did a good deal in the way of church beautifying and restoration in different parts of the city. Among his other works in this direction, he built (706) a chapel to Our Lady in St. Peter's, and covered its walls with mosaics, which our Bede describes as of "admirable workmanship", though, apart from considerations of the age in which they were executed, they are indifferent enough. In the center of one of the two groups of figures stands the Blessed Virgin in the garb of a Byzantine empress, and at her right the Pope, his head crowned by a square nimbus, "and the model of the chapel in his hands. Traces of figures, together with the ancient inscription, may still be discovered in the crypt of the Vatican". The inscription ran: "John, an unworthy bishop, the servant of the Blessed Mother of God, carried out this work". "The chapel", continues Gregorovius, "was pulled down in 1639(1606?); and the remains of the mosaics removed to St. Maria in Cosmedin. Here the time-honored relics still remain, built into the walls of the sacristy, and, rough in execution though they be, bear the stamp of an age, the pious simplicity and child-like faith of which it is scarcely possible for us to understand".

Other entries in the *Book of the Popes* have been remarkably illustrated within the last few months. One passage, for instance, runs: "He adorned with frescoes the basilica of the Holy Mother of God, which is known as *the Old*; and alongside of it he built a palace for himself, and there he lived and died". It is curious that John's home should be brought to light by descendants of the people about whose clothes he was solicitous, viz., by the British School of Archaeology at Rome. Though, to anything but the credit of the nation, our School only came into existence in November 1899, it has not been idle since its birth. Its work in connection with S. Maria Antiqua had best be told in the words of the letter, already cited, of Mr, Rushforth, the head of the School :

"The Church (S. Maria Antiqua) was installed in the ancient buildings (buried deep till a year ago beneath the garden of the now destroyed S. Maria Liberatrice), which occupied the space between the back wall of the colossal brick structure known as the Temple of Augustus and the substructures of the northern angle of the Palatine. Passing the Temple of Castor on the right, and the House of the Vestals, with the fountain and shrine of Juturna on the left, one reaches the precincts of the church. Its plan presents the regular features of a great Roman house or palace. Passing through the open portico which extended along the facade, one enters, as in the Flavian Palace on the Palatine, a great hall with niches (alternately round and square) for colossal statues in its walls. The door at its opposite end leads into an open court or peristyle, beyond which is the usual arrangement of a big room, with one side completely open to the court, in the middle flanked by two smaller chambers. It is impossible, in this place, to discuss the origin and history of these buildings. But it may be taken that, in their present form, they belong to the time of Hadrian, and that, probably, their *raison d'être* is the spacious staircase, or rather, incline, which leads from the left-hand corner of the peristyle to the summit of the Palatine. They formed, in fact, the state entrance to the

Palace from the Forum, or, to put it in another way, they may be thought of as part of the Palace brought down for the sake of convenience to the level of the Forum.

"Such was the building which had to be adapted to the uses of a church. The *tablinum* became the sanctuary, the chambers which flanked it side chapels. The central space of the peristyle was enclosed with low screens and formed the choir, while the great entrance hall served as the atrium. It is by no means clear that the open space of the peristyle was ever roofed in, even after it had been turned into a choir by being enclosed with a low wall, covered with paintings and fitted on the inside with a marble seat, which ran all the way round, except where on the left it was broken by the staircases which led to the ambo. When did this transformation take place, or begin to take place? Presumably not before the middle of the sixth century, the period of the Byzantine conquest. That was the age when the forms of the ancient world, being extinct, the Church first took possession of the disused public buildings. It is therefore not surprising to learn that the earliest mention of S. Maria Antiqua occurs in a catalogue of Roman churches made in the Byzantine period, possibly about the middle of the seventh century. Moreover, it is significant that we hear of it for the first time in the *Liber Pontificalis* at the beginning of the eighth century. Can we believe that the earlier part of the book, with its copious information about the oldest churches, would have omitted this one if it had existed very long before?

"But if the church was so recent as the sixth or seventh century, how are we to account for its title Antiqua? The difficulty is increased by the fact that while Old St. Mary's ought to have a New St. Mary's corresponding to it, the only S. Maria Nova we know was the church which replaced S. Maria Antiqua in the ninth century. They never existed side by side. There were other churches in Rome bearing the name of the Virgin much older than the one in the Forum, but they differed from it in this, that originally they were designated in quite another way. S. Maria Maggiore was the Basilica Liberii or Sicinini; S. Maria trans Tiberim was the Basilica or Titulus of Julius or of Callixtus. The latter does not appear as S. Maria trans Tiberim before the seventh century, whereas S. Maria Maggiore, after the restoration by Sixtus III (432-440), and as late as John I (523-526), is regularly mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* as St. Maria simply. Can we believe that this would have been so if S. Maria Antiqua had been already in existence? As common experience shows, "old" in these cases of nomenclature means not absolutely, but relatively, "old"; and the most reasonable supposition seems to be that, while S. Maria Maggiore, as one of the greater basilicas, stands apart in a category of its own, S. Maria Antiqua was so called because it was the first church dedicated *ab initio* to the Virgin—*i.e.*, before the foundation of S. Maria Rotunda (the Pantheon), and before the church in the Trastevere acquired its new name, both in the seventh century. This is precisely the order given in the seventh century catalogue referred to above, where the Lateran is followed by S. Maria Major, S. Anastasia, S. Maria Antiqua, S. Maria Rotunda, S. Maria Trastiberis. Etc.

"We learn from the *Book of the Popes* that John VII (705-707) decorated the church with paintings, and gave it a new *ambo*. Though discarded at a later date, the base of this *ambo* has actually been found in the church. It bears the inscription "Johannes servu(s) scae Mariae". The style and lettering, as well as the sentiment, is exactly the same as that of the Pope's epitaph still preserved in the crypt of St. Peter—

Johannis servi sanctae Mariae. His interest in this church was not solely due to his devotion to Mary. His father Plato, the *cura palatii urbis Romae,* as his official title ran, had lived in the imperial palace on the hill above, and when he died in 687 John had put up a monument to his memory in S. Anastasia, which mentions his restoration of the long staircase, perhaps the one which we still see connecting the Forum with the Palatine.

"When John became Bishop of Rome in 705 the Lateran had fallen into decay, and the *Liber Pontificalis* describes how, above S. Maria, *episcopium quantum ad se construere maluit, illicque pontificati sui tempus vitam finivit.* Brought into intimate relations with the church by means of the ascent before mentioned, John began to take a special interest in it. In addition to his gift of the ambo, he decorated it with paintings, and it becomes important to try to discover which, if any, of the considerable remains of painting in the church may be attributed to him. The only parts which can be dated with certainty belong to the middle of the eighth century and later. But there is good reason for thinking that the pictures on the walls of the square sanctuary are some of those executed under John. It is to be regretted that the difference of material and their fragmentary character make it difficult to draw any satisfactory comparison between the scattered relics of John's works in mosaic from the old St. Peter's and these paintings. The wall above the small apse, which must have contained the altar, shows at the summit the Crucifixion. On either side the white-robed elders are offering their crowns, as in the well-known mosaics at St. Paul's without the Walls and at S. Prassede. Below is a band of quotations in Greek from the Prophets, relating to the Crucifixion. Another band of adoring saints follows, and then, cut in the middle by the arch of the apse, we see a row of four popes. Everything here is much damaged, but two important details are certain. One of the popes on the right is St. Martin, who died in 655, and the one on the extreme left, though his name has perished, has the square nimbus, and is therefore, in all probability, the donor of the pictures—*i.e.,* John VII. The apse itself, with a colossal figure of Christ, has been painted again at a later date, for we can still see the head with its square nimbus and the name of Paul I, (757-767). Below the row of popes is a fragment of the dedicatory inscription: *Sanctae Dei genitrici semperque Virgini Mariae.* Below this the walls on either side of the apse have been decorated again and again. A Madonna robed and crowned like a Byzantine empress, the four Evangelists, the four Fathers, have replaced one another at different times. The side walls of the sanctuary have been decorated at least twice; but the upper surface, which corresponds to the presumed work of John VII, represented the Gospel history with the Crucifixion on the main wall as its climax. The last scene on the left side wall is the procession to Calvary. To judge by the remains, the paintings on the screens which enclosed the choir and presbytery were of the same style and epoch. They were taken from the Old Testament, and were no doubt treated as types. The best preserved are David's victory over Goliath, and Isaiah announcing to Hezekiah his approaching death.

"The chapel to the right of the sanctuary contains many single figures of saints. The place of honor is occupied by Stephen. The rest, like the inscriptions, are mainly Greek. Cosmas and Damian, Abbacyrus and John, Procopius, Panteleemon, Celsus, are among the best preserved. The chapel to the left is the most perfect in the whole building. Some of the painting is as fresh as when it was executed, and equally

important is the fact that it can be dated with precision. Below a Crucifixion, in which the living Redeemer is represented clothed in a long, sleeveless garment, a seated Madonna is flanked by SS. Peter and Paul, Quiricus and Julitta, and the square-nimbed, and therefore contemporary, portraits of Pope Zacharias (741-752) and the donor, who, as his inscription tells us, is Theodotus, *primicerius defensorum* and *dispensator* of the *diaconia* of St. Mary *qui appellatur antiqua.* The pictures on the side walls represent the story of Quiricus and Julitta as given in the later Acta.

"The outer wall of the church on the side next the Palatine has retained its paintings in a fair state of preservation. The wall surface was divided into four bands; a dado representing hangings, a row of life-size saints, while the upper tiers were devoted to the Old Testament history, beginning, no doubt, with the Creation. Of the highest section all that has survived is the story of the Flood. On the lower we get the end of the life of Jacob and the history of Joseph as far as the fulfillment of the dreams of the chief butler and the baker. Probably the series was continued on the opposite side of the church, but the remains there are too scanty to enable us to say this with certainty. In the center of the row of saints is a seated figure of our Lord. On His left are the saints of the Greek world: John Chrysostom, Gregory, Basil, Peter of Alexandria, Cyril, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Nicholas, Erasmus. The West, and especially Rome, is represented on His right: Clement, Silvester, Leo, Alexander, Valentine, Abundius (?), Euthymius, Sebastian (?), George, Gregory (the Great). The names are in Greek, whereas the inscriptions on the Old Testament scenes above are in Latin. Considerations of style make it probable that all this work was executed in the middle or latter half of the eighth century.

"The outer church or atrium was also completely covered with paintings, but mere fragments have survived. The best-preserved picture is that of a Madonna (inscribed *Maria Regina),* flanked by six sacred personages, of which the outer one on the left is a contemporary pope with the square nimbus. Unfortunately, all that can be certainly made out of his name is the termination 'anus'. A detached building outside the entrance to the church was apparently dedicated to the Forty Martyrs, who are represented in the apse as immersed in the lake, while on the left wall they appear as glorified with the Saviour in their midst.

"The church had not a long history. We learn from the *Book of the Popes* that in the middle of the ninth century Benedict III (855-858) bestowed various offerings *in basilica beatae Dei genetricis qui vacatur Antiqua quam a fundamentis Leo papa (i.e.,* his predecessor Leo IV) *viam juxta sacram construxerat.* And once again, Nicholas I (858-867) was the first to decorate with paintings this new Church of St. Mary, *que primitus Antiqua nunc autem Nova vocatur.* The new church is perfectly well known: it is S. Francesca Romana, built originally in part of the colonnade surrounding Hadrian's temple of Venus and Rome. The meaning is obvious. For some reason the diaconia of S. Maria Antiqua was transferred to a new site, where, for a time, it preserved its old name, until, as being a new construction, it got to be known popularly as New St. Mary's. That reason can only have been some catastrophe which overwhelmed the original church. It was not fire, for there are no traces of fire in the building. But it may well have been that a day came when the towering structures at the north-west angle of the Palatine toppled over the edge of the hill and buried the church beneath their ruins. Natural

decay is quite enough to have brought about this result, just as we know that in the time of Hadrian I the Church of SS. Sergius and Bacchus was crushed beneath the falling ruins of the Temple of Concord. But perhaps we can localize the catastrophe more precisely. The *Book of the Popes* carefully records the occurrence of earthquakes in Rome. In the period with which we are concerned one took place under Leo III (795-816), but apparently it was of minor importance and only affected seriously the basilica of St. Paul. But half a century later, under Leo IV, there was a terrible convulsion,and Leo IV was the Pope who rebuilt S. Maria Antiqua on the new site in the Via Sacra. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here the cause of the abandonment of the old building".

Before leaving this interesting subject, it may be noted, from Federici's article, that traces of John's palace are to be seen in the remains of mediaeval constructions by the side of S. Maria Antiqua, by the side of the apse of the chapel adjoining it, and close to the temple of Castor and Pollux and the sacred fountain of Juturna. Tiles of the Romano-Byzantine period have been found stamped with the name of John. John of course, may have been the name of the maker; but it may have been that of the son of Plato, John VII.

John closed his short but full reign in 707, and was buried in St. Peter's, before the altar of the chapel of Our Lady, about which mention has been made. He died in the palace which he had himself built, and which, before Mr. Rushforth's discovery, De Rossi had mistakenly identified with "certain ruins at the foot of the Palatine hill", which are to be seen on his right by anyone who walks from the Arch of Titus towards the Coliseum. His only epitaph was: "(The place) of John, the servant of Holy Mary"

SISINNIUS.

A.D. 708.

EMPEROR.

JUSTINIAN II (RESTORED), 705-711.

KING.

ARIPERT II, 700-712

EXARCH.

THEOPHYLACT, 702-709.

ALL that we know of this Pope, who only reigned twenty days, can be told in a few words. A Syrian, and the son of one John, he was consecrated on January 15 (a Sunday), 708. So afflicted was he with the gout that he could not feed himself. Still, says his biographer, he was of firm mind, and had a care for the inhabitants of this city. Both these characteristics he displayed in the order which he gave to prepare lime for the restoration of the city walls. To this repairing of the walls he was doubtless moved, not merely by the nearer approach of the Lombards, but by fear of the rapidly-advancing power of the Saracens, and perhaps by a wish to strengthen the city against the arbitrary and often violent action of the emperors at Constantinople. Sudden death, however, prevented him from carrying out his design. From the simple words, "*Qui et calcarias pro restauratione murorum jussit decoquere*", Dr. Hodgkin, in a style quite unworthy of the man himself and his work, takes occasion to remark, "An evil precedent truly. How many of that silent population of statues which once made beautiful the terraces of Rome have perished in these same papal limekilns?". No matter how willing Sisinnius might have been to make the 0silent population0 defend the walls as well as the 0speaking population0 the fact is, as Dr. Hodgkin, himself quoting Gregorovius, observes in a note, the great general Belisarius had practically got all the military service possible out of the 'silent population', as his soldiers used them for various military purposes.

Sisinnius consecrated a bishop for Corsica, and was buried in St. Peter's, February 4, 708.

Here one cannot but ask, Why were men in such a feeble state of health elected? Why was the city to be kept constantly in the state of excitement caused by elections? A healthy excitement indeed, if gratified at sufficiently remote intervals, but unhealthy if constant. For then either the excitement becomes feverish, or it plays itself out altogether; both which results are as injurious to states as to individuals. In the case of

Sisinnius the answer to these queries may be, that the electors knew very well on the one hand that gout does not kill a man all at once; and on the other they may have had proof of the energy and strength of mind of their invalid candidate. The fact that Sisinnius at once made preparations to strengthen the city would serve to show that he could read the times, and that he foresaw the troubles which the Lombards and then the Saracens were soon to bring on Rome and the popes. It may be, then, that Sisinnius was elected simply because he was an able and proper person, and because there was no suspicion that the gout had obtained the hold on him that it proved to have done.

On the other hand, there are not wanting authors who assert that the sole ground of his election was that he was an Oriental. They point to the fact that from John V, who was a Syrian, to Pope Zachary, who was a Greek, there was only one Western Pope, the Roman Gregory II. These authors believe that this succession of Orientals was brought about by the machinations of the exarchs, in the interests of their masters. If, however, such were indeed the case, it only remains to point out that once again history shows us "man proposing but God disposing"; for these Oriental popes were very estimable men, a credit to the Papacy, and, as far as the records of history enable us to see, anything but creatures of the lords of Constantinople.

CONSTANTINE.

A.D. 708-715

EMPERORS.

JUSTINIAN II, 705-711.

PHLIPPICUS (BARDANES), 711-713.

ANASTASIUS II, 713-715

KINGS.

Aripert II, 700-712.

Ausprand, 712.

Liutprand, 712-744.

EXARCHS.

Theophylact, 702-709.

John Rizocopus, 710-713.

Scholasticus, 713-726.

OF Constantine we know nothing before he became Pope, except that, like his immediate predecessor (could he have been his brother?), he was a Syrian and the son Pope, of John. “The mildest of men”, he was consecrated March 25, 708.

The first act that is recorded of Constantine is his consecrating Felix, the successor of Damian (consecrated by Sergius I), as archbishop of Ravenna.

The subsequent conduct of Felix will be more readily understood if it be premised that it appears from the *Liber Diurnus* (formulas 73-4-5) that the bishops immediately dependent on the See of Rome (the suburbicarian bishops) had, after their consecration, to sign three formulas and give them into the hands of the Pope. The first, called *promissio fidei*, was a detailed profession of faith, and had to be signed by the new bishop and his priests. The second, the *cautio*, was an undertaking to observe certain rules of ecclesiastical government. It had to be dictated by the bishop to a notary, in presence of the primicerius and secundicerius of the notaries of the Roman Church, and then signed by the bishop and several witnesses. The third document, known as the *indiculum,* was a promise not to be connected with any undertaking against the unity of

the Church or the security of the Roman empire. The *indiculum* had to be written out by the bishop himself, and placed by him in the *confession* of St. Peter.

Felix had no sooner received the desired consecration, than, thinking he had humbled himself quite enough by coming to Rome to be ordained, he refused to sign the accustomed acts of submissionto the Holy See, *i.e.* probably, he refused to sign the second document just mentioned, the *cautio* strictly so called. Backed by the secular power, "by the power of the judges", as the papal biographer expresses it, Felix refused to comply with the Pope's demands. The parchment, however, on which the *indiculum* had been duly written, was placed by the Pope himself in the *confession* of St Peter. And we have it on the authority of the same historian that, a few days after, it was found all black, and, as it were, scorched. In the sacking and partial burning of the city of Ravenna (in the following year, 709) by the troops of Justinian, the papal biographer sees the hand of God punishing its people and archbishop for their pride in wishing to be more independent of the Pope. Why Justinian treated Ravenna in this manner cannot be precisely ascertained. According to Agnellus it was because some of the Ravennese had taken part in the rebellion against him in 695. At any rate, it is certain that he put to death all the chief men of the city, deprived Archbishop Felix of his sight, and sent him into exile somewhere in Pontus, very likely to Cherson. However, when Justinian finished his violent career by a violent death (711), the poor sightless archbishop was allowed to return to his See. Humbled by his terrible sufferings, Felix submitted to the Pope, sent, of his own free will, the required "oath of obedience" *(cautio)* and died (723) in communion with the See of Rome.

The example of Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons, and Offa who, as we have seen, resigned his kingdom and went to Rome to die, was followed, twenty years after, by two other Anglo-Saxon kings, Coenred, "who had for some time (704-709) very nobly governed the kingdom of the Mercians", says Bede, "did a much more noble act by quitting the throne of his kingdom and going to Rome (after May 709), where, having received the tonsure, when Constantine was Pope, and been made a monk at the shrine of the apostles, he continued to his last hours in prayer, fastings, and alms-deeds ... With him went the son of Sighere, king of the East Saxons, whose name was Offa, a youth of most lovely age and beauty, and most earnestly desired by all his nation to be their king. He, with like devotion, quitted his (betrothed) wife, lands, kindred and country, for Christ and for the gospel, that he might receive a hundredfold in this life and in the next life everlasting (St. Matt, xix, 29). He also ... receiving the tonsure and adopting a monastic life, attained the long-wished-for sight of the blessed apostles in heaven".

With them, and at their request, there went to Rome, for the second time, Ecgwin, the famous bishop of Worcester.

To get at the truth with regard to the history of Ecgwin is well-nigh impossible. The biographies of him which we possess do not go back beyond the tenth or eleventh centuries; and the royal charters and papal letters which concern him are, for the most part, regarded as forgeries. However, of the chief facts of his life there is no reason to doubt. Most of them are vouched for by his charter of foundation of the abbey of Evesham (714), which has been preserved for us by one of his biographers, Prior

Dominic. And of this charter Mr Macray, the editor of Dominic's *Life* for the Rolls series, writes: "The version (of Ecgwin's charter) in our text claims so decidedly to be a transcript, *paene verbum ex verbo, sicut ipsemet vir sanctus in cartis suis ex maxima parte scribendo est prosequutus*, that its genuineness, as a whole, can only be disputed either by accusing the prior of a deliberate forgery, or by imputing to him an almost incredible ignorance of the age and character of the document which he used".

Ecgwin's first visit to Rome was the more romantic. His people, finding that he never ceased denouncing their evil ways, contrived to bring upon him the displeasure both of Rome and the king. To Rome, then, was he summoned. To show how he was bound by accusations, we are told that he fastened fetters on himself and threw the key of them into the Avon. Though thus impeded, Rome was reached at last. A fish caught in the Tiber was found to contain the key of Ecgwin's fetters! Taking this marvel as a sign from heaven, Ecgwin freed himself from his chains. Then by the Pope also was he declared innocent of the charges brought against him, and by his authority was he restored to his see.

The second time he went to Rome was, as we have seen, in the company of kings.

His eleventh century biographer relates that, while at Rome on this occasion, Ecgwin consulted the Pope about a vision that he had seen, in which he was directed to build a church in the midst of a wild country, the site of the present town of Evesham, where there was a "bit of a chapel *(ecclesiolam)*, probably the work", says Malmesbury, "of the Britons". The Pope, in full belief of the genuineness of the vision, wrote (709) to the archbishop of Canterbury (Brithwald), and ordered a council to be held on the spot where Ecgwin had seen the vision of Our Lady, and a Benedictine monastery to be built there. In the Lateran church of Our Saviour, whence the letter of the Pope and the supposed charters of the kings are dated, the two kings, whom the saint had conducted to Rome, gave large grants, it is said, towards the expenses of the new church and monastery, in presence of the Pope and a great number of Anglo-Saxon bishops and nobles. The saint returned with great joy to England. The monastery of Evesham was begun at once; and in 713 a bull of Pope Constantine placed it under the special protection of Archbishop Brithwald, and declared it "free from all tyrannical exaction".

From this history of Ecgwin, if we conclude only that he made two journeys to Rome in the days of Pope Constantine, and obtained a "privilege of exemption or protection" from that Pontiff for his monastery of Evesham, we shall certainly not err on the side of credulity.

Towards the close of the year 709, Constantine left the harbour of Portus for Constantinople, in obedience to an order from Justinian, who thought to settle the 'Quinisext question' more quickly by word of mouth than by diplomatic correspondence.

As this journey of the Pope is interesting from various points of view, it seems worthwhile to give it at the same length as it has been given to us by the papal biographer. There accompanied the Pope two bishops, three priests, Gregory the deacon, afterwards the great Pope Gregory II, the secundicerius, the first of the *defensors*, or agents, the (private) treasurer, the nomenclator, the keeper of the archives *(scrinarius)*, two subdeacons, and a few inferior clerics. At Naples the Pope was met by

the exarch John, who, on leaving the Pope, went to Rome, and, for some reason quite unknown to us, proceeded to decapitate four officials of the papal court—the majordomo, the treasurer, the *ordinator* and an abbot. Passing on to Ravenna, he met with a most shameful death, a just reward, as the Pope's biographer thinks, of his great crimes. Meanwhile the Pope sailed on to Otranto, touching at Sicily, Reggio, Cotrone and Gallipoli, in Calabria. At Otranto, where he passed the winter, he was visited by the *Regionarius* Theophanius, who brought with him an imperial mandate, to the effect that, wherever the Pope touched in the course of his journey, he was to be received by the judges as though he were the emperor. When the winter was over the Pope sailed to Constantinople by way of the island of Ceos. To the seventh milestone from the city went forth the populace in their holiday attire to meet the Pope. At their head were the emperor's young son Tiberius and the nobility, with the patriarch Cyrus and his clergy. Mounted on beautifully caparisoned horses from the imperial stables, the Pope wearing his mitre, the papal party were escorted in triumph to the palace of Placidia. This palace, the usual residence of the papal apocrisiarii when at Constantinople, stood where once stood old Byzantium, and where now stands the old Seraglio, and so was beautifully situated at the eastern end of the promontory which separates the Sea of Marmora from the Golden Horn, commanding a view of the Asiatic coast. Justinian, who was then at Nicaea in Bithynia, at once wrote to the Pope to express his joy and thankfulness for his coming, and begged him to come as far as Nicomedia. Thither the emperor made his way; and there, with the imperial crown upon his head, he prostrated himself before the Pope on his arrival and kissed his feet. Then, whilst all admired the emperor's humility, the Pope and emperor embraced. On Sunday the emperor received Holy Communion at the hands of the Pope; and whilst praying the Pope to intercede for his sins, he renewed all the privileges of the Church. As to what passed between Justinian and the Pope in the course of their conversation, the biographer of the latter gives us no further information in his *Life* of Constantine. But it is the general opinion of historians, supported by what will be immediately cited from the life of Gregory II, that the two discussed the Quinisext Council. By the aid of his deacon Gregory, the Pope succeeded in satisfying the emperor without compromising his See. "When questioned by the emperor on certain chapters", says Gregory's (II) biographer, "he (Gregory) solved every difficulty by his admirable answers". As Hefélé remarks, Constantine took the middle course which we know that John VIII afterwards took, *i.e.*, he approved those canons of the Trullan synod which were not opposed to the faith, good morals, or the decrees of the Roman Church.

Despite a great deal of sickness on his return journey, the Pope reached Rome (October 24, 711) in safety, to the great joy of the people.

Soon after the Pope's arrival in Rome, the bloodthirsty Justinian, whom the papal biographer, on the principle, it would seem, that one ought to speak of men as one finds them, calls "orthodox and most Christian", was slain, and Philippicus (Bardanes), a heretic, reigned in his stead! The first thing that this "luxurious and extravagant" prince did was to attempt to revive the Monothelite heresy. By so doing, remarks Finlay, "he increased the confusion into which the empire had fallen (by the frequent revolutions that had occurred from the date of the first accession of Justinian II), and exposed the total want of character and conscience among the Greek clergy, by re-establishing the

Monothelite doctrines in a general council of the Eastern bishops" (712 AD). The letter which he sent to the Pope was replete with heresy.

Examined in a synod at Rome, the imperial document was condemned by the Pope. The Roman people also took up the question; and by their conduct retorted in a very direct manner on the action of Bardanes. For one of the first acts of the emperor had been to order the removal of a representation of the Sixth General Council, which had been hanging for some years in the vestibule of the palace, and, on the other hand, he had decreed the reinsertion into the diptychs of the names of those who had been condemned by the Sixth General Council and the re-erection of their images. The acts of the Sixth Council he had caused to be burnt and its supporters exiled. Accordingly Pope and people proceeded to erect in the portico of St. Peter's a series of pictures illustrative of the six general councils. They then went a step further, a step equivalent to declaring themselves independent, at least of an heretical emperor. They decreed that the name of Philippicus should not appear in their charters, nor be stamped on their money. His image was not placed in the church, nor was he prayed for in the Canon of the Mass. After this, what need for surprise when, after further provocation, we find the Roman people making themselves wholly independent of the emperor and placing themselves under the rule of the Pope; and if we find under Zachary, if not under one of the Gregorys (II or III), the Pope's name on the coins of the Roman people instead of the emperor's!

Of course the emperor could not tamely submit to see all this defiance of his authority, and he sent (713) a certain Peter to replace the Duke Christopher, who had connived at all these doings. The people, however, took Christopher's part, and a fight took place in the Via Sacra, in front of the official residence of the governor of Rome, between what was known as the Christian party and Agatho, who had come to Rome to represent Peter. Several had been killed on both sides, when the Pope, to prevent further bloodshed, sent down to the combatants a body of priests bearing the Book of the Gospels and the Crucifix. They prevailed on the Christian party, which was far the stronger, to yield. The triumph of the heretical party was, however, short-lived; for news reached Rome, a few days after the combat, that the heretic Philippicus had been deposed, and that the orthodox Anastasius reigned in his stead. "Then", says the papal biographer from whom we learn these facts, "great was the joy of the orthodox, while black night fell upon the heretic".

With their imperial sympathies the popes ought to have been the last persons with whom any emperor should have quarreled. This the new emperor, Anastasius, understood and, by the hands of his exarch Scholasticus, sent the Pope a profession of faith, in which he declared his orthodoxy and consequent adhesion to the Sixth General Council. The patriarch John, also, who had been forcibly placed in the See of Constantinople by Philippicus, sent a profession of faith to Constantine (whom he calls the head of the Christian priesthood), in which he endeavored to make out that he had always really been orthodox at heart, but had acted as he had done to ward off greater evils from the Church. And he maintained that the decree of faith drawn up at the pseudo-council of Philippicus was orthodox in sense, if not at first sight in words. As a sole comment upon this, let it suffice to point out that it was conduct of the same weak kind on the part of our own bishops under Henry VIII that brought about the so-called

Reformation and all the evils, social and religious—notably the Civil War—that it has produced in England. The exarch or the Roman people suffered Peter to receive the dukedom of Rome on condition of his promising not to molest any of his opponents.

With Muratori, we may refer to this year the action of the holy archbishop of Milan, Benedict. It would seem that of old, certainly in the fifth century, the church of Pavia had been subject to that of Milan. For some cause the right of the archbishops of Milan had been lost; perhaps because the Lombard kings had obtained exemption for the bishops of their capital from the jurisdiction of Milan. And so when it was shown to Benedict, who wished to recover the rights of Milan, that for a long time the bishops of Pavia had been consecrated at Rome, and had been subject only to its jurisdiction, he waived his contentions once and for all.

After the year 713 we know nothing more of the life of Constantine. When, in conclusion, it is stated that in his time, as in the time of Pharao, there was a season of extraordinary scarcity and one of extraordinary plenty, and that he consecrated a great many bishops both when going to and when returning from Constantinople, and at other times, practically all has here been said that is known of this "worthy predecessor of the greater popes under whom Rome effected her emancipation from the yoke of Byzantium".

Constantine was buried in St. Peter's, April 9, 715.

ST. GREGORY II

A.D. 715-731

EMPERORS.

Anastasius II, 713-715.

Theodosius III, 715-716.

Leo III, 716-741.

KINGS.

Liutprand, 712-744

EXARCHS.

Scholasticus, 713-726.

Paul, 726-727.

Eutychius, 727-752; apparently the last of the exarchs.

Under any circumstances the life of Gregory II is beset with difficulties. But to the Christian historian, who approaches it with a wish to be impartial, the biography of that Pontiff presents exceptional difficulties. The principles—from whatever source drawn, from education, natural temperament, and the rest—which he brings to the examination of the 'Image-breaking' (Iconoclast) heresy, and of the 'temporal power of the popes', are naturally calculated to make him draw conclusions about the conduct of St. Gregory in accordance with those principles. The historian with rationalistic or Puritan leanings will, of course, look askance at the great defender of 'image-worship'. The opponent of government by clerics will decry the great Pontiff under whom the temporal rule of the popes may be said to have fairly begun.

The difficulties, however, that meet the biographer of Gregory II, in any case, are caused by the unsatisfactory nature of some of the records of his time that have come down to us. We can gather from them little or nothing of the motives that actuated the chief figures on the world's stage in those times; e.g., why Leo, after a reign of ten years, began to persecute the worshippers of images. There is also a lamentable want of reliable dates in the period under consideration, and there is much controversy as to the genuineness of some of its most important documents, e.g., the two famous letters of the Pope to the emperor. The Greek historians are so badly informed on Western affairs as to confuse the two Gregorys; the Latins relate events which seem scarcely to be consistent. All this, of course, tells strongly in favor of the prejudiced writer. He can arrange his facts to suit his theories with less fear of contradiction. And as the

pontificate of Gregory II is very important, this is the more unfortunate. Under the circumstances, then, all that can be done for the benefit of the reader is to make every effort to lay before him the sequence of events in the plainest terms, so that he can judge for himself of the merits of the personages that will be brought under his notice.

At the outset it is interesting to call attention to the resemblance between the histories of the first two Gregorys. Both reigned for about the same number of years, were reigning in the beginning of their respective centuries. Both of noble families, they turned their parental mansions into monasteries, and both acted as secretaries of the popes, their immediate predecessors. Both, in their struggles with the Lombards, subdued them at last by their personal influence, and both were prepared for their dealings with the emperors of Byzantium by a personal knowledge of the Eastern court. If, in the history of the conversion of nations, the name of St. Augustine and England is inseparably linked with that of the first Gregory, the second Gregory is just as closely allied with St. Boniface and Germany. And finally, from the extracts of his registers, which have come down to us, it would appear that the second Gregory might also, like the first, be set down as a careful administrator of the patrimony of St. Peter.

To proceed to the details of Gregory's life. He was, again like his great namesake, a Roman, the son of Marcellus and Honesta. It was after her death that Gregory, then Pope, transformed the ancestral mansion into a monastery in honor of St. Agatha, in Suburra, endowed it and enriched it with many precious vessels for the service of the altar. When very young, he was placed under the care of the popes, and was by Pope Sergius made subdeacon and treasurer of the Roman See. He was then entrusted with the care of the papal library, and made deacon. In the Life of Constantine we saw the part he played, in the latter capacity, in the affair of the Quinisext canons with Justinian II.

He was a man of pure life, eloquent and firm, had a good knowledge of the sacred Scriptures, and ever showed himself a stout upholder of the rights of the Church and a formidable foe to his opponents. Such was the man who was consecrated bishop of Rome, May, 19,715.

Whether or not because he could see that the Lombards, after their long period of rest, were about to make another effort to bring all the Italian peninsula under their yoke, or because he felt that danger from the Saracens was imminent, Gregory, in the very first year of his pontificate, commenced to repair the walls of Rome, beginning at the gate of St. Lawrence. But various circumstances (among others, probably, an unusual rising of the Tiber, about October 716, which did great damage in Rome, lasting for eight days, and which only subsided after many Litanies had been said by the order of the Pope) prevented Gregory from completing their entire restoration. The last days of a state have come when it has to depend for its existence on stone walls! Well was it for Rome in the eighth century that it had in the person of its bishops a defence stronger than barred gate or turret!

In connection with the overflow of the Tiber just mentioned, Duchesne has a very useful topographical note, which we cannot do better than translate. After observing that this is the first time that an inundation caused by the Tiber is described by any of the papal biographers, he calls attention to the fact that, whenever an overflow of the Tiber

is chronicled by later writers in the *Liber Pontificalis*, it is always in the same words as those used in this life of Gregory II. Nor is there any objection to this, as the phenomenon always repeats itself in the same way. Striking against the north wall of the city, the river rushed in by the only opening on that side, *viz.*, the Flaminian Gate. Unable, as it swept along, to effect an entrance by the openings which lead to the Pons Aelius (St. Angelo) and the Pons Aurelius (Ponte Sisto), owing to their height above the river, it nevertheless managed to force its way through the postern gates and up the water-courses and other smaller openings. Thence it spread over the Campus Martius. Along the Via Lata it rushed to the foot of the Capitol and to the basilica of St. Mark. Here it had to make a bend; and here it was that the water seems to have attained its maximum height, and here was the height of the inundation measured. On the left bank of the river the flood covered the Neronian fields from the porta Sti. Petri, near the castle of St. Angelo, to the Milvian Bridge (Ponte Molle). In the other direction, *viz.*, towards St. Peter's, the flood stopped at a place called Remissa, which is spoken of in the first Ordo Romanus of Mabillon as a place where the cortege of the Pope halted for a moment on its way to St. Peter's on Easter Monday. As, in the twelfth century, this halt, we know, was made in front of the steps which led to the atrium of the basilica (before the church of St. Maria of the Virgarii), *i.e.*, where now stands the obelisk, it may be argued that there was the remissa of the eighth and ninth centuries.

In this same year (715) also, Gregory received a profession of faith (a synodical letter) from the 'prudent' John, patriarch of Constantinople, whom we have seen truckling to the Monothelite emperor Philippicus. This lengthy letter, of which mention has already been made, and which had been directed to Constantine, John styled an apology, inasmuch as it was largely taken up with specious efforts to palliate his weakness. He had to yield somewhat, he urged, to the character of the man (*viz.*, the emperor). After a tedious and confused endeavor to clear himself as far as possible, John concluded by assuring the Pope, 'God-inspired', as he called him, that he is now, on the one hand, in possession of his defence, and, on the other, of his profession of the orthodox faith. And he earnestly begs the Pope not to be severe with him, as he had acted under constraint.

In the eighth century, then, the Pope of Rome, even to the patriarchs of Constantinople, was the sacred head of the church, whose office it was to direct and govern all the other members of the church without exception, just as, in the human frame, the power of controlling the other parts of the body proceeds from the head. This document, so interesting in many ways, may be read in Labbe, or in any of the great editions of the councils. It was one of the documents the deacon Agatho thought fit to append to the acts of the Sixth General Council, at which he had been present. Gregory sent his profession in return. John probably did not live to receive it. For on the 11th of August, Germanus, who had been bishop of Cyzicus, was transferred to the vacant patriarchal See of Constantinople, and was installed in the presence, among others, of "the most holy priest Michael, apocrisiarius of the Apostolic See". He was soon, by his heroism in resisting the tyranny of the Iconoclast Leo, to atone for his weakness under the Monothelite Philippicus.

The number of Anglo-Saxon pilgrims to Rome, which throughout the whole of the seventh and eighth centuries was large, was particularly great during the life of

Gregory II. “At this time many of the Angles, noble and simple, men and women, soldiers and private persons, moved by the instinct of divine love, were wont to repair from Britain to Rome”. The two most illustrious names among the English pilgrims of this period were those of Abbot Ceolfrid and King Ina. Ceolfrid had been the specially beloved disciple of the great abbot Benedict Biscop, had accompanied Benedict in his journeys to Rome in search of books and treasures of all kinds, had been appointed by him abbot of the monastery of St. Paul, on the north bank of the Wear, and, after the death of Benedict, had presided over the twin monasteries of SS. Peter and Paul for twenty-eight years. Being then very old, he decided to revisit Rome, “where he had been in his youth with Benedict, to the end that, before his death, he might have some relaxation for a while from the cares of the world” ; and that his brethren might have the benefit of a younger and more energetic abbot. In tears the monks heard of the determination of their beloved abbot. And as nothing could shake the resolve of the aged man, they elected Huethbert as his successor. In the whole range of monastic history—one is almost tempted to say in the whole range of general history—there is nothing more touching than the narrative of the resignation, departure for Rome, and death of the abbot Ceolfrid, whether it be read in the simple original of Venerable Bede, or in the glowing pages of the historian of the Monks of the West. Ceolfrid took with him to Rome a complete copy of the Bible as a gift to the Church of St. Peter, and a letter from the new abbot “to the apostolic Pope Gregory”, which began as follows : “To the thrice-blessed Pope Gregory, his most beloved lord in the Lord of lords, Huethbert, your most humble servant ... wishes eternal health in the Lord. I, together with the brethren, who desire in these places to find rest for their souls by carrying the easy yoke of Christ, cease not to render thanks to the providence of the heavenly judge, that he has thought fit to appoint you, who are such a glorious vessel of election, to be the ruler of the Church Universal in our times; and by means of the light of truth and faith with which you are filled, to disperse the beams of his love among your inferiors”. He proceeds to recommend to the Pope’s care the venerable grey hairs of their dear Ceolfrid. Such was the language of English churchmen of the eighth century to the Vicar of Christ. Ceolfrid was not destined again to see at Rome “the shrines which it was to him a cause of unceasing joy to remember and repeat that he had seen and adored in his youth”. He died at Langres, September 25, 716.

Ina, the great and powerful king of Wessex, was more fortunate in accomplishing his pilgrimage. After a glorious reign of thirty-seven years, he went to Rome (725 or 726), “being desirous to spend some time of his pilgrimage upon earth in the neighborhood of holy places, that he might be more easily received by the saints into heaven”. According to Malmesbury, Ina passed his time in Rome in retirement and in obscurity, clad in the garb of an ordinary citizen, in order that he might not be seen of men. Later writers, however, will have it that he spent part of his time in Rome in founding “the school of the English”. Matthew Paris, who flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century, tells us “that Ina built a house in the city with the consent and goodwill of Pope Gregory, which he called the school of the English, to which the kings of England, the royal family, and the clergy might come to be instructed in the Catholic faith, that nothing false or contrary to the Catholic faith might be taught in the Church in England”. In this narrative of Paris there is nothing intrinsically improbable; nay, considering we find a *schola* (colony) of the English certainly established in Rome in

the days of Leo III it should be even called probably true. But the distance of time that separates Ina and the monk makes the statements of the latter about the early history of our country proportionately open to suspicion.

King Ina was not the only royal personage whom authentic documents enable us to see in Rome in the days of Pope Gregory. Before the end of the sixth century there seem to have been Christian dukes in Bavaria, but it was only during the seventh century apparently that Christianity was to any considerable extent propagated among the Bavarians. Its true apostle, St. Emmeran, had been slain in the middle of that century; and in the beginning of the eighth century its Duke Theodo, called II by some and I by others, came to Rome, the first of his race, to pray. He doubtless also came to arrange with Gregory about taking further measures for the complete conversion of his country. For in the May of this same year (716) Gregory addressed a series of instructions to Bishop Martinian, and to Gregory and Dorotheus, deacon and subdeacon of the Apostolic See, when setting out for Bavaria. He bade them, in conjunction with the duke, establish ecclesiastical discipline; and, after careful instruction of the candidates, to constitute a hierarchy. If, however, they cannot find a proper person to set over the new episcopate as archbishop, they are to send word to him (Gregory), and he will send a suitable one. He gave minute directions as to what they were to teach concerning marriage, a matter undoubtedly of as much importance in civilizing and Christianizing a wild and pagan people as in preserving a civilization already acquired. The man who tampers with the sacred truths in connection with marriage is aiming destructive blows at the very keystone of civilization. As very important points to be attended to in the conversion of idolaters, the Pope exhorted the missionaries to warn the people against the observance of dreams, and of lucky and unlucky days, and against incantations and witchcraft. The necessity of personal penance for sin, the resurrection of the body and the eternity of hell, were also among the striking truths that the Pope would have impressed on the minds of the heathen Bavarians.

To revert for a moment to Theodo, the convert of St. Rupert. He seems to have died (716 or 717) soon after his visit to Rome, before the death of his spiritual father, and before the return to Bavaria of the saint now to be spoken of.

To help to hasten on the conversion of Bavaria, Gregory induced St. Corbinian, a Frank, like most of the other missionaries who converted the Bavarians, whom his predecessor had ordained bishop, not to retire from the world, as the worthy bishop wished to do, but to return and continue his labors in the Lord’s vineyard. The chronology of the life of St. Corbinian is a little obscure, owing to a mistake of his biographer Aribo, his third successor (764-784) in the See of Freisingen, who has either confused Pepin of Heristal with Charles Martel or Constantine with Gregory II.

If, however, with the Bollandists we suppose that Aribo, who as a boy may have seen Corbinian, by an easy lapse of memory assigned the two visits of the saint to Rome to the reign of the same Pope (Gregory II), the narrative of Aribo will be consistent, not only with itself but with other historical data. Though a man of strong feeling, not to say temper—indeed, no doubt on that very account —it is plain that Corbinian exerted a great influence on all with whom he came into contact. Wherever he went he soon became very popular, and was everywhere sought after. Fearing that his popularity

would prove a snare to his virtue, he left his native place (near Melun, not far from Paris), and went to Rome with a number of disciples, not only to seek the Pope's instruction and prayers, but also that he might obtain a quiet spot, where, away from the praise and flattery of men, he could live under monastic rule. This was probably in 709, when Constantine was Pope. But it was not difficult to conclude that a man with such spirit as Corbinian, and with such a winning personality, was a proper subject for the performance of great things. Constantine would not allow him to hide his light under a bushel. He consecrated him bishop, and gave him the pallium, which, though usually the sign of archiepiscopal jurisdiction, was, as we have seen, occasionally bestowed on bishops. To Frankland accordingly Corbinian returned, to work with the power of a successor of the apostles. Again was the homage of men at his feet, and again did he seek to shun its dangerous allurements by retiring to a cell. His retreat was discovered, and once more did men flock around him; and once more had he recourse to Rome, hoping that what one Pope had refused another might grant. No doubt to avoid embarrassing recognition, he did not go through Gaul but through Germany. Whilst he was journeying through Bavaria (717), it in some way came to the ears of Theodo, who had by that time returned from Rome, that the saintly Corbinian was on his way to the Eternal City. He invited him to come to him. Especially eager was the duke's son, Grimwald, that he should abide with them. But to escape from the turmoil of the world was the deep desire of Corbinian. He continued his journey to Rome "to obtain his release"—*solutionem percipere*.

Gregory II, however, proved no more amenable than his predecessor. Still, with a view of making a deeper impression on the saint, he examined the affair in a synod. All were of opinion that he should return to the Lord's vineyard. Not to be disobedient, Corbinian submitted, and again turned his face towards the North. He was not destined to reach the land of the Franks. Grimwald had resolved that if the saint had to return to the world, he should remain to labor in Bavaria. This, perforce, Corbinian had to do. Grimwald, however, had soon reason to regret his pious violence. He had married his brother's widow, the beautiful Piltrudis. Corbinian, who had now fixed his See at Freisingen in Upper Bavaria, denounced the marriage; and after a long struggle succeeded in bringing about a separation between the pair. But Piltrudis returned to Grimwald and to influence. Corbinian was banished. The misdeeds of the guilty couple were destined to be punished even in this life. To ensure a more real dependence of the Bavarians on the Frankish kingdom, Charles Martel invaded Bavaria both in 725 and 729. Grimwald lost his life (725 or 729) and Piltrudis her liberty. She was carried into Frankland by Charles, and seems to have died in poverty. The Bavarian dukedom passed to Hucbert, Grimwald's nephew. He recalled Corbinian, who died working for the conversion of the Bavarians, probably in 730.

But the one who firmly established the faith in Bavaria, as in the whole of Germany, was St. Boniface, or Winfrid, which was his proper name. This glorious apostle of Germany was one of our own countrymen, having been born at Crediton, in Devonshire, about 680. This is not the place to treat at length of the heroic labors of St. Boniface for the conversion of the Germans. We must be content to unfold his relations with the popes.

Fired with zeal for the conversion of nations, who had become a monk, betook himself to Rome (718); and, as the abbess of Minster expressed it to Boniface himself, God "moved the pontiff of the glorious See to grant the desire of your heart". With all the ardor of his soul, Winfrid poured forth to the Pope the cause of his coming to him, and told him with what a longing desire he had wished to preach the Gospel to the heathens. Delighted with the saint's vivacity, the Pope could not forbear to smile at the earnestness of the zealous Englishman at his feet; but to be sure that the zeal came from true virtue, and was according to order, Gregory asked him if he had commendatory letters from his bishop. At the word the letters were at once produced. From them, the idea which Gregory had conceived of Boniface was confirmed, and daily conferences were held between them. At length (May 15, 719), with the Pope's blessing and with letters from him, Boniface was "sent to the wild nations of Germany to see whether the rude soil of their hearts, when tilled by the ploughshare of the Gospel, would receive the seed of truth". In the letter of authorization to preach in Germany, which Gregory addressed to Boniface, the Pope approves of his desire, as well on account of his earnest zeal and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures as because he had proceeded in the proper order, *viz.*, as a member of a body, and had put himself in communication with the head. "And so", continues the Pope, "in the name of the undivided Trinity, and by the irrefragable authority of Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose place we hold, go forth and preach to the nations in the bonds of error the truths of both testaments".

Before the coming of St. Boniface, Christianity, as we have seen, had been preached in Germany, but in a more or less desultory kind of way. Owing, however, to the isolation and smallness of the Christian communities, little advancement was being made. In fact, in many instances, they were themselves eaten up with errors and superstitions. After having purified its various parts, Boniface put the Church in Germany on a firm basis, by welding the different communities together and joining them with the center of Christian life, the See of Rome. Justly did he earn for himself the admiration of the Christian Europe of his day, the everlasting gratitude of the German people from that time forth, the title of Apostle of Germany, and the martyr's crown!

Boniface, following out the papal instructions, began his labors in Thuringia. There, and in Hesse and Saxony, he labored unremittingly in restoring discipline and in purifying and spreading the faith. After many thousand pagans had embraced the doctrines of Christ, Boniface sent (722) one Bynnan to Rome to tell the Pope what had been done, and to ask a variety of questions as to the direction of the infant Church. The Pope replied by summoning Boniface to Rome. In company with a number of his brethren, Boniface at once set out for Rome in the autumn of 722. From Willibald we learn that the sight of the Eternal City deeply moved him, as it must move every true Christian. "As soon, as he caught sight of the walls of Rome, he poured forth praise to God; and when he reached St. Peter's he armed himself with prayer". The Pope met the saint in St. Peter's; and, after mutual greetings, at once proceeded to question him with regard to the faith he had been teaching. Perhaps some wicked persons, from jealousy or other motives, had been casting aspersions on the doctrinal preaching of Boniface. "Apostolic father", answered Boniface, "as a foreigner I find it hard to understand your speech; give me but time, and I will set forth my faith in writing". Readily, of course,

was the delay granted. It is interesting to observe from this passage that the pure Latinity affected by St. Gregory the Great had in a hundred years so changed in the mouth of his illustrious namesake, that to a stranger it was not easy to follow its altered form. Some days after his profession of faith had been handed in to the Pope, Boniface, called to the Lateran, received it back from Gregory, with an exhortation ever to stand by it himself, and with all his strength to preach it to others. Then on November 30, 722, Gregory consecrated Boniface bishop. In accordance with the general custom of the bishops ordained at Rome, Boniface, with his own hand, wrote out a profession of faith, which he swore to follow, and placed it on the tomb of St. Peter. The oath which Boniface took was much the same as that taken by the bishops of Italy, and had been in use as far back as the pontificate of Gelasius I (492-496). It is given towards the beginning of Otholo's life of our saint, and runs as follows: "In the name of Our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the sixth year after the consulship of the emperor Leo, and in the fourth year of the emperor Constantine his son, in the sixth Indiction :—

"I, Boniface, by the grace of God, bishop, promise to thee, Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to thy Vicar, the Blessed Pope Gregory and his successors, by the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, undivided Trinity, and by thy most holy body, to proclaim the whole Catholic faith in all its purity; and by the help of God, to remain steadfast in the unity of that faith, in which, without doubt, is the Christian's hope of salvation. Never, at the bidding of anyone, will I do anything against the unity of the One Universal Church; but, as I have said, I will in all things be faithful and helpful to thee and to the interests of thy Church (to which God has given the power of binding and loosing), and thy said Vicar and his successors.

"Moreover, I will hold no communion with any bishops who may contemn the canons, but, if I can, will prevent them from so doing; and, if I cannot, will denounce them to the Holy See.

"And if, which God forbid, I should at any time or in any way act against this oath of mine, may I be found guilty at the last judgment and incur the penalty of Ananias and Saphira, who dared to speak a lie to you.

"This oath, I, Boniface, a lowly bishop, have written out with my own hand; and, according to what is prescribed, have placed it on the most holy body of Blessed Peter, and, in the sight of God, have sworn to keep it".

Gregory did not detain Boniface in Rome long after his consecration (November 30, 622), but sent him back again to the field of his toils with a book of the canons, a letter of recommendation to Charles Martel; a synodal letter—so called because read at the synod held for the installation of the new bishop—addressed to the clergy and people; a letter to all the clergy, the glorious Dukes, the magnificent Castellans, Counts, and to all God-fearing Christians; and two others to the Thuringians and to the Alt or Old Saxons in particular.

The powerful Mayor of the palace received our saint with the greatest reverence (723); took him under his protection; and in a letter, in which he styles himself 'illustrious' and 'Majordomo', and which he addressed to his "Lords and Fathers in Christ the Bishops, to Dukes, Counts, Vicars, Domestics, Stewards, to his Juniors, to the (royal) Missi and to his friends", Charles informs them all that Boniface has been placed

under his "Mundbyrd", that is, under his special protection. With the strength of Charles Martel to help him, Boniface resumed his labors in Hesse and Thuringia; and, as it were by magic, churches, monasteries and episcopal Sees sprang up in all directions.

Informed by the letters of Boniface of what was being effected in Germany in the way of conversion by his exertions, Gregory wrote to congratulate him on his success (December 4, 724); but, to keep him humble, did not fail to remind him that it was God who gives the increase, and that he must persevere in the good he was doing if he hoped to gain the immortal crown of victory. But Gregory did not content himself with a mere verbal interest in the work of Boniface. He showed his practical concern in the endeavors of our saint, not merely by writing to the Thuringians to urge them to renounce their idolatry and to receive Boniface, whom "we have sent to you to baptize you ... not for any temporal gain, but for the good of your souls"; but also by trying to procure the active interference of Charles Martel in his favor. A certain bishop, anxious to reap where he had not sown, claimed part of the newly-converted province as belonging to his diocese. Concerning this bishop, writes Gregory to Boniface, "we have written paternal letters to our most excellent son and patrician Charles, begging him to restrain the said bishop, and we have little doubt that the matter will be attended to".

The last communication that the Pope had with Boniface was towards the close of 726. Boniface had sent to ask the Pope for solutions to various difficulties that had sprung up in the course of his administering the young Church, just as St. Augustine consulted St. Gregory I. To these questions Gregory returned (November 22, 726) suitable answers, "not from us as of ourselves, but by the grace of Him who opens the mouth of the dumb and makes the tongues of infants eloquent". Some of the questions related to marriage, others to the question of re-baptism, and others to contagious diseases. The replies of the Pope were in accordance with canon law or sound practical sense, as the case might be. His letter concludes with the prayer that "He who, by apostolic authority, has caused you to go into those countries in our stead, may help you to obtain the reward of your labors and us to get the pardon of our sins". The rest of the career of St. Boniface, his reception of the pallium, his third journey to Rome, his reforms in Gaul, and his martyrdom (June 5, 755), belong to the times of St. Gregory III, Zachary and Stephen III, and will be treated of in the lives of those popes.

Before proceeding with the most important events of Gregory's reign, *viz*., his relations with the Lombards and the Iconoclast emperors, relations, it may be observed, very much interconnected, the remaining minor events of his pontificate may be conveniently noticed here.

From the lists of church repairs and decorations ordered by Gregory, left us by his biographer, we may safely conclude he was a lover of the glory of God's House. A still extant inscription between the doors which lead from the vestibule into the interior of St. Peter's records the donation by Gregory of certain lands and olive groves to SS. Peter and Paul, to provide the lamps of the basilica with oil—pro concinnatione luminariorum vestrorum, as it was expressed. He founded monasteries round the great basilica of St. Paul, outside the walls, that there might be monks to recite therein the Divine Office by day and by night. His action with regard to his ancestral mansion, and his founding or restoring various other monasteries, show him also as a lover of the

monastic order. Among the monasteries restored by Gregory II was the famous monastery on Monte Cassino, one of the highest hills in its neighborhood, and which overlooks the city of San Germano. About the year 580 the original abbey had been destroyed by the Lombards. The monks had fled to Rome, where, under Pope Pelagius II, they had founded the Lateran monastery. Sometime about the year 717, as is generally supposed, a citizen of Brescia, one Petronax, "full of the fire of divine love", came to Rome; and, at the exhortation of Pope Gregory, betook himself to Monte Cassino, and became the second founder of the glorious abbey of that name. He was helped in his work as well by some hermits, whom he found on the mountain, as by some monks of the Lateran congregation, assigned to him by the Pope. With Petronax, therefore, Gregory shares the honor of being the second of the four founders of the world-renowned monastery of Monte Cassino.

Among the great monasteries of Italy which were rebuilt or founded during the eighth century was the famous one of St. Vincent's on the river Volturno. It was founded by three young noblemen of Benevento during the reign of Gregory, and was first governed by its three founders in succession. On the death of the first abbot (720), the second of the three noblemen, Taso by name, a cousin of the first, was chosen abbot. The choice was in some respects unfortunate, as the zeal and sanctity of Taso were wanting in discretion, probably on account of his youth, as he was the youngest of the three. He would have placed upon the monks burdens greater than they could bear. The consequence was that Taso was deposed, and his elder brother Tato was elected abbot in his stead. An appeal to Rome was the consequence. Gregory, of course, condemned the conduct of the rebellious monks, and inflicted a severe penance upon them—apparently some hard manual labor. For we are told that the heat rendered the penance very difficult of accomplishment. Autpert (d.778), a monk, and afterwards abbot of this same monastery, who tells us this incident, adds that God also punished the disobedient monks. They soon all died, and were shortly afterwards followed to the grave by the abbot himself. Autpert tells us that he wrote down this sequel to the affair, that "for the future both shepherd and flock might refrain from such disturbing conduct".

A very curious story is to be found in the *Liber Pontificalis* in connection with the Saracens in Spain, which serves at least to show that Gregory was watching with an anxious eye over the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of his flock, and that consequently he was doing all he could to encourage the leaders of the Franks in their efforts against the Moslems, who for the second time had just besieged Constantinople itself. In the year 711 the Mohammedans poured into Spain, and in ten years not only overthrew the Visigothic kingdom in what is now called Spain, but were contesting (721) that part of it which had once extended over southern France. Unfortunately, whether in ancient or modern authors it is not easy to determine the exact order of events in this invasion of the Moslem. However, it seems clear that beneath the walls of Toulouse, Eudo, Duke of Aquitaine, gained a victory over them (721) by his own unaided efforts, eleven years before Charles Martel, with the aid of Eudo, for ever did away with danger from them to France in the decisive battle of Poitiers (732). According to the Book of the Popes, Gregory had sent 'three blessed sponges' to the Frankish leader in the preceding year (720). Of these Eudo gave small particles to his troops to be eaten just before the battle. We are assured that of those who eat of the

blessed sponge, not one was slain or wounded! The use of 'sponges' in this connection seems so extraordinary, that it has been contended, *e.g.*, by Jager, that the Pope sent indeed some eulogies, *i.e.*, blessed bread or some other blessed present; but that for 'sponges' should be read *sportulae* or baskets. So that the passage would indicate that "three baskets of blessed bread, such as used at the Pope's table", were sent to Eudo. Such an alteration of the text, however, is at once arbitrary and unnecessary. In days when people eat their food with their fingers, sponges would be a useful adjunct to the dinner table. And, likely enough, they were not so common among the Franks in the eighth century that they might not well serve as fitting objects for a Pope to send as a present—the more so that, then as now. Catholics value a present from the Pope because it has come from his anointed hands, and not so much because of its intrinsic worth. Gregory no doubt sent the three sponges for lavatory purposes! The use they were actually put to by Eudo was due to the lively faith of that warrior. The passage is chiefly important, however, as we have said already, inasmuch as it shows that Gregory was carefully watching the movements of the Saracens, and was kept informed as to what was being done against them.

But political affairs, great and important though they were, did not take up the whole of Gregory's attention. In the April of 721 a synod at Rome under his guidance drew up seventeen canons for the furtherance of discipline. These canons had reference mostly to the Sacrament of matrimony, and forbade marriage with those consecrated to God, or between near relatives.

Gregory's next occupation was that of peacemaker.

The 'schism of Aquileia' was at least fruitful in one respect. It engendered two patriarchs. As might be expected, two men with very large powers, but with a limited area to exercise them in, did not always agree as to how much of the said area was the peculiar sphere of action of each of them. The patriarch of Aquileia, at this time, was Serenus, Bishop of Forum Julii (Cividale), whose rights were limited to the mainland of Venetia, to that part where reached the power of the Lombards. In response to a request preferred by Liutprand, Gregory sent the pallium to Serenus. Elated at this, Serenus began to encroach on the rights of Grado. Donatus, the patriarch of Grado, appealed to Gregory for protection. Gregory at once wrote to Serenus (December 1, 723), reminding him that humility was the noblest ornament of high station, and that he (the Pope) had sent him the pallium on the understanding that he would not attempt to interfere with what was due to others. By right of his apostolical authority he warned the patriarch not to transgress the rights of others, but to be content with his own, otherwise he would feel the weight of apostolical rigor.

On the other hand, Gregory wrote to Donatus, the patriarch of Grado, *i.e.*, the patriarch of Aquileia resident in Grado, to his suffragans, to Marcellus the Doge, and to the people of Venetia and Istria. To judge from the Pope's letter, Donatus had objected to the Pope's granting the pallium to Serenus at all. For the Pope opens his letter by reminding Donatus, that in virtue of the office, which by the divine mercy he holds, it is his to carry through—all obstacles to the contrary notwithstanding—whatever he has, after careful consideration, judged to be right. However, continues Gregory, he has no wish to act in that high-handed manner; and he informs Donatus of the line of conduct

he has adopted towards Serenus. In conclusion he warns them all to look to it, that the Lombards do not take advantage of any dissension among them to make an attempt upon their country. The patriotism of the man is apparent everywhere.

On the death of Donatus, Peter, Bishop of Pola, was translated to, or usurped, the See of Grado. Translation from see to see, however, was not of old in accordance with the discipline of the Church; and Pope Gregory at once declared Peter deprived of both Pola and Grado, The people of Venetia, at whose invitation, doubtless, Peter had left his See of Pola, begged the Pope to have mercy. Gregory, therefore, allowed Peter to return to his original See; but by letter warned the people of Venetia only to elect their bishops in accordance with the laws of God and the Church. At the bidding of this same Gregory II, not of Gregory III, as the date of this letter proves, Antoninus was elected patriarch of Grado. Space enough has now been given to what may be regarded as the minor events of Gregory's reign. Our attention must now be given to the Pope's dealings with the Lombards and the Iconoclast Emperor Leo, the Isaurian—dealings which occupied almost the whole reign of Gregory.

There seems to have been a fairly good understanding between the Lombards and Gregory in the early days of the his pontificate. As Dr. Hodgkin takes notice, Liutprand was swayed in the drawing up of his laws by the letters of the Pope, "who is the head of the Churches of God, and of the priests in the whole world". And at the exhortation of Gregory he abandoned his designs on the patrimony of the Cottian Alps, and confirmed the restitution of it which had been made by Aripert II. When trouble with the Lombards did begin, it was not with their king, but with one of the practically independent Lombard dukes, Romwald II. It was to render these dukes more submissive that, as will be noted presently, there took place such an extraordinary alliance as that between an exarch and a king of the Lombards.

By stratagem, and at a time when there was peace between the Lombards and the empire, the Lombards of the Duchy of Benevento got possession (717) of Cumae, a town that belonged to the Duchy of Naples. In Rome all was sadness at this untoward event, as their communications with Naples were now cut off. But the loyalty and patriotism of Gregory were equal to the occasion. Though, ever since the recall of Narses, the Roman emperors at Constantinople were only theoretically the rulers of any part of Italy at any distance from the walls of Ravenna, still, despite the outrageous treatment the popes received at their worthless hands, they (the popes) remained faithful to the emperors as long as it was at all possible. And so, on the present occasion, filled with grief at what had happened, Gregory used every means to induce the Lombards to give up their ill-gotten gains. He threatened them with the divine vengeance for their perfidy; he offered them money. But the Lombards despised the Pope's threats and his money alike. Failing in this direction, Gregory, by daily letters, did his best to rouse the Duke of Naples into action, telling him what ought to be done, and promising to reward him if he were successful. With Theodimus, a subdeacon, one of the rectors of the patrimony at his back, the Duke John managed in his turn to take Cumae by surprise, killed or captured the Lombard garrison, and for further reward received from the truly patriotic Pope no less an amount than 70 lbs. of gold, a very considerable sum in those days. The apparently conflicting action of the Lombards at this period may be best harmonized by reflecting that ambitious and able sovereigns seem to have the power of

summoning similar spirits around them; that it was Liutprand's aim to make all Italy, in fact as well as in name, dependent on him; and that consequently he was not displeased when he beheld hi more or less independent dukes and the exarch busily engaged in destroying one another's power.

The next move on the part of the Lombards was the capture of Classis, the seaport of Ravenna, by Farwald II, Duke of Spoleto, again in time of peace! By the order of Liutprand it was restored to the exarch. Nothing could give a better proof of the weakness of the imperial power in Italy at this period than this seizing of Classis by a Lombard duke, and its restitution at the bidding of a Lombard king. As in the days of Agilulf, Italy would have fallen altogether into the hands of the Lombards had it not been for Pope Gregory I; so would it now in the days of Liutprand, had it not been for the watchfulness, personal influence, and liberally spent money of the second Gregory.

The Pope well understood the signs of the times. In the interval of seeming rest that followed the raids on help from Classis and Cumae, when men said there was peace, Gregory knew there was no peace. He did his best to meet the storm he saw was brewing. He turned for help, where Pelagius II had long before declared that divine providence had ordained help to come from, viz., from the Franks. Gregory wrote for aid to Charles Martel.

But either Charles had too much to do himself, in the way of driving back the Saracens, or else he had some understanding with his warlike brother-in-law. At any rate, no help was sent by him. And help was certainly needed if the power of the Lombards was to be checked.

Somewhere about the year 725, the Lombards, whether Transamund, Duke of Spoleto, or Liutprand himself, is not clear, but probably the former, took the important mountain fortified city of Narni, on the Flaminian Way, and on the frontier of the Roman Duchy. To add fuel to the flames, there appeared in 726 Leo III's decree against images.

Leo II the Isaurian. 716-741

Two military revolutions, which brought to an abrupt close the short reigns of Anastasius II and Theodosius III, raised to the imperial throne the rude warrior, generally known as Leo (III) the Isaurian, or as Leo the Iconoclast. By the force of a strong or unscrupulous character he had worked himself up from the ranks of the people to the position of general of the Imperial army in the central portion of Asia Minor, when in 716 he usurped the empire. By his valor he saved Constantinople from the Saracens, who besieged it for nearly a year (September 717-August 718). Had he persevered in the way in which he began his reign, and devoted his whole attention to the consolidation of the empire, weakened as it was at this time as well by internal dissensions as by the Saracens, he would have been one of the most useful of the emperors who ruled at Constantinople. But the same mania for interfering in matters of religion seized him as took possession of so many others of the Byzantine Caesars; and

he threw both Church and State into a ferment by his decree (726) against the worship of images.

It is the fashion nowadays with many authors, reversing the conclusions of former writers, always to speak of the Iconoclast emperors as great. They follow, at least they always quote with approval, Schlosser of Heidelberg's History of the Iconoclast Emperors—a work which, in the judgment of such an acknowledged learned and impartial author as Hefélé, is "as offensive through insipid argument as by prejudiced perversion of history". Acting, it would seem, on the principle, certainly erroneous, that because a man belongs to a particular party, he is therefore so prejudiced that his statements are not to be believed, authors of such deserved repute as Professor Bury begin by discounting what is told us by the 'Iconodulic chroniclers', whose records, they are careful to remind us, are the only ones which have come down to us. They then proceed to enlarge, from sources, other than those of contemporary writers, on the great deeds of the Iconoclast emperors.

"It is a misfortune", writes Bury, "that no historical or other works composed by Iconoclasts (with the exception of the Ecloga, which does not deal with Iconoclasm) are extant ..." And yet he unhesitatingly declares the Iconodules "exaggerated their (the Iconoclast emperors) faults and calumniated their moral characters". "As the Iconodulic chroniclers did not know or did not care to tell of Leo's beneficial reforms, we are left in the dark as to the details"—and one would think, from the evidence producible, as to the reforms themselves. And certainly when an effort is made to discover on what Leo's title to greatness rests, its foundations seem to be a rather vanishing quantity. He indeed saved Constantinople from the Saracens. But he was helped not only by an unusually severe winter, but, as Bury informs us more than once, by the preparations for a siege that had been made by his prudent predecessor Anastasius II. Despite, however, the fearful losses the Saracens endured under the walls of Constantinople, Leo was unable to make any real headway against them. And how much better he would have been employed in trying to break their power rather than images is obvious from what Bury has to write of their constant inroads into Asia Minor, especially after the year 726, the year of the edict against the images!

The *Ecloga* of Leo, of which so much is made, was only published in the last year of his reign (740); and was but a "handbook in Greek for popular use, containing a short compendium of the most important laws on the chief relations of life". Hence, rather to their intrinsic insignificance than to any hatred of the Isaurian emperors "by their successors on account of their religious policy", should be attributed the fact "that none of their laws were incorporated in the great ninth century code of Basil I and Leo VI".

Leo was certainly no respecter of the rights of conscience. To say nothing of his treatment of the image-worshippers, "four years after his accession, Leo attempted to compel all the Jews in the Empire to be baptized ... At the same time he tried to force the Montanists to embrace the orthodox creed" (Bury).

As little did he respect the pockets of his subjects. Not only did he rob the popes (732) of 31 talents of gold (for which act there is no word of condemnation in Bury), but he increased the taxes readily and heavily. As a result of his oppressions in the domains of both mind and matter, he had to face the rebellions of Cosmas (727) and of

Italy. No ruler deserves to be called great, who so little understands the first principles of government that his measures of even needful reform should bring about such results.

While Professor Bury tells us that the palace of Leo's son Constantine V (Copronymus) "was constantly a scene of frivolity and festivity", he still represents him, as well as his father, as a man of elevated views. But while it may be conceded that Leo and Constantine V by their determination of character lessened the anarchy which had preceded their administration, and hence were so far useful rulers, it is not easy to find any evidence that they were great rulers, or that the attitude they took up in the image-controversy was that of men of superior enlightenment struggling against degrading superstition. On the contrary, there would seem to be evidence that Leo, at least, attacked what he was too ignorant and uneducated to understand.

Here it may be observed that a history is no place for a theological treatise. It is no part of the historian's business to inquire whether the worship of images is in accordance with the teachings of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; or, on broader grounds, whether it is compatible with right reason. His sole affair is to explain what exactly the Iconoclast question was, and to give its history as he would that of a political intrigue or a war. Most historians, however, who have treated of the Iconoclast or image breaking controversy have indulged in long and by no means unimpassioned diatribes on the worship of images. A word or two, as calm as possible, may therefore be permitted here.

There is no question, in the first place, that every Christian must repudiate all ideas of giving supreme honor to images as gods or the abode of God. And certainly no Christian who has had any religious instruction whatsoever would ever dream of so doing. But, it is urged, some Christians have given this supreme worship to images. A proposition most difficult of proof. Except by individual confessions it can never be proved. No amount of external signs that a man may give, apart from a verbal acknowledgment, can ever prove that he has given supreme worship to anything. The means at our command of externally showing honor are so limited that the intensity of the worship a person may wish to convey by the use of one or all of those means can only be gauged by one who knows the mind or intention of him who employs them. That intention can only be known by express statement. And how many Christians, it may be asked with confidence, have ever acknowledged that they have meant to give supreme honor to an image by any of the acts of reverence they may have shown it?

At any rate the ignorant may have rendered such adoration, and certainly by their extravagant attitude towards images they often seem to have given them a worship which cannot be said to be advisable. All that may be very true (though it must be borne in mind that with Eastern or more Southern peoples, very violent outward demonstration means very little), and raises the questions as to whether the employment of images in religious worship is useful; and whether, if it is, the abuse does not take away the use. That images of Our Lord and His saints are useful to recall or raise even the minds of the learned to higher things can only be denied by those who have never tried their utility in that direction, or by men who have not sufficiently reflected on what creatures of sense we are. Even the learned pray with some kind of image before their mind's eye; and as the great Protestant theologian, Leibnitz, closely argued, "To offer

up one's adoration before an external image is no more blameworthy than to do so before the internal image in our minds. The only use of the external image is to deepen the internal one". Never was the utility of images as reminders more realized than at the present day. The universal use of the camera is proof enough of that. The utility of images as a means of instruction for the uneducated was clearly pointed out by St. Gregory the Great in his letter to Serenus.

If, in itself, however, the utility of images even in religious worship be conceded, does not the dreadful abuse in practice of image worship render the employment of images for devotional purposes altogether undesirable? Emphatically no. In every department, abuse of good is so rampant, that even the necessary would have to be given up, if even gross abuse was always a sufficient excuse for abolishing the use of a thing. Food and drink, for instance, would be the very first things that would have to be given up. And in the case of the use of images, what abuse there may have been or is in their employment, has arisen or comes, for the most part, only from the very stupid or the grossly uninstructed. And surely, in their case, it is better that they should be led by the use of images to offer a mistaken worship to God, rather than that their ignorance or stupidity should keep them from giving Him any worship at all. So much for image worship in the abstract.

And now, what, as a matter of fact, has been the position the Church has taken up from the beginning with regard to the use and worship of images? Anyone can well understand that in the early ages of Christianity, when idolatry (i.e., the worship of many gods, who were supposed, according to the more or less cultured mind of the worshipper, to be, to a less or greater degree, connected with their statues) was well-nigh universal, the Church would be very chary about the use of images. The same caution was required on account of the early converts from Judaism, who had a great hatred of images on account of the frequent falls of their nation into idolatry.

The pagans who, we know, ever put their own construction on the little they cared to find out about Christian teaching, would, of course, have declared that the Christians worshipped as well as they did, had they seen or heard of their kneeling down and praying before a statue. But with all that, the early Christians, fully alive to the advantages of images as aids to piety, did not fail to use them from the very beginning. Witness their use of images of the 'fish'. They carried the 'fish' about with them in life; they had it laid by their sides in death.

Comparing the famous caricature graffito of the Crucifixion found on one of the walls of the Palace of the Caesars on the Palatine hill, and now in the Kircherian Museum, with the common accusation of the Heathens against the Christians, viz., that they worshipped crosses, proves at least that the Christians venerated crucifixes and crosses from the earliest times. The ardent words of St. Paul about the Cross of Christ, and the fact that from the earliest ages the Christians gloried in making the 'sign of the Cross' on themselves, quite prepare us to find a veneration for the 'image of the Cross'.

It is not, however, contended that 'image worship', for the reasons alluded to above, made any great progress in the public worship of the Church till after the conversion of Constantine in the fourth century. Some will have it that the council of Elvira in Spain, held about the year 300 (306?), condemned the use of pictures in the

churches. After the conversion of Constantine, however, the triumph of Christianity in Europe, by precluding any likelihood of a general return to idolatry, rendered the introduction of images into the churches comparatively safe. Accordingly, that they were then promptly and freely introduced into the churches is scarcely called in question, as the fact is so abundantly demonstrated not only by the 'very stones themselves' (*e.g.*, by the figures on sarcophagi, mosaics, etc.), but by the testimony of the Fathers.

This general use of images Leo III thought to abolish by his edict of the year 726. "After the tenth year of against his reign", says the deacon Stephen, who wrote in 808 the life and martyrdom of St. Stephen the younger, "Leo proclaimed: Since the making of images is an idolatrous art, they (the images) ought not to be adored". It is very unfortunate that we do not know for certain the motives that impelled Leo to attack holy images. However, as Theophanes was almost contemporary with the beginnings of Iconoclasm, it will be best to follow his guidance in our efforts to get at the truth in this matter.

In the year 722, urged on by a lying Jew, who promised him forty years of rule (which, needless to say, he did not get), Yezid II, the Ommiade Caliph of Damascus, issued a decree against the use of images in the Christian Churches of his dominions.

And we are assured that in Egypt, at any rate, the treasurer el-Habhab, in accordance with the Caliphs order, carried out (722) a general destruction of the sacred pictures of the Christians. The Caliph's early death, however, prevented his decree from having any lasting effect in his own realm. But it made an impression on the uneducated mind of Leo. This unfavorable impression against images entertained by Leo was deepened by one Beser, who had apostatized in Syria, apparently whilst a slave. His strength of body and kindred character introduced him to the notice and friendship of Leo. Then, doubtless, on the principle of hating what one has wronged, he never failed to instill into Leo his Mohammedan notions on the subject of images. Another evil adviser of the emperor was Constantine, Bishop of Nacolia, a man whom Theophanes describes as thoroughly impure and ignorant. Thus, on the testimony of Theophanes, than whom on this matter we have no better authority, and whose testimony there is no reason to doubt, the two chief instigators of the Iconoclast reform (?) were an apostate and an immoral bishop!

A movement against images, begun by Leo in 725, was quickened into the formal edict of 726, forbidding their use altogether, by a convulsion of nature. A terrific volcanic eruption threw up a new island in the group of the Cyclades, and covered with ashes the coasts of Asia Minor. Beser and the emperor saw in this eruption a portent urging them on. Amid great commotion a famous image of Our Lord above the great gateway (known as the Brazen Gateway) of the emperor's palace was smashed to pieces. The soldier who did the deed was slain, and a tumult followed. But Leo put it down with a strong hand, and punished its supporters with exile, mutilation and confiscation. The nature of the reform desired by Leo may be gathered from the fact that his persecution was particularly directed against the noble and the learned, with the result that schools were broken up which had flourished from the days of Constantine the Great.

The immediate result of Leo's decree, and perhaps also of some special heavy tax which he imposed at this time (727) was a rising in Greece. One Cosmas was proclaimed emperor. A fleet of the rebels arrived off Constantinople (April 18, 727), but the dread Greek fire was more than a match for it. Cosmas was executed, and the emperor raged more than ever against the worshippers of images.

The same two causes brought about commotions in Italy, which were not so easily laid to rest as those in Greece; and when they had subsided, they left the imperial power in Italy a mere shadow of what it was, and that of the Pope the only one able to oppose any resistance to the Lombards, who took occasion of the disorder to still further enlarge their territory.

On the authority of Theophanes, as has been said above, it was in the year 725 that Leo first began to make a movement against the use of images. Probably in the same year, whether on their own authority, with a view of hereafter gaining Leo's favor, or at his direct command, as the Book of the Popes expressly states, a certain duke Basil, the Cartularius (assessor) Jordanes, and a subdeacon Lurion formed a conspiracy to kill the Pope. This conspiracy received the encouragement of Marinus, who had been sent from Constantinople to govern the Duchy of Rome. The unfolding of the plot was checked for a time by the enforced departure from Rome of Marinus in consequence of illness. When Paul came as exarch (726-7) into Italy, the conspirators resumed their work. But the Romans, discovering their dark designs, extinguished them in the blood of their authors.

Meanwhile, in the latter half of the year 726, there was published, in Constantinople, Leo's edict against the use of images in the churches, and likely enough, at the same time, notice of a very heavy special tax, for the purposes of which Bury supposes that the emperor suppressed a year of the indiction. Apparently, and as might be expected, the notice of the exorbitant tax was the first to reach Italy. As a leader "of a lawful opposition to the tyranny of imperial administration", Gregory contended against the imposition of the said tax. And because he did so, the exarch, at the command of the emperor, began to concert measures for taking Gregory's life, putting another in his place, and plundering his churches. An army was accordingly dispatched from Ravenna to carry out these tyrannical intentions. But that they should be put into execution suited neither the Romans nor the Lombards. The Lombards did not wish any increase of the power of the exarch; and the Romans were resolved that no harm should come to their beloved Pope. Combined Roman and Lombard forces therefore caused the exarch's army to return without accomplishing its purpose.

At length, after this repulse of the exarch, the emperor's decrees against images were published in his Italian dominions, perhaps at the end of the year 726, arrive in but probably at the very beginning of 727. The Pope was informed that if he interfered with these decrees, as he had in the matter of the tax, he would be degraded. On the contrary, if he acquiesced he would meet with the emperor's favor. At once Italy was in a storm! The Pope, whose political and ecclesiastical position entitled him to make a direct opposition to Iconoclasm, at once took action, and wrote in all directions to warn the people against the teachings of the emperor. The subjects of the empire took more decided measures. They flew to arms in defence of the Pope; they anathematized the

exarch and the one who had commissioned him; and consulted for their own safety and liberty by electing dukes for themselves all over Italy. They even resolved to elect an emperor for themselves and to lead him to Constantinople. But this intention Gregory contrived to divert as he hoped for the conversion of the emperor. In the midst of this general defection, some, of course, took up the emperor's cause; among others the Duke Exhilaratus, on insufficient authority sometimes called the Duke of Naples. He marched on Rome with his son Hadrian, calling on the people to obey Leo and kill the Pope. The people replied by killing him. In Ravenna also Paul, the exarch, tried to form a party for the emperor, and he also was slain in the tumult that ensued

Now, of course, was the time for the Lombards. They availed themselves of it. In the first place Ravenna itself fell into their hands. Both from the Book of the Popes and the Lombard deacon, it is certain that Liutprand took and destroyed Classis, the harbour of Ravenna, and besieged Ravenna itself. That siege seems to have occurred (717) some years before the capture of Narni, and not to have resulted in the capture of the city. It is certain, however, that Ravenna was captured somewhere about this time, as particulars of its capture are given by Agnellus, and of its recapture by John the Deacon (who wrote some 250 years after this) and Paul the Deacon. When it was actually taken cannot be laid down with any certainty. But from the first letter of Gregory to the emperor, of which more hereafter, it would appear that Ravenna fell into the power of the Lombards for a short time in the year 727. There also fell, without much difficulty, under the rule of the Lombards, the Pentapolis—or the district around the five cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Ancona, and Umana—and various other places. Among others, Liutprand seized (727-8) Sutri, an important town in the Roman Duchy on the Cassian road. This place, however, in response to the entreaties and money of the Pope, the Lombard restored "to the apostles Peter and Paul".

Meanwhile, besides thus doing what he could to check against the encroachments of the Lombards, Gregory did not neglect to take steps to hinder the spread of the new heresy. Besides writing the warning letters we have alluded to, but of the contents of which we know nothing, he called a council in Rome (towards the close of 727) to deliberate on the best measures to be adopted to counteract the evil. This synod is spoken of by Pope Hadrian I in the letter which he wrote to Charlemagne (794) in answer to his capitular (the Caroline books). Pope Hadrian quotes a little of Gregory's speech to the Fathers of this council. Among other points, the Pope insisted "that images and pictures must be so kept and loved that their usefulness might not be spoilt by contempt, and this irreverence redound to the injury of those whose images they are; and that, on the other hand, the integrity of the faith might not be hurt by excessive worship; and that too much honor given to material things might not be an argument that we think too little of spiritual". Several of the Pope's arguments "have so great a similarity with some passages of the two letters (yet to be spoken of) of Gregory to the emperor, that we may suppose that Gregory delivered in the synod the principal part of what he wrote to the emperor. But what did he write to the emperor? This question brings us to the two famous letters of Gregory to Leo.

There are to be found appended to the Acts of the Seventh General Council two letters in Greek, letters which were not read at that council, but which, first found by the Jesuit scholar Fronto Ducaeus, were added to the Acts of the Seventh General Council

as pertaining thereto, and purporting to be from Pope Gregory II to Leo III. Up till comparatively recently these letters had always been accepted as genuine. Now their authenticity, on what seem to us insufficient grounds, has been called in question by Duchesne, Hodgkin, etc. While it is allowed that the 'documentary testimony' in their favor is fair—for MSS. copies of the letters, dating as far back as perhaps the tenth century have been found—it is urged that the internal evidence furnished by the letters is against their genuineness. Such evidence must be strong before it can suffice to upset what has been long accepted, and for which there is satisfactory external evidence. The chief argument against the authenticity of the letters is their alleged coarseness. No doubt there is some plain speaking in them. But if it is a question of balancing the very courtly style of Pope Gregory I to Maurice or Phocas, with the unpolished directness of the letters in question to the uneducated Leo, one ought rather to prefer the latter, and be thankful that the times and the man were such as to permit of a rude tyrant, who was interfering with conscience, being told the simple truth in unvarnished language.

The first letter, then, of Gregory to Leo on the subject of Iconoclasm was dispatched at the close of the year 727, and was to the following effect. The Pope began by reminding Leo that in ten letters he had promised to observe the doctrines of the Fathers.

"If anyone removes the ordinances of the Fathers, said you, let him be anathema. For ten years sacred images have not been mentioned by you. Now you say, they take the part of idols, and you add: Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, etc. But why have you not questioned wise men on this subject before disturbing and perplexing poor people? You could then have learnt of what kind of images God gave that command ... I am forced to write to you in a rough simple style, as you yourself are uneducated and uncultivated".

The Pope then shows that God, who gave the command about not making graven things (of a certain kind), yet Himself ordered their making for His worship and that men who had seen Our Lord and His martyrs, made pictures of them for others, who, leaving the worship of the devil, venerated these images, not absolutely (with the worship of latria), but relatively...

"You say: We worship stones and walls and boards. But it is not so, O Emperor; but they serve us for remembrance and encouragement, lifting our slow spirits upwards, by those whose names the pictures bear and whose representations they are. And we worship them not as God, as you maintain, God forbid!"....

"Stop", continues the Pope, "the scandal you are causing. Even the little children mock at you. Go into one of their schools, say that you are the enemy of images, and straightway they will throw their little tablets at your head, and what you have failed to learn from the wise you may pick up from the foolish. You wrote: As the Jewish King Ozias cast the brazen serpent out of the temple after eight hundred years, so I after eight hundred years cast the images out of the Churches. Yes, Ozias was your brother, and, like you, did violence to the priests ... In virtue of the power which has come down to us from St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, we might inflict a punishment upon you, but since you have invoked one on yourself, have that, you and the counselors you have chosen ... though you have so excellent a high priest, our brother Germanus, whom you

ought to have taken into your counsels as father and teacher ... The dogmas of the Church are not a matter for the emperor, but for the bishops".

The Pope then goes on to point out some of the unhappy consequences of the emperor's conduct; he tells how, when news of the destruction of the figure of Our Lord at the Brazen Gate, and of the subsequent massacres, had reached the West, the imperial laurel-crowned busts (laureata) were smashed and the Lombards took advantage of the general confusion to seize even Ravenna. But you say, "I will carry off Pope Gregory a prisoner as Constans (II) did Martin".

After pointing out what would be the folly of such a proceeding, as he acts as a peacemaker between the East and West, Gregory adds that in any case he has only to go a few miles out of Rome and then the emperor might just as well pursue the wind. "Would that it might be the will of God, that Pope Martin's lot might be mine".

"Still", adds the Pope, "as, though quite unworthy, the whole West trusts in us, and in St. Peter, whom men here regard as an earthly god, I am willing to live".

That the emperor replied to the above letter we know from the second letter of the Pope, in which he expresses grief that the emperor has made it clear by his letter that he (the emperor) has not changed his attitude towards holy images and refuses to follow even the Greek Fathers. Again the Pope reminds Leo that doctrines are matters not for emperors but for bishops, who "have the mind of Christ. You persecute and tyrannize over us with military and physical force. We, unarmed and defenseless ... invoke the Leader of armies ... Jesus Christ, that he may send thee a demon, according to that of the apostle (l Cor. v. 5), deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of Our Lord Jesus Christ".

"You ask", continues Gregory, quoting from the emperor's reply, "how it was that nothing was decreed about images in the six general councils". For the same reason, retorts the Pope, that it was not decreed that bread had to be eaten and water drunk. Men had as much the habit of venerating images as they had of eating bread and drinking water. Gregory might have added that at least by the Quinisext Council, which the Greeks classed with the Sixth General Council, the worship of images was practically recognized, for it decreed respect to the Cross. "Reverence for the holy cross requires that the form of the cross shall never be found on the floor, so that it may never be trodden under foot" (can. 73). In conclusion the Pope prays for the emperor's conversion, and that all may be brought back into the one true fold of Christ.

Much about the same time that Gregory wrote his first Gregory letter to Leo on image worship (viz., towards the end of self for the 727), he wrote to Ursus, doge of Venice, and to Antoninus, patriarch of Grado, in the same terms, urging them to stand by the exarch (that must be the new exarch Eutychius), who, the Pope heard, was in Venice, and in his (the Pope's) stead to fight with the unspeakable Lombards (they were probably then holding Sutri) for the recovery of Ravenna. Ravenna was, in fact, retaken, probably in the early part of the year 728, after it had only been in the hands of the Lombards for a month or two, which may account for its speedy recovery. It may be thought, from all the events we have assigned to the year 727, that things must have moved quickly at that time. Probably, from the energetic character of the principal

agents, Leo and Gregory, they did. Even the exarch Eutychius seems to have been a man of more enterprise than most of those who had preceded him in his office.

After the recapture of Ravenna, Eutychius, at the attempt on command of the emperor, proceeded to Naples, whence it was thought he might the more easily operate against the Pope, and effect what had so often been attempted in vain before. Accordingly the exarch sent an emissary to Rome, with instructions to compass the death of the Pope and the chief nobility. The plot transpired, and, but for the interposition of the Pope, its author would have been slain. Indignant at what had occurred, the citizens, great and small, bound themselves by oath to die rather than suffer their noble bishop to be harmed in any way. Not to be baulked, Eutychius endeavored by promise of liberal presents to the king and the dukes of the Lombards to turn them against the Pope. In vain. Romans and Lombards "bound themselves together with the bonds of faith", declaring they were ready to die rather than that harm should come to such a glorious champion of the Christian faith. But, adds the papal biographer, the Pope placed greater trust in the abundant alms he gave to the poor, and in prayer and fasting, to which he earnestly devoted himself. And while thanking the people for their goodwill, he exhorted them to be earnest in the faith, and in the performance of good works, and begged them "not to swerve from the love and fidelity which they owed to the Roman Empire".

Certainly it was not the Pope's fault if the Roman people at this epoch threw off the yoke of a rotten empire, which, utterly unable to protect them from the foreigner, could only find strength to try and wring from them their money or their faith. With the facts of history and any elementary knowledge of ethics to guide them, it is truly wonderful how certain English authors descant about the loyalty due (?) from the Pope and the Italian people to the emperor at this time—Englishmen who, of course, do not believe in any 'divine right of kings' who govern well, let alone who govern wrongly.

In the East, the emperor continued to work for the establishment of his heresy. He tried, privately at first (728), to gain over the holy patriarch Germanus to publish a declaration in favor of the destruction of images, knowing well that if he succeeded with him his work would be more than half done. The attempt failed, and Germanus notified it to the Pope. Gregory at once wrote (728) to the patriarch to tell him the joy that his (Germanus') 'honorable letter' had brought him. He feels that he must write and greet Germanus, his brother, and champion of the Church, and praise him for the struggle he has so nobly maintained—a struggle which has left the emperor defeated. Then the Pope goes on to show that Germanus acted rightly in defending the use of holy images, as honor rendered to an image passes on to what it represents. "If God had not become man we should not represent Him in human form ... The images of those things which do not exist, the inventions of pagan poetry, are called idols ... The Church of Christ has nothing to do with idols ... Christians only worship and adore with the worship of 'latria' the Blessed Trinity ... If, however, anyone in Jewish fashion (a reference doubtless to the Jewish advisers or proclivities of the emperor), misusing the words of the Old Testament which were of old directed against idolatry, accuses our Church of idolatry, we can only hold him for a barking dog". Then, very pointedly, Gregory proceeds to urge that if only the Jews themselves had paid more attention to the images which were used in their own worship—the rod of Moses, the ark, the tabernacle, the

cherubim, *etc*.—they would not have so often turned to idolatry. By the prayers of the Mother of God, and all the saints, Gregory in conclusion trusts that Germanus may long be preserved to teach the way of truth, learnt from the Fathers.

Leo was not, however, at the end of his resources. He tried to crush the resolution of Germanus by breaking him when in contact with already 'broken reeds'. Acting like our own tyrants, Henry I with St. Anselm and Henry II with St. Thomas of Canterbury, he brought Germanus before a council (called by the Greeks a 'Silentium'—a very good name, as a general rule, for an assembly presided over by the 'master of many legions') composed of his creatures, both cleric and lay (729, or January 7, 730). Germanus was not to be overawed, but, finding he could effect no good, he took off his pallium, the mark of his archiepiscopal dignity, saying: "If I am Jonas, cast me into the sea. Without the authority of a general council, O emperor, no innovation can I make in matters of faith". Then, adds the chronicler, Germanus retired to his ancestral home and passed the few remaining years of his old age in retirement. And his ambitious disciple Anastasius, who for power had sacrificed his conscience, was made patriarch in his stead (January 22, 730). But, of course, both he and his synodal letter were rejected by Pope Gregory, who threatened to depose him if he did not renounce his heresy.

Whilst Leo in the East was persecuting the orthodox with mutilation and death, his exarch was pushing his cause in Italy. Eutychius had at last managed to bring about an alliance with the Lombard king, on the understanding that they were to help one another, till Liutprand reduced to complete subjection the almost independent dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, and till Eutychius was able to work his will at Rome. Liutprand, with his usual adroitness, got what he wanted done first. Then the two armies marched on Rome, and encamped on the plain of Nero, between the Vatican hill, Monte Mario and the Tiber. But again the personal influence of a Pope saved Rome. Perhaps from what we have already seen of the character of Liutprand, it was not very hard to persuade him to abandon the cause of the exarch. However that may be, Gregory so moved the Lombard king that he threw himself on his knees before the Pope and promised not to harm anyone. Then, after laying down before the body of St. Peter his royal mantle, his spear, and his crown, and reconciling the exarch to the Pope, he withdrew his troops.

As though for the one purpose of bringing into still clearer relief the forgiving nature of the Pope, whilst the exarch was in Rome a certain Petasius, taking the name of Tiberius, raised the standard of revolt in Tuscany against the emperor. He gained the adhesion of certain towns, such as Barberano, Bieda and Luna, an old Etruscan city in the territory of Bieda or Blera. The exarch was alarmed; but encouraged by the Pope, and aided by a body of troops, with which Gregory furnished him, Eutychius slew Petasius and sent his head to Constantinople. "Even with this, the emperor did not look upon the Romans with favor", concludes the *Liber Pontificalis*. The popes were loyal to a fault.

It may be well to remark again that the order of events, as set forth above, is at best but conjectural. All that can be said for it is that it has been arranged after a very careful study of the original sources, and of many eminent modern authorities. As far as its author can see, the chronological sequence that he has given above, if it rests on

some suppositions, does not contradict anything the most reliable of the ancients have told us, and has the merit of not arbitrarily altering the order in which the Book of the Popes (our best authority) has related the incidents of Gregory's life, and is in general accord with the views of some of the best modern authorities. Much would be done towards settling the chronological and other difficulties of Gregory's pontificate if only the date of the capture of Ravenna could be definitely fixed. But, unless some fresh documents are brought to light, it does not seem possible to determine the said date with certainty. No doubt, what with the emperor and his exarch being more intent on forcing heresy on their Italian subjects than in resisting the Lombards; what with the Pope having to resist the Lombards with physical force, and the emperor with moral; and what with the Lombards now apparently favoring and now opposing both the emperor and the Pope, and now acting in unison and now at variance one with the other, no doubt some of the historians themselves of those times were as much in the dark as we are as to the true state of things.

In the account of the beginnings of Iconoclasm given above, nothing has been said of what the Greek historians unanimously relate as to the excommunication of the emperor by the Pope. Theophanes, *e.g.*, after assuring us that in consequence of Leo's Iconoclasm Gregory prevented Italy and Rome from paying taxes, twice asserts that the Pope "separated Rome and Italy and the whole of the West from political and ecclesiastical obedience to Leo and from his Empire". But the testimony of later ill-informed Greeks is not to be compared with the opposite evidence of the contemporary *Liber Pontificalis*, and the Lombard, Paul the Deacon. The later Latins, who have mentioned these stories, have copied them from Theophanes. And it is very clear that the idea of Gregory excommunicating the emperor has been drawn from that passage in the Pope's second letter, where Gregory, quoting St. Paul (I Cor. V. 5), prays that for the salvation of his soul God will send the emperor a demon. The Pope's resisting the imposition of the extraordinary tax and his opposition to the emperor's Iconoclastic decree, have been magnified into his forbidding the payment of any taxes and separating Italy from political subjection to Leo.

The day at length came when the storms in which he had passed his important and glorious pontificate broke unheeded over Gregory's head. His mortal remains were laid to rest in St. Peter's, February 11, 731. Both ancient and fair-minded modern authors join in praising the character of Gregory. To the Greek Theophanes he was as illustrious for his deeds as for his learning; to Hodgkin he had "much of the true Roman feeling which had animated his great namesake and predecessor"; and to Finlay he "was a man of sound judgment as well as an able and zealous priest".

And certainly during the trying years of Gregory's pontificate there was need of a Pope of sound judgment. He was in the midst of keen and grasping foes. There were Lombard dukes and Lombard kings eager to seize on Rome or its territory; and exarchs of Ravenna wishful to wring from him his faith or his life. The emperor at Constantinople, who ought to have been his strongest support, was his worst oppressor. Great must have been his temptation to throw in his lot with Liutprand or with his practically independent dukes! But throughout he displayed loyalty and good sense. He would not favor an ambitious duke against his king, nor show himself a rebel against a tyrannical sovereign. He steered a straight course, and it brought him to harbour with

safety and with profit. He kept faith with Leo whilst all around him were falling away from their allegiance and were everywhere choosing ‘dukes’ for themselves. He caused territory to be restored, and put down those who raised themselves up against the Isaurian despot. Despite of this, Gregory became in practice ruler of the Duchy of Rome. Virtue, in his case, proved its own reward. The exarch could not break through the ring of friends who surrounded Rome and the popes. Liutprand would only restore what he had seized to Blessed Peter. Before the close of his reign, then, Gregory, without failing in loyalty, but by the force of circumstances—the oppressive taxation and meddling theology of Leo the Isaurian—became the sovereign power in Rome.

In the midst of all his difficulties, Gregory found time to devote to church repairs and endowments, as we have noticed before, and to attend to the Church’s liturgy. He decreed that in Lent, on the Thursdays the fast should be observed as on the rest of the days of the week, and that Mass should be said publicly in the churches, though these things were not wont to be done before because Thursdays used to be specially honored by the Pagans in their worship of Jupiter. But Walfrid Strabo (t849) in his work, *De divinis officiis* (c. 20), says that even before the time of Gregory II Mass was celebrated on the Thursdays in Lent, but that Gregory appointed proper offices for those days, for before his time the Mass of the Sunday immediately preceding was wont to be used on the said Thursdays. Cardinal Bona would reconcile the two statements by supposing that till Gregory’s decree there was no assembly of the faithful on the Thursdays.

Gregory is commemorated as a saint in the Roman calendar and martyrology on February 13th. Some martyrologies give his feast on the 11th February.

GREGORY III

A.D. 731-741

EMPEROR.

LEO III. 716-741.

KING.

LIUTPRAND, 712-744.

EXARCH.

EUTYCHIUS, 727-752; LAST OF THE EXARCHS.

GREGORY, the son of the very distinctive 'John', a Syrian, and known to the Romans as Gregory the Younger the Second, was elected Pope (February 11, 731) by popular acclamation. He was following in the funeral procession of his saintly predecessor, when, "moved by divine inspiration", the whole body of the people uprose, carried him off, and elected him Pope. For some cause he was not consecrated till March 18. For *Anastasius*, in the life of Gregory II, says that after his (Gregory II's) death the see was vacant for thirty-five days.

As the bitterness of Leo against the upholders of 'image worship' was steadily increasing, the first thing that the Pope did was to address him letters of remonstrance, as Gregory II had done. These letters were entrusted to a priest named George, whose name appears in connection with the Roman Council of 721. But being a man rather wanting in courage, he returned to Rome without having dared to present them to the emperor. Great was the indignation of the Pope when George returned to him the undelivered letters, and he would have degraded him from his sacred office.

However, at the intercession of the nobility and of the fathers of a council which the Pope had called to consider this matter, George was simply subjected to a suitable penance and again sent with the letters to Constantinople. But he was not allowed to get there. He was seized by the emperor's orders in Sicily and sent into banishment.

Hereupon Gregory took stronger measures. He summoned a council to meet in Rome on November 731. Ninety-three bishops took part in the synod held at the tomb or *confession* of St. Peter. The whole of the Roman clergy were also present at the synod, as also the 'noble consuls' and the people. It was decreed, in accordance with the decrees of previous popes and the belief of antiquity, that "if anyone, for the future, shall take away, destroy, or dishonor the images of Our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of His Mother, the immaculate and glorious Virgin Mary, or of the Saints, he shall be excluded from the body and blood of Our Lord and the unity of the Church".

Another letter was sent to Leo by the *Defensor* Constantine; and deputies from different parts of Italy were also dispatched with letters to the emperor praying for the restoration of holy images. All these messengers shared the same fate. They were all detained in Sicily, then robbed of their letters and sent back loaded with injuries. The Pope even made a fourth attempt to get letters to the emperors (for Constantine Copronymus was now a partner in the imperial throne with his father) and to the 'intruder' in the patriarchal throne, Anastasius.

To these appeals on the part of the Pope to moral force, Leo had recourse to the tyrant's assistant, brute force. He determined to punish the Pope and his refractory subjects (?) in Italy directly and indirectly. About the year 732, a fleet was dispatched to Italy to enforce the imperial will. It was shipwrecked in the Adriatic. The taxes of the people of Calabria and Sicily, over whom the emperor still had power, were considerably increased; the 'patrimonies' of the See of Rome in those parts, which yielded 3.5 talents of gold were confiscated to the imperial exchequer; and the churches of those countries as well as those of the great prefecture of Illyricum he transferred to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. This prefecture comprised the Old and New Epirus, Illyricum, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Dacia, Ripensis and Mediterranea, Moesia, Dardania and Praevalis, with its metropolis Scodra. By this last measure of Leo the patriarchate of Constantinople became coterminous with the limits of the Eastern Empire, and the foundations of the coming schism between the Eastern and Western Churches were deepened. For the orthodox patriarchs were afterwards unwilling to give up their jurisdiction over the provinces of Illyricum, even though acquired in such a scandalous manner. Professor Bury supposes, not without reason, that these changes were the more easily effected by Leo inasmuch as South Italy had become largely Greek by the number of the orthodox who had fled thither from his persecuting arm. The number of orthodox Greeks, he says, priests, monks and laymen, who escaped from the East to South Italy in the reigns of Leo and Constantine has been set at 50,000. And, of course, Leo did not attempt to enforce his Iconoclastic edicts there.

Leo's attempts to cut off the Pope's supplies were not so successful in the Duchy of Naples. There Duke Theodore, the successor of Exhilaratus, was known to be well disposed towards the Pope. Accordingly, the emperor sent one of his secretaries, by name Alfanus, to Naples with strict orders to charge Theodore not to render any kind of service to the Pope, but, on the contrary, to hinder the dispatch to Gregory of the revenues due to him from property belonging to the Holy See in the Duchy. But to these tyrannical orders Theodore turned a deaf ear, and the papal patrimonies in Naples remained safe. Unfortunately the authority for this action by Duke Theodore rests, it seems, solely on a work edited by Pratilli; and the work in question was one of those productions which Pratilli invented as well as published.

For a year or two after the events above narrated, Gregory seems to have enjoyed an interval of repose from the vexations of external foes, whether the Lombards or the Iconoclast emperors. He employed the interval in making a practical protest against the conduct of Leo, by showing as much honor to images and relics as the emperor was showing disrespect. The *Book of the Popes* gives us a long list of churches which Gregory built, repaired or beautified. Among his other works, he built a beautiful

oratory in St. Peter's, in which he placed a large number of the relics of the saints. This oratory (known later as Sancta Maria in Cancellis) stood where now stands, in St. Peter's, the altar of the Transfiguration. Renewed in 1149 by Eugenius III, it was finally demolished in 1507, when the ground was cleared for the present stupendous pile of St. Peter's on the Vatican. This oratory is more interesting to us now from the liturgical history connected with it.

In a third synod at Rome, held by the Pope, it was decreed that the monks of the three monasteries, whose duty it was to sing the divine office in St. Peter's, should recite part of the office in this oratory. Proper prayers were also prescribed for the Mass to be said in this oratory, and Gregory even added a few, words to the canon of the Mass, only, however, to be used in the Mass said in this oratory because the canon of the Mass had never been touched from the time of St, Gregory I, and it was thought to be against apostolical tradition to tamper with it.

The acts of this synod, thenewly prescribed prayers, etc., were by Gregory's order engraved on marble tablets, and placed in the oratory itself. These tablets were transcribed by the celebrated collector of epigraphs, Pietro Sabino, a Roman antiquary of the fifteenth century, on the occasion of their discovery, when, by order of Cardinal Cibo, nephew of Innocent VIII, there was being built in this oratory a shrine for the 'Holy Lance'. Many fragments of these tablets are still in existence in the crypt of the Vatican. That prince of archaeologists, De Rossi, with their aid, and that of the transcripts ofSabino, has perfectly restored the reading of this profoundly interesting memorial of an otherwise unknown synod of Gregory III.

Still further to decorate St. Peter's, Gregory made use of a present sent him by the exarch, who, since his reconciliation with Gregory II, remained true to the Holy See. The gift consisted of six beautiful spiral columns of onyx marble, and as Bartolini, whom we are here closely following, observes, Gregory determined so to place them that the very sight of them would serve as a protest against the Iconoclasm of the Greek emperors. In the Greek churches, the 'Holy Place', or Sanctuary, is separated from the rest of the church by a screen that stretches right across, made of pilasters that support a cornice, on which are placed the candelabra. The spaces between the little pillars are taken up with images of the saints. Hence this partition is known as the 'iconostasis', or place of the images. Gregory made a similar use of the exarch's present. In front of the already existing columns round the 'confession' of St. Peter, the Pope erected the six onyx marble pillars, and between them placed images of Our Lord, Our Lady, and the saints. A beam, covered with plates of pure silver, rested on the columns, and on it was placed some open ornamental work, in the midst of which appeared lamps of pure silver. From these lamps this architrave was known as the 'lamp-beam'. There does not seem any further call to enumerate the 'church work' of Pope Gregory. Suffice it to add that he founded monasteries (in one of which—St. Chrysogonus— the future Pope Stephen (III) IV was brought up), and rebuilt the hospice of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, near St. Peter's, and endowed it for the support of the poor for ever; and that he decreed that the wine, candles, etc., to be used at the Mass to be said at the cemeteries on the feast days of their various patron saints were to be taken from the Lateran palace by the 'oblationarius', *viz.*, the subdeacon or deacon whose business it was to take the 'oblata' (the wine, etc.) for the officiating priest and offer or present them to the archdeacon.

Besides building and decorating churches, various affairs of importance occupied Gregory's attention during this interval of rest which the Greeks and the Lombards allowed him. At the exhortation, as we have seen, of Gregory II, the bishops and people of Venetia and Istria had elected Antoninus, as successor of Donatus, to the patriarchate of Grado. Gregory III (?) sent him the pallium, and at the Roman synod of November 731 it was decided that the bishop of Grado should be primate of the whole of Venetia and Istria, and that Serenus of Aquileia must be content with Cormones, where he was then residing. But later on we find Calistus, the successor of Serenus, standing in need of the same rebuke for trespassing on the jurisdiction of the See of Grado that Gregory II had had to address to Serenus. Callistus had to be called to order for trying to obtain possession of certain property in the island of Barbiana that belonged to the See of Grado.

Gregory was also busy with the affairs of the English Church. By the decree of his great namesake, Gregory I, there were to have been two archbishoprics in England, one at York and one at Canterbury; but after St. Paulinus had had to abandon York, there had only been one archbishop in England. Now, however, Egbert, Bishop of York, backed by Ceolwulf, King of Northumbria, a relative of his, claimed metropolitical rights for York. Being a man of considerable energy and determination, as well as learning, and "realizing that while it is a mark of pride to seek what is not one's due, it is a sign of listlessness not to look after one's rights", he never rested till he obtained the pallium from the Pope. This, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* he received in the year 735.

To two archbishops of Canterbury is it recorded that Gregory III gave the pallium. Tatwine, elected archbishop in 731, went to Rome to ask for the pall. The Pope, as we learn from his own letter to the bishops of England, pleased with the character of the man, still took good care to look up the rights of the See of Canterbury before conferring the pall. Finding that Tatwine was only asking for his dues, the Pope gave him the pall and all the privileges that St. Gregory I had given to St. Augustine, subjecting to him all the bishops of Britain, and making him his vicar. On the death of Tatwine, "this year (736) archbishop Nothelm received his pall from the bishop of the Romans".

Transition from the affairs of England to Boniface, thegreatest Englishman of his age, is easy. We left him in receipt of the solution of various difficulties about which he had consulted St. Gregory II. With the most marked success he continued his labors in Hesse and Thuringia. Thousands were baptized. And again, about the year 732, messengers from Boniface appeared in Rome to inform the Pope of the progress of the Church in Germany. After telling Gregory of the kindly relations that existed between his predecessor and their master, they proceeded, in accordance with their instructions, to declare that Boniface wished to profess his humble subjection to the Holy See for the time to come, and to beg that he might be allowed to remain on the same intimate terms with Gregory HI. as he had with his namesake. To these requests the Pope returned a most gracious consent both by word of mouth and by letter; and sent his messengers back to St. Boniface with the archi-episcopal pallium and with various presents and relics.

Cheered by the Pope's encouraging words, 'the German exile', Boniface, continued his glorious work, again laboring in Bavaria. Once more to enjoy 'the life-giving conversation' of the apostolic Father, and as he felt old age creeping on, to commend himself to the prayers of the saints, Boniface, with a numerous company of his disciples, went *(c.* 737) to Rome for the third time. He was not only most kindly received by the Pope, but during a stay at Rome of over a year, not only the Romans flocked to hear him, but pilgrims of various nations, Anglo-Saxons, Bavarians, etc. What, among other things, helped to keep him so long at Rome was his having to wait for a synod which the Pope was about to hold, as Boniface himself informs us. Whether the said synod was ever held we know not, for it could not have been the third synod of which we have just spoken. However that may be, Boniface returned to his work, loaded as before with presents and relics. This time he made straight (739) for Bavaria, bearing with him various commendatory letters. One commends Boniface to all the bishops and principal ecclesiastics of Germany, urging them to give him what helpers they could. A second was addressed by the Pope to the nobles and peoplesof all Germany, to the Thuringians, Hessians, Borthari (a people on the Bordaa or Wohra), Nistresi (a people on the Nister, a branch of the Sieg), Wedrecii (a people on the Wetter), *etc.*, and was an exhortation to them to obey Boniface, to eschew all manner of sorcery and witchcraft, and to serve God. Finally the bishops in Alemannia and Bavaria were reminded that for the good of the people they ought to receive and listen to Boniface, as his (the Pope's) vicar, renounce all paganism and heresy, and assemble in council twice a year—by the Danube, at Augsburg, or wherever Boniface may appoint the required synods to be held. With the cooperation of Odilo, the reigning duke, Boniface set vigorously to work to consolidate Christianity in Bavaria. False bishops and priests had to be disposed of—as well those who had been invalidly ordained as those who were untrue to their sacred character—and a new hierarchy established. To this end he (739) divided Bavaria into four provinces, placing a bishop over each. In a letter dated October 29, 739, Boniface received a letter from the Pope congratulating him on the thousands of men that, with the help of Charles Martel (whom Gregory calls 'Prince of the Franks'), he had brought into the fold of Christ; approves of what he has arranged in Bavaria; exhorts him to go on teaching them "the holy Catholic and Apostolic tradition of the Roman Church", orders the reordination of those doubtfully ordained, bids him hold in his (the Pope's) stead a synod by the banks of the Danube, and rather go about from place to place than remain in one spot. For the present we will leave Boniface toiling for his heavenly Master in Bavaria, which he did not leave to return to Hesse and Thuringia till the end of the year 740.

We must now turn again to the 'eternal Lombard question' which troubled the last years of Gregory's life.

Conscious that the ambition of Liutprand was not dead but sleeping, Gregory completed, at his own cost, the restoration of the walls of Rome, taken in hand by his predecessors. He also renewed in a very strong manner the fortifications of Centumcellae (Civitavecchia). For a price, Gregory recovered from Transamund (or Trasimund), Duke of Spoleto, Gallese, a strong place on the Flaminian Way, which the Lombards had seized, and which the Romans had never ceased trying to retake, for it

commanded their road of communication with Ravenna. “It is clear that he (the Pope) behaved as ruler in the Roman duchy”.

Returned, flushed with victory, into Italy from Provence, whither, at the urgent call of Charles Martel, he had gone (737) to help that prince against the Saracens, Liutprand again took up his ambitious views for the subjugation of the whole of Italy. Incursions were at once (Spring 739) made into whatever remnant of the exarchate still remained in the power of the exarch; and the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum were called upon to ravage the Duchy of Rome. This they refused to do, giving as their reason “that they had a treaty with the Roman people and had received their faith from the Roman Church”. This action on the part of the dukes gave occasion to Paul the Deacon to write that Transamund of Spoleto rebelled against Liutprand, and has given, we may presume, what ground they have to certain moderns of accusing Gregory of unfair intrigues with the Lombard dukes. But if the spoken of above were a league—even offensive and defensive—between Gregory and the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum, the Pope is not to be blamed. He had a perfect right to try and strengthen himself against the ambitious Liutprand. No doubt the Lombard dukes had other motives for their action than those which they put forth. Likely enough they threw in their lot with the Pope to get support against Liutprand, whom they were as little anxious to have too powerful as the Pope himself. But we may be sure that Gregory’s version of the affair is the true one, *viz.*, that Liutprand did not take up arms to quell a rebellion of insurgent dukes aided by the Pope, but that the dukes were attacked because they refused to carry out the instructions of their king. The resistance of the dukes was passive, not active. Had not this been the truth of the matter, Gregory would not with such confidence have declared that the stories told to Charles against the dukes were untrue, and have begged him to send an incorruptible *missus* to enquire into the whole case. However all this may be, Liutprand was soon on the march for Spoleto. Transamund fled to Rome, and was kindly received by the Pope.

Nothing could stop the march of the warlike Liutprand. By June 739 Spoleto was in his hands, and one of his followers was named duke in place of Transamund. His troops were soon in the territory of the Romans. Not knowing which way to turn for help in this emergency, Gregory followed the example of his predecessor and appealed to Charles Martel for help. The embassy, which he dispatched to the powerful Frankish Majordomo, and of which the chief members were Anastasius, a bishop, and Sergius, a priest, to avoid falling into the hands of the Lombards, went by sea. They were the bearers of a letter, which has perished, many presents, and the keys of the ‘confession’ of St. Peter. Acting in concert with the Pope were the Roman nobility, whose resolutions, to the effect that they wished to place themselves under the protection of Charles, and give up all dependence on the emperor, were also taken by the ambassadors along with the Pope’s letter. The embassy was received with all honor by Charles, and sent back to Rome, we are told, with great presents, but without any promise of assistance. Continued success meanwhile was attending the arms of Liutprand. Four of the border towns of the Roman duchy fell into his hands—Ameria (Amelia), Ortas (Orte), Polimartium (Bomarzo), and Blera (Bieda)—and his tents and standards were to be seen from the walls of Rome dotted over the Neronian plain. Once more was the unhappy Campagna laid waste, and, as a mark of their dependence, many

Roman nobles were forced to wear their hair and dress in the Lombard fashion. In despair the Pope sent again for help to Charles. For Transamund, neither he nor the Romans would give up, and Liutprand was resolved to get him into his hands. "Our affliction", he writes to the *subregulus,* as he called Charles, "moves us to write to you once again, trusting that you are a loving son of St. Peter and of us, and that, from respect for him, you will come and defend the Church of God and His "peculiar people", who are now unable to endure the persecution and oppression of the Lombards. They have seized the very means set aside to furnish funds for the lights ever kept burning at St. Peter's tomb, and they have carried off offerings that have been made by you and by those who have gone before you. And because, after God, we have turned to you, the Lombards deride and oppress us. Hence the Church of St. Peter has been stripped and reduced to the last straits. We have put into the mouth of the bearer of this letter, your faithful servant, all our woes, which he will be able to unfold to you". In conclusion Gregory begs Charles to come at once, to show his love towards St. Peter, and 'us, his own people'.

It was perhaps this letter which caused Charles Martel to dispatch an embassy to Rome. Certain it is, at any rate, that he sent one. Grimo, abbot of Corbie, and Sigebert, a monk of St. Denis, brought a letter and presents for the Pope. Whether through fear of the Roman fever, or, as there is reason to believe, influenced by the arrival of this deputation, and perhaps by some remonstrance on the part of Charles Martel, who was doubtless to that extent moved by the letters of Gregory, Liutprand withdrew to Pavia in the August of 739. But he was not prepared to forego the goal of his ambition without an effort. He, too, sent an embassy to Charles. The great 'Mayor of the Palace' was reminded that Liutprand had adopted or taken under his special protection Charles' young son Pippin, and that Liutprand was his brother-in-law. On the other hand, every effort was made to impress upon the Frankish Prince that Liutprand simply wanted to punish rebellious subjects. Whether or not Charles was convinced, the envoys of the Lombard returned rejoicing. The Mayor of the Palace was ill, they said, and would not fight. Again, then (740), did Liutprand take the field; and again was Gregory compelled to write to Charles. "We were overwhelmed with grief when we saw the little that was left from last year for the support of the poor of Christ and the upkeep of the church lamps in the Ravennese district, laid waste with fire and sword by the kings of the Lombards. Moreover, to these parts also have they dispatched troops. They have destroyed the farms of St. Peter, and the cattle which still remained to us they have carried off. Not only have we not received any help from you, but, as you have not checked the warlike action of the kings, it is clear that you have paid more attention to their version of the affair than you have to ours, true though it be. The result is that you yourself are even derided by them : 'Let Charles and his Franks come and save you from us if they can'. By the power given him by God, St. Peter could defend his own; but he would try his faithful children". Charles must not believe what the Lombard kings urge against the dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum. "Their only offence is that last year (738) they refused to make an inroad on us ... For the dukes were, and are, ready to render them that obedience which ancient custom requires ... Still, that you may know the truth for yourself, send a faithful agent, who cannot be bribed, and let him see what we have to suffer, and then report everything to you ... Prefer not the friendship of these kings to that of the Prince of the Apostles. Make haste to help us". Meanwhile, taking

advantage of the withdrawal (739) of the Lombard king, Transamund came to an understanding with the Romans, collected a large army and entered the Duchy of Spoleto in two directions. He was completely victorious, and entered Spoleto, December 739 (or 740 ?). But no sooner was Transamund once more firmly established in his position than he proved unfaithful to his benefactors. In vain Gregory wrote to him "to recover the four cities which had been lost for his sake". Transamund would not move; probably he felt it would take him all his time to prepare to resist Liutprand. Gregory then tried to move Liutprand himself to restore the cities. He sent to him the priest Anastasius and the regionary subdeacon Adeodatus. This we know from a letter which the Pope wrote to the bishops of Lombard Tuscany (October 15, 740), reminding them of their consecration oath, by which they had undertaken to do all they could for the Church of St. Peter when it was in danger, and exhorting them to help and cooperate with his ambassadors, so that the four cities might be restored. "Weak as I am from illness", concludes the brave Pope, "if, as I will not believe, you should refrain from giving your help and going with my ambassadors, I will undertake the journey myself and save you from the responsibility of being unfaithful to your obligations".

It was all in vain; Liutprand would not listen, but continued his warlike operations against the exarchate and the Roman duchy. The shock of battle was not to be much longer felt by Gregory; but he died whilst its din was ringing in his ears. Gregory was buried in St. Peter's, December 10 (November 29, Jaffé), 741. It is very unfortunate that, for the pontificates of the two Gregorys, while events of paramount importance were taking place, there should be such chronological uncertainty. Those who are of opinion that the capture of Ravenna effected by Liutprand did not take place under Gregory II, believe that it occurred at the close of the reign of his successor. If the conjecture of these writers is correct, and if it be further the fact that Transamund recovered possession of Spoleto in December 739, we have perhaps an explanation of how it was that Liutprand had not attacked him again in force before the death of Gregory, at the close of 741. Liutprand would have been too busy with his designs on Ravenna to attend to his enemies further south. But, of course, even without supposing that he seized the imperial capital in Italy at this time, he may have had to devote such attention to the exarch that he had not proper time to devote to punishing the Spoletans. But obviously there is nothing but conjecture in all this.

After what we have seen of the life of Gregory III, we can have little difficulty in endorsing his character as we find it in the pages of the *Book of the Popes*, and that even though it is almost a word for word repetition of the character of Leo II. "He was a man of the greatest meekness and one truly wise. He was well acquainted with the sacred Scriptures, knowing all the Psalms by heart, and thoroughly imbued with their meaning. Skilled both in Latin and Greek, he was a polished and successful preacher, and a stout upholder of the Catholic faith. He was a lover both of poverty and the poor, a protector of the widow and the orphan, and a friend of monks and nuns.

A few months before the death of Gregory, first the emperor Leo III (June 18) and then Charles Martel Martel (October 21) had also terminated their turbulent careers. The one was to be followed by a son, Constantine Copronymus, who was to be a fiercer enemy of the Church than his father; the other by a son, Pippin, who was to be to it a greater benefactor.

ST. ZACHARY.

A.D. 741-752.

EMPEROR.

CONSTANTINE V (COPRONYMUS), 741-775.

KINGS.

Liutprand, 712-744.

Hildeprand (alone), 744

Ratchis, 744-749.

Aistulf, 749-757.

EXARCHS.

EUTYCHIUS 727-752. LAST OF THE EXARCHS

ON the very day of the death of Gregory III (December 10), according to Duchesne, but, according to others, four days after the burial of Pope Gregory, *viz*., on Sunday, December 3, 741, Zachary, a Greek, the son of Polychronius, was consecrated Bishop of Rome. It need scarcely be pointed out that, from the shortness of the vacancy of the Holy See in this case, there can have been no reference to exarch or emperor in connection with the election and consecration of Zachary. Of the new Pope we are informed, by the *Book of the Popes,* that he was a man of extraordinary suavity—a trait in his character which his success in dealing with his Lombard foes may well incline us to believe—a lover of the clergy and people in Rome, slow to anger, quick to forgive, and never returning evil for evil. On the contrary, returning good for evil, he even, after he became Pope, honored and enriched those who had opposed him. Although regarding this description of the character of Zachary as a stereotyped 'official eulogium', Gregorovius allows, "with respect, at least, to the benefits acquired for the Church, the tribute in the case of Zachary to have been well deserved".

Doubtless one of the principal reasons why the consecration of Zachary took place with such little delay was the critical state of affairs between the Romans and the Lombards. We left Liutprand, angry with both the Romans and the Lombards of Spoleto and Beneventum, preparing to subdue both; and Transamund false to his engagements to help the Romans to recover 'the four cities'. The first thing that the new Pope did was to send an embassy to Liutprand, to beg him to restore the cities. Liutprand promised to

do so; and in return the Pope sent the forces of the duchy to help the king against the faithless Transamund.

But after Transamund had been disposed of (he had been made a cleric), and his 'kingdom given to another', Liutprand imitated his example and would not move in the matter of restoring the cities. Accordingly Zachary resolved to interview the Lombard king in person. With a number of his clergy in his train, the Pope set out boldly for Interamna (Terni), where Liutprand was then staying. Arrived at Orte, the Pope was met by an envoy of the king, who escorted Zachary to Narni, the key of the valley of the Nera or Nar. On the great Flaminian road, eight miles from Narni, the Pope encountered Liutprand himself, who walked respectfully—*in ejus obsequium*—by Zachary's side, and likewise his nobles and a large number of his troops. The king and the Pope, we are told, prayed and conversed together; and then Zachary urged peace. Liutprand agreed, and gave back 'the said four cities with their *inhabitants'* to the Pope. He also restoredthe Sabine patrimony, which had been lost for thirty years, and Narni, Osimo, Ancona, Humana, and the valley which is called Great, by the title of donation to Blessed Peter himself, the Prince of the Apostles, concluded a treaty for twenty years with the Roman duchy, and set free the Roman captives in his dominions. Before leaving the king, Zachary, at his request, consecrated a new bishop for Terni(?), as some maintain. On the Sunday the two dined together, and so merry was the meal, that Liutprand declared that he had never had such a glorious dinner before. The next day the Pope set out for Rome, taking possession, *en route*, of the four cities, which officers of Liutprand, who escorted the Pope, caused to be handed over to him. Zachary entered Rome in triumph; and to thank God for His mercies, ordered a solemn procession from the Church of Our Lady 'ad Martyres' (the Pantheon) to St. Peter's (741 or the beginning of 742).

Into all this affair it is the personal element only which enters. We have on the one hand the commanding personal influence of Zachary, and on the other a Lombard king moved to acts, if not of generosity, at least of justice, by considerations of which the Pope was the sole center. Liutprand had no respect for the Iconoclast emperor at Constantinople, and the only thought he gave to that emperor's Italian dominions was to consider how he himself might best obtain possession of them. Hence what was his by the right of the spear he gave up, not to the emperor, who with his image-breaking propensities was quite at a discount with all parties in the Italian peninsula, but to the Pope personally. Pope Zachary was practically a king by consent of Liutprand. In all these transactions there is no mention of either emperor or Roman Republic. Liutprand and Zachary are the only parties concerned. As far as the former was concerned, the rule of the Byzantine in Italy was at an end. And had it not been for Pope Zachary, there is no doubt that Liutprand the Lombard; like Theodoric the Goth, would have ruled in Rome and Ravenna.

Zachary had not yet finished with the Lombards. In against 743 Liutprand began to make preparations for the final reduction of Ravenna. Convinced of their powerlessness to resist the old Lombard warrior, the exarch, the archbishop of Ravenna (John), and the people sent to entreat the Pope to hasten to their aid. As the embassy that Zachary at once sent off with presents to Liutprand failed in its object, the Pope himself, after entrusting the government of the city to the Duke Stephen, "like a true shepherd

hurried off to save the sheep who were in danger of perishing". Whilst on their journey to Ravenna, the Pope and his companions were, it is said, in answer, as we are assured, to their fervent prayers to St. Peter, protected every day from the heat of the sun by a cloud, which disappeared every evening. The Pope was met by the exarch at the Church of St. Christopher, at a place—not now known—called 'ad Aquila', about fifty miles from Ravenna. When Zachary drew near the city, all the inhabitants poured forth to welcome him, crying out with tears in their eyes, "Welcome to our Shepherd, who has left his own sheep and come to save us who are on the point of perishing".

The first thing the Pope did on his arrival at Ravenna was to dispatch messengers to the Lombard king to announce his coming. When they reached the Lombard borders at Imola, they found that orders had been given not to allow the Pope to pass. During the night they contrived that notice of this should be sent to the Pope. So far from being daunted by this news, Zachary left Ravenna (Saturday, June 22, 743), and, soon striking the straight Aemilian Way, he reached Placentia, June 28. Here he was met by many of the Lombard nobility, who had been sent by Liutprand to receive the Pope, though he had refused to see Zachary's messengers. Thus escorted, the Pope pushed on to Pavia, which he entered the same day, after having said Mass at three o'clock in the afternoon (as was usual on fast days) in the Church of St. Peter, outside the walls. On the Monday (June 30), after a great deal of opposition, Zachary carried his point; and Liutprand agreed to give up the parts around Ravenna that were in his hands, and two-thirds of the district of Cesena. The remaining part, and Cesena itself, he was to keep in pledge till June 1, 744, by which time his ambassadors would have returned from Constantinople, whither, as Bartolini thinks, they were sent by Liutprand to have this treaty of peace ratified.

When the Pope left Pavia, Liutprand sent a number of his nobles with him, to see that the recently conquered territory should be restored to its owners. Zachary, on his return to Rome, 'with all the people', sung a Mass of thanksgiving for the success of his enterprise, begging of God to save the people of Ravenna and Rome from any further oppression on the part of the persecuting intriguer Liutprand. "His prayers", adds his biographer, "were heard by the divine clemency", for Liutprand died in January 744. Further, "there was joy" not only among the Ravennese and Romans, but even among the Lombards themselves, when Hildeprand, Liutprand's nephew (who had been associated with him in the kingdom in 735), who was evilly disposed to them, was expelled the kingdom, and Ratchis (Duke of Friuli) was chosen in his stead". To the new king the Pope sent an embassy at once, and, "out of reverence for the Prince of the Apostles", he granted a peace for twenty years—a peace which well-nigh cost Ratchis dear. It caused many of the Lombard nobles to ally themselves with Aistulf, his brother, with a view of his seizing the reins of government. It is not, therefore, matter for surprise that, with such a warlike spirit rife among the chief men in his kingdom, Ratchis was driven, willy-nilly, into breaking the peace he had made. In the year 749, doubtless in the spring, his armies both poured into the Pentapolis and invested Perugia. Without any delay, the Pope, taking with him a few of the clergy and nobility, hastened to Perugia, again determined to try the effect of his personal influence. And again was he successful. His presents and eloquent entreaties so prevailed on Ratchis that he drew off his armies. Like St. Leo I, twice had he saved Rome from the barbarian. Nor did the

effect of his eloquence end there. Soon afterwards Ratchis resigned his crown, and from the Pope's own hand received, along with his wife and daughter, the monastic habit, following the example of Carloman. As we might have expected, his fierce brother Aistulf was elected in his stead, June 749.

To retain, as far as consistent with clearness, the chronological order of events, and because Zachary's dealings with Boniface are as important as any of the events of his pontificate, we may here with advantage take up the thread of the history of St. Boniface, 'the envoy *(missus)* of St. Peter", as he is called in a capitulary of Carloman. As soon as he heard of the accession of Zachary, Boniface wrote at once to express to him his great pleasure at his (Zachary's) election, and to assure him that he hoped to be as obedient a servant of his (Zachary's) as he had been of his predecessors, and to bring all his converts to the same obedience. He then went on to ask the Pope to confirm the three bishoprics of Wurtzburg, Buraburg and Erfurt, which he had established in Germany, to the end that "present or future generations might not presume to interfere with these dioceses or violate the commands of the Apostolic See".

Zachary is then informed that Carlomann, duke of the Franks, wanted Boniface to hold a synod in that part of the kingdom of the Franks which was under his control, and had promised to do all in his power to reform ecclesiastical discipline, which for some sixty or seventy years had been neglected. To carry out his design, Carlomann was anxious for the sanction of the apostolic authority. "As the older men declare, it is more than eighty years ago since the Franks held a synod, had an archbishop, or made or renewed laws for any church. Most of the sees have been handed over to laymen eager for gain, or to immoral clerics to enjoy in a worldly way. If I am to carry out the duke's wishes, I desire to have behind me the power of the Apostolic See". Boniface next asked the Pope what steps he should take against immoral bishops, or against such as were given to drink, hunting, or fighting in battle.

In accordance with permission granted by Gregory III, as Zachary knows, inasmuch as the permission was given in his presence, Boniface had elected a successor. Now, however, he wishes to get leave to choose another, as a feud had sprung up between the one first elected and the Prince.

Boniface has to complain of various abuses which, under pretense of permission from the apostolic See, or of doing as they do in Rome, certain people wish to practice in Germany. For instance, certain stupid Bavarians and Franks think that they can practice all sorts of pagan superstitions, because in Rome, under the very eyes of the Pope, they have seen or heard, on the first of January, choruses singing pagan and sacrilegious songs through the streets, pagan feasts, women binding their arms and legs in pagan fashion with amulets, and offering the same for sale, and other heathen rites. The Pope is urged to stop these customs.

Immoral bishops who have returned from Rome, saying that they have obtained permission to celebrate, Boniface has resisted, because he has never heard that the apostolic See has given decisions against the canons. To show his devotion to the Pope, he sends him, as a present, a little gold and silver and a hairy towel for the feet—an article we find that Boniface was very fond of sending to his friends.

To this, to us most interesting letter, Zachary returned an answer (April 1, 742?) such as might have been expected. He approves of the erection of the three sees, says he has sent 'letters of confirmation' to each of the three candidates, permits Boniface to be present at the synod, and, by virtue of the apostolic authority, exhorts him on no account to allow unworthy bishops to perform the functions of the episcopal office. The Pope, however, forbids Boniface to appoint his successor during his life-time, as such a proceeding is wholly against the canons; but, as a great personal favor, the Pope will ordain the one whom, on his death-bed, in the presence of all, Boniface may designate as his successor.

Zachary next assures Boniface that he has put an end to all pagan customs on the 1st of January, and that his predecessor and father had also issued a decree against them. After approving of the action of Boniface in the matter of those immoral bishops who had, of course, falsely pretended to have been granted indulgence at Rome, Zachary concludes by telling the archbishop to refer to him what difficulties he cannot settle by the canons, and assuring him that he (the Pope) has such love for him that he would be glad to have him ever by his side.

The holding of a synod was part of a scheme of reform inaugurated by Boniface for the whole Frankish kingdom, which both Carlomann and Pippin, who ruled respectively over Austrasia and Neustria, were eager to carry out. The wholesale decay of morals, which years of internal and external wars had engendered, and which the reckless confiscation of Church property and the barefaced bestowal of ecclesiastical offices on his soldiers indulged in by Charles Martel had greatly increased, called for immediate attention. Accordingly a synod, in which all the ecclesiastics in Carlomann's realm were present, was held under the presidency of Boniface, as legate of the Pope. The place at which this synod met is not known for certain. It was held April 21, 742.

Carlomann, who was present at the synod along with many of his nobles, gave to its decrees the force of public law. These decrees provided for the holding of synods every year, and for the punishment of bad priests, forbade clerics to wear the dress of laymen, or fight on the field of battle, and ordered priests to obey their bishops.

In accordance with the decree of this synod of 742, relative to the annual holding of synods, there was assembled at Liftinae (often on inferior authority called Liptinae) again, in the dominion of Carlomann, a second synod, March 1, 743. From the fragments of the acts that have come down to us, we see that the first thing done was that the bishops, counts and prefects confirmed the acts of the previous synod and promised to stand by them. Various other decrees were passed to regulate the morals of clergy and laity, and to prevent the sale of Christian slaves to the heathen, or the practice of pagan rites. Illustrative of the unsettled state of the times was a decree to allow those who were holding confiscated Church lands still to retain them, on condition of paying a specified sum of money, owing to impending war. In the month of August of the same year Hartbert took to Rome letters to the Pope from Carlomann, Pippin and Boniface, in which, as may be gathered from the Pope's reply, for the originals appear to be lost, Zachary was informed of the holding of the council, and asked to send palliums to Grimo, Abel and Hartbert, archbishops respectively of Rouen, Rheims, and Sens. In his answer to Boniface, Zachary says that he has sent the desired

palliums, and also letters on the use of the pallium, to the prelates in question, and praises him for having condemned "two false prophets in the province of the Franks", and put them in prison. The said false prophets were two heretics who claimed to be bishops. One a Frank, Adalbert by name, professed, not unlike Mahomet and Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormons, to have received from heaven by angelic hands letters and relics, had himself worshipped, distributed his hair and nails as relics to his infatuated followers, and taught correspondingly outrageous doctrines. Clement, the other heretical opponent of St. Boniface, went astray in the matter of morals both in theory and practice; and in dogma held that when Our Lord 'descended into hell', he did not leave any one there (where by 'hell' he included the abode of the lost as well as that of the souls of the just who were waiting for the coming of Christ), denied the Catholic rule of faith, *viz.*, Scripture and Tradition, as interpreted by the living voice of the Church, and erred on the matter of predestination and other fundamental truths of Catholic teaching.

Before the last cited letter of the Pope reached Boniface, he had sent off another to the Pope, in which he only asked for one pallium, *viz.*, for Grimo of Rouen, and hinted at some simoniacal practices. Unfortunately Boniface's letter is not forthcoming. Replying to this letter on November 5, 743 or 744, Zachary expresses his astonishment at the demand for only one pallium, and adds: "In your letter we find what has greatly upset us. You speak as though we ... which God forbid, and our clergy had fallen into the heresy of Simon Magus, and had compelled those to whom we sent palliums to give us money. But we exhort you, dearest brother, never again write to us in that strain. To impute to us what we thoroughly detest, is to treat us very injuriously. The three palliums which, at your suggestion, we were asked for, as well as the letters of confirmation and instruction, we have granted without receiving anything from anybody". In conclusion, so little was the Pope displeased at the plain speaking of our saint, that the sphere of Boniface's action was enlarged by the Pope. Jurisdiction was given to him over all Gaul.

Through the unceasing energy of Boniface, who at once took advantage of his extended legatine powers, there were renewed in Neustria, at a synod of Soissons (March 2, 744), the decrees that had already been passed in the synods in Austrasia. But corruption was more deep-seated in Neustria. There were the worldly bishops—such as Milo of Rheims, whom Abel had been elected to succeed, but who was too strong to be dislodged—whom Charles Martel had intruded into the various Sees; and the introduction of reform was stoutly resisted. Carlomann and Pippin were, however, earnest in the matter, and by their united efforts a council was held in 745, at which bishops from both parts of the kingdom were present. With regard to this synod, we are about as much in the dark as we are with the others at which St. Boniface presided or which he summoned. Indeed, some authors identify this synod with that of Liftinae. Among the other deeds of this council seem to have been the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement, whom we have seen imprisoned by St. Boniface to await their trial at a council; the deposition of Gervilio (Gewilieb), archbishop of Mayence, for having assassinated the man who had killed his father; and the excommunication of various clerics for irregular life. To establish proper canonical jurisdiction, it was decided that Boniface should have a fixed metropolitan See; and as the See of Cologne was vacant

and was thought to be suitable, for it was on the border of country still pagan, it was resolved that the Pope be asked to sanction Cologne as a metropolitan See.

In fine, from a letter which St. Boniface about this time wrote to Cuthbert; Archbishop of Canterbury, we learn that the council subscribed to a profession of faith and proclaimed their loyalty to the See of Rome. "Our synod declared that to the end of their lives they wished to preserve Catholic faith and unity and subjection to the Roman Church, to St. Peter and his Vicar. We also decreed that metropolitans should ask for their palliums from that See, and that we would, in accordance with canon law, follow in all things the decrees of Blessed Peter, that we might be numbered among the sheep entrusted to his care". The sequel of this letter shows that the decrees issued in preceding councils for the reformation of discipline were renewed in this general synod of the Franks.

As soon as the Pope received word of this council, in a letter addressed to "all the bishops, priests, deacons and abbots; and to all the dukes, counts, and God-fearing men throughout the Gauls and provinces of the Franks", Zachary thanks God that the synod he had ordered had been held, through the help of their princes, Pippin and Carlomann, and the agency of his vicar Boniface; he exhorts them to persevere in their obedience to Boniface, who is acting in his stead, and in assembling in synod every year; and finally promises them victory over their pagan foes, if they put in practice the decrees of reform which they have passed.

The next step taken by Zachary was to call a council of seven bishops of Sees in the immediate neighborhood of Rome. This synod was held in the basilica of Theodore (afterwards the oratory of St, Venantius), in the Lateran Palace, October 25, 745. With the bishops were seventeen priests of the Roman church—among whom we find three Stephens, one of whom, at least, doubtless sat on the chair of Peter. A rather more detailed account of this synod will perhaps be found interesting. When the bishops and priests were assembled, the book of the Gospels in their midst, with the deacons and inferior clergy standing round, Gregory, the regionary, notary, and *nomenclator*, said: "The priest Deneard, the envoy of the most holy Boniface, archbishop of the province of Germany, is without, and craves admittance. What are your wishes?".

On this, Deneard was allowed to enter, and said: "My Lord! when in obedience to your orders my master, Bishop Boniface, had assembled a synod in the province of the Franks, and had exposed the heresies of Adalbert and Clement, they were deposed; and, acting in harmony with the princes of the Franks, he has put them in prison. However, they remain impenitent and continue to seduce the people. Hence I present you this letter of my masters, that you may make it binding in council".

In obedience to orders, the notary and treasurer Theophanius read the said letter, in which Boniface informed the Pope that, since the council which he had held by his orders, he had had a great deal to put up with from bad priests, and especially from Adalbert and Clement, "men unlike in their errors but equal in crime". Zachary is therefore asked himself to condemn these men, that the people may the more readily leave their errors. What those errors, as well of abstract dogma as of practical morality, were, we have already seen, so that there is no need of repeating their enumeration by further extracts from this letter. The reading of this document of the archbishop brought

the first session to a close. In the next session, after the reading of Adalbert's wild autobiography, and of the letter which, written to him by Our Lord, had dropped from heaven, the Pope remarked that only those with the minds of women or children could pay any attention to writings of that description. In the third session a prayer was read which Adalbert had written to himself, and in which angels with names, such as Uriel, Raguel, *etc.*, were invoked. Zachary ordered these extraordinary productions to be stored in the archives of the church, and the synod declared the two heretics degraded, and, along with their followers, anathematized.

A few days after the synod was over, the Pope wrote to Boniface, bidding him not to be disheartened if the enemy had oversown with cockle the field in which he had about labored so hard, sympathizing with him on the damage which a late inroad of barbarians had wrought in his flock by reminding him that the 'Roman state' has often been depopulated by like causes, congratulating him on the great synod he had held, approving of the establishment of Cologne as his metropolitical See, replying to various questions about the rebaptising of heretics, etc., which Boniface had asked him in three different letters, and sending him a copy of the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement in the hope that those who heard it read would give up their impiety.

Adalbert and Clement, either in their own persons or through their friends, apparently put forward some plea why judgment should be stayed. For on January 5, 747, the Pope wrote to Boniface to tell him that he had sent answers to different questions on the subjects of clerics and matrimony propounded to him by Pippin; and that, at the synod that he (Boniface) must call to make the answers public, he was to summon the two sacrilegious and contumacious ex-bishops Adalbert and Clement, that their cause might be again thoroughly sifted. If, on being convicted of error, they show themselves wishful to turn to the right path, the synod and the prince of the province are to treat them as they think proper, in accordance with the canons. If, on the other hand, they continue with proud obstinacy to proclaim their innocence, they are to be sent with two or three most prudent and upright priests to the Pope, who will thoroughly investigate their cause himself and treat them as they may deserve. As to what finally became of these men history is silent. Adalbert at least, as the Pope himself observed in the synod at Rome, was certainly insane; so that it is to be hoped that some milder asylum than a prison was found for him.

In the midst of all his difficulties, Boniface had a firm friend in the Pope. In the letters that he wrote to Boniface there were always kind words of encouragement, and in the letters that he wrote to other bishops he always supported the authority of Boniface, reminding them that their archbishop was acting for him, that is, for Blessed Peter. He would not send another to hold councils and represent the Apostolic See whilst Boniface lived. In every way Zachary showed himself a hearty cooperator in the work Boniface was about.

And certainly that help was needed. Boniface was beset by ignorant or malicious opponents. One of these foes is more particularly well known from an idea that, as a man very much in advance of his age, he taught the existence of the antipodes; and that the Pope in his ignorance condemned the said teaching. The *facts* of the case are these. In the letter just quoted the Pope writes: "I understand from your letter that Virgilius (I

forget whether he was described as a priest) has been acting maliciously against you, because you showed that he had wandered from true Catholic teaching, trying to make enmity between you and Odilo, Duke of Bavaria. Nor is it true, as he says, that he has been absolved by me so that he may obtain the diocese of the deceased bishop, who was one of the four that you consecrated in Bavaria. If it be true, moreover, that he teaches that beneath the earth there is another world and other men, call a council, excommunicate him, and (if he be a priest) deprive him of his dignity. We have, however, ourselves written to the duke about Virgil, and sent a letter to the latter summoning him to appear before us, that he may be condemned, if, after a careful examination, he be found to err in his teaching".

The above passage contains all that is known of the teaching of Virgil relative to 'another world'. It cannot, therefore, be stated with any degree of certainty whether, arguing from the rotundity of the world, he simply inferred the existence of antipodes, or whether he went a step further and argued, on the old pagan lines for the existence of antipodeans, who constituted an *entirely different race of men, not descended from Adam.* If Virgil confined himself to the first conclusion, he would not have been condemned by the Pope; but if he taught the second, he would, as that conclusion is opposed to the teaching of the Church on the redemption of all men by Our Lord. And here it may be observed in general, that, despite all the assertions of her rash critics to the contrary, the Church does not attempt to condemn the legitimate conclusions of science from its own data in its own domain. The Church only raises her protest when scientific conclusions are introduced into the realm of theology, and scientific data are made to take the place of theological data.

Already, in his letter of May 1, 748, the Pope speaks of Boniface as then residing not at Cologne, but at Mayence. He gives as the reason of this that the 'Franks had not kept their promise'. Three years later, in response to the united wishes of Boniface himself and that of the 'sons of the Franks', Zachary issued a decree to Boniface, in which he decided that, "by the authority of Blessed Peter, the Church of Mayence be for ever the metropolitical See of you and your successors, and that it have subject to it the five cities of Tongres, Cologne, Worms, Spires and Utrecht, and all the nations of Germany, to whom, by your preaching, you have brought the light of Christ".

In one of the last letters that Boniface sent to Zachary, he wrote : "In the midst of a vast solitude there is a woody spot, in the midst of which I have built a monastery, and placed therein monks of the order of St. Benedict, men who lead a very strict life, abstaining from flesh and wine, and working with their own hands. This place was the gift particularly of Carlomann, once Prince of the Franks. I have dedicated it to Our Saviour. Thither, with your consent, I would retire for a few days at a time to recruit the strength of my aged frame, and there would I like to lie after my death". The monastery here spoken of is the famous monastery of Fulda, one of the greatest centers of learning in Germany in the Middle Ages.

In his reply (November 4, 751) to this letter of Boniface, the Pope says that he has granted Boniface's request in the matter of the monastery; and there is extant the brief by which Zachary frees the monastery from subjection to any jurisdiction but that of Rome. This exemption Boniface then managed to get confirmed by Pippin, 'King of the

Franks', for the "love of God and the veneration he bore St. Peter". Here, once again, must we leave the narrative of St. Boniface's connection with the See of Rome (a see with which it was his one wish always to be on the best of terms) to conclude it under the *Life* of Pope Stephen (II) III.

In seeking for the causes of the wonderful success achieved by our great countryman "among the races of Germany to whom he was sent", there is no doubt that, apart from his burning zeal and his capacity for work, which for so many years he strained to its utmost tension, one of the chief ones was the amiability of his character. This it was before which opposition melted away, this made all wishful to work with him, this attached all men to him. Not only was he beloved by the popes, who, as we have seen, would have had him always with them, but he was dear to the whole Roman Church. Its deacons and its archdeacons were constantly writing to him the kindest of letters, and sending him presents. He had the greatest influence with the 'Princes of the Franks', who ever showed themselves ready to do all he wanted; and the people of his country, whether men or women, were always most devoted to him. Every letter that is addressed to him is full of affectionate language. Hence, not unnaturally, is one loath to leave the delightful collection of his letters and those of his friends.

In the early part of the year 742 Zachary sent legates to Constantine V with letters, as well for the emperor as for the Church of Constantinople. The emperor was exhorted to restore the holy images, and the Church of Constantinople was put in receipt of the Pope's synodical letter or profession of faith. On their arrival in Constantinople, the legates found that Constantine V was no longer in power there. Taking advantage of his absence on a campaign against the Saracens, his brother-in-law, the orthodox Artavasdus, took possession of the imperial city, and had himself crowned towards the close of the year 741. The papal ambassadors were prudent enough not to recognize the usurper, but in retirement awaited the issue of events. It was not long before Constantine appeared with an army before his capital, and by November 743 Byzantium was in his hands and the cause of Artavasdus was lost. Pleased at the action of the Pope's legates, Constantine had them sought out, and for once showed himself well disposed to the Church of Rome. For in accordance with the expressed wish of the Pope, the emperor, in writing, granted to Zachary and the Roman Church for ever the two estates known by the names of Nympha and Normia (now Norma), which had till then remained in the hands of the emperor. These two estates were of very considerable value; and it has been suggested that Constantine wished to make some compensation for the confiscation of the Calabrian and Sicilian patrimonies.

But Zachary had not much communication with the East, at least as far as our knowledge goes. Such as he had was confined to writing to the emperor from time to time, to beg him to give up his persecution of 'image worship' and its adherents. Whilst Zachary was Pope, Constantine V was so much occupied, first with the rebellion of Artavasdus and then with the ravages of a great plague, that he had not much leisure to attend to the image controversy, or the relations between them might have been more frequent than pleasant. For the persecution against those who dared to oppose the imperial will in the matter of the 'images' still went on; and unless he has been very much maligned by Theophanes, Constantine's character seems to have been on a par with his nickname, Copronymus.

Whilst pushing on reform in the Frankish kingdom through his legate Boniface, the Pope did not neglect to attend to needed reforms at home. In the autumn of 743 he presided over a synod of some forty bishops, twenty-two priests and six deacons, in which fifteen decrees were promulgated. These decrees regulated various points of discipline in connection with bishops, priests and nuns; forbade marriages within certain degrees of kindred; anathematized those who kept the 1st of January and the 25th of December (the feast of Bacchus) after the pagan fashion, as well as those who sold Christian slaves to the Jews; and ordered disputes between clerics to be settled by the bishops or by the Pope, and that all bishops who are subject to the Pope (as patriarch of the West) come *'ad limina apostolorum'* (viz., to Rome, to the Pope), if near at hand, every year on the 15th of May, but if they reside at a distance, in accordance with their 'indult'.

One of the events that made the greatest stir in Zachary's reign, not only in Rome, but over a large part of Europe, was the arrival (747) in the Eternal City of the great and successful Prince of the Franks, Carlomann, to become a monk. His departure for Rome and his becoming a monk is noted in chronicle after chronicle. The influence of St. Boniface upon him had been very great, and under it he strove to advance in virtue day by day. But as he felt that he could not make that progress towards perfection which he wished whilst still 'in the world', he chose, continues the biographer of St. Boniface, "the best part, which shall not be taken away from him" (St. Luke X. 42). That is to say, he determined to embrace the *religious life.* According to one chronicle, his desire to leave the world was quickened by the reflection of the thousands of men who had fallen in the wars he had had to undertake. However that may be, he entrusted his kingdom and his son to the charge of his brother Pippin, and, with a numerous train of followers, bearing considerable presents for the Pope from both Pippin and himself, betook him to Rome, and at the hands of Pope Zachary received the clerical tonsure and the habit of a monk. At first he withdrew to Mount Soracte, some twenty-eight miles from Rome, to a monastery which he had himself built, and which may still be seen.

"He there enjoyed for several years the repose he sought for, in company with the brothers of the order (Benedictine) who had gone with him. He was, however, obliged to change his place of residence, because many of the Frankish nobility, when making pilgrimages to Rome to fulfill their vows, broke, by their frequent visits to him, that quiet which he most of all desired, since they were unwilling to pass by unnoticed one who had formerly been their king. As constant interruptions of this sort hindered the object of his retirement, he betook himself (by the advice of the Pope) to the monastery of St. Benedict on Mount Cassino, in the province of Samnium, and there passed the remainder of his life in religious exercises". The last remark of Charlemagne's famous biographer is, as we shall see later, not quite accurate. At the bidding of his abbot Gratianus, he left his monastery in the year 753, and went to France to try to ward off from the said monastery the destruction with which the Lombard king Aistulfus threatened it. He died at a monastery in Vienne in 755.

In the same year in which he bestowed the monastic habit on Carlomann, Zachary was working for an improvement in morals in England. Informed of the decay in discipline that began to set in after the death of the great archbishop Theodore, the Pope ordered a council to be held, and those who should oppose its decrees to be

anathematized. The letters of the Pope conveying these orders are lost, but of their *former* existence and purport the opening words of the council itself assure us. The synod was opened with the reading of two letters received from the Pope, "who was held in reverence by the whole world". These letters were read "as the Pope had himself ordered, with the greatest care, first in Latin and then in an English translation. In these writings he admonished the people of this island, lovingly exhorted them, and finally threatened to cut off from the communion of the Church, all who should despise his warning and obstinately persist in their wickedness". There assembled (September 747) at the council, held at Cloveshoe, which some think to have been a town near Rochester, and others Abingdon, then known as Sheovsham, some dozen Bishops and a considerable number of ecclesiastics, Ethelbald, King of Mercia, and thirty-three of his chief nobility. Over thirty canons were drawn up for the reform of the clergy and monastic bodies, for the better rendering of the divine service, and for the general advancement of piety. Hence every effort was ordered to be made to foster a love of study and the Holy Scriptures; and in whatever regarded the Mass and the sacred chant, all were commanded to follow the customs and teachings 'of the Roman Church'. Altogether the decrees of Cloveshoe were of a most useful and practical order. Well worthy are they of being read and studied at any time. They cannot fail to have been productive of good in the eighth century.

The year 748 is a most important one in the history of monasticism. In that year was completed the restoration of Monte Cassino, the chief seat of the greatest religious order that has ever graced and strengthened the Church—the Benedictine. The work, begun by the abbot Petronax under the auspices of Gregory II, was continued by the same zealous monk with the aid of Gregory III, and completed with such munificent assistance from Pope Zachary, that the credit of the entire restoration was assigned to him. Attended by thirteen archbishops and sixty-eight bishops, Zachary performed the dedication ceremony, venerated the bodies of St. Benedict and his sister St. Scholastica, confirmed the various donations and possessions of the monastery, exempted the abbot from any episcopal jurisdiction, except from that of Rome, granted him certain of the honors that are usually confined to bishops, and himself gave various presents to the monastery. Besides a copy of the Holy Scriptures—his copy of the Gospels is said to be still preserved there—he presented the abbey with the copy of his rule, which St. Benedict had written out with his own hand, and his weight for the bread and his measure for the wine which the saint allowed his monks. These precious memorials of their founder the monks had saved from the first destruction of their monastery under Zoto and his Lombards. Presented by them (the monks) to Pope Gregory II, as an act of gratitude for the kindness they had received at the hands of the popes during their sojourn in Rome, these interesting mementos were thus restored to them by Zachary. The bull of Zachary, dated February 18, from Aquino, on the strength of which some of the above statements with regard to Monte Cassino and the Pope rest, has been rejected by Muratori, Jaffé and others as spurious. It has been received here as, to say the least of it, many of the arguments against its genuineness have been disproved by Troya.

By another bull bearing the same date as the previous one, Zachary confirmed the rule of St. Benedict, ordered the feasts of SS. Benedict, Scholastica and Maurus to be

kept by the community as doubles of the first class, *i.e.*, with the same solemnity as Christmas Day.

Over the authenticity especially of the first of these bulls there has been a fierce controversy—a controversy in which not a few among the best of modern historians have been engaged. We allude, of course, to the famous dispute as to whether the body of St. Benedict was or was not in the seventh century (672 or 673) removed by some Gallic monks from Monte Cassino to Fleury by the Loire. Discussion on this topic has been going on for the greater part of a thousand years; and when last summer (1901) we visited what still remains of the once glorious abbey of Fleury (*viz.*, a fine romanesque church), we were assured that the French monks had at length settled the discussion, and that it was now acknowledged at Monte Cassino that the relics of St. Benedict which we were shown in the crypt were really the body of the great patriarch of Monasticism in the West! To those who are disposed to sneer at such lengthy and ardent discussion on such subjects, and to brand them as sterile, we would point out that this and similar disputes have at least done a very great deal to sift the sources of history, and have even led to historical discoveries. Into the arena of this controversy we have no thought of entering, either to take sides or even to arbitrate. The monks of St. Benedict are doughty literary champions, and we will leave them to settle their literary difficulties themselves. We will simply observe that if the bull of Pope Zachary, *Omnipotenti Deo,* can be urged as proving that the body of St. Benedict was at Monte Cassino on the date of its publication (748), there is a letter of the same Pope, written in 750-1, and seemingly more likely to be genuine than the aforesaid bull, in which he exhorts the clergy of France to cause the body of St. Benedict to be restored whence it had been taken. Of the rest of this letter, which treats of Pippin and Grifo, something will be said when Zachary's connections with the Franks come to be treated of.

Now that a beginning has been made of treating of the work of Church restoration by Zachary, it will be convenient to mention here the rest of his labors in that direction. For though in his days the people entrusted to him by God lived in peace and happiness, there was so much to be done, in the way of keeping existing monuments in repair, that even an energetic Pope, such as Zachary, had no time to think of adding new ones. His first care was the Lateran Palace, which he practically rebuilt. From the days of John VII, who built the new palace beneath the Palatine—the finding of the ruins of which has already been described—evidently no great attention had been paid to the old Lateran palace The work of Zachary, no doubt, saved it from going to complete decay. It contained the archives of the Church and the Treasure Chamber, and was the dwelling, at the same time, of the popes and their households. Enlarged by degrees, it included, besides the great basilica, several smaller churches, many oratories, *triclinia* or dining halls, and several chapels, among them the celebrated private chapel of the popes, called St. Lorenzo, or, later, Sancta Sanctorum. In addition to the ordinary decorations, such as mosaics, paintings and images, with which the Pope adorned the Lateran, he had painted a large fresco map of the world, which doubtless furnished Giovanni da Udine with the idea for those similar maps that now adorn one of the loggias of the Vatican.

Among the gifts presented by Zachary to the basilica of St. Peter were his own copies of the Psalter, the antiphonary of St. Gregory and the lives of the saints which are recited at Matins. One of these is still preserved in the Vatican Library.

Of special interest to us in this country was the finding of the head of St. George. Probably whilst some repairs were in progress at the Lateran palace, a box was discovered in which was found a skull, which, from an attached label in Greek characters, was shown to be the head of St. George. With great joy both pastor and people assembled at the Lateran. With hymns and canticles the sacred relic was transported by the Pope's orders to the deaconryof St. George (in the second region of the city), known as 'ad Velum aureum' (Velabro). The mention of St. George in Velabro belonging to the second region of the city shows us that at least part of the tenth imperial region—(the Palatine Region)—was included in the second ecclesiastical region. The church of the deaconry was completely restored by the Pope, and placed in charge of some Greek monks of the order of St. Basil, who had fled to Rome to escape the persecution of the Iconoclast Copronymus. These monks were very naturally chosen by Zachary, as St. George was one of the chief patron saints of the Greeks. Various inscriptions, still to be seen in this old basilica of St. George, recall the memory of the Greek *Egumeni* (abbots), who in the eighth and ninth centuries had charge of the church.

To go further into Zachary's work in the direction of Church restoration and decoration would be to trench on the office of the archaeologist and the antiquarian. Referring, therefore, our readers to the *Book of the Popes*, and the learned comments of Bartolini, it will be worthwhile to add a word or two on his efforts as a landlord to improve the cultivation of the Roman Campagna.

The Campagna, a low-lying plain round Rome, some ninety miles in length and some thirty, from the sea to the Sabine and Alban hills, in breadth, was never at the best of times a very healthy district. But at the period of which we are now writing, what with the devastations of the Huns and other barbarians, who broke up the Roman empire and sacked its capital, what with the wars of Belisarius and Narses for the recovery of Italy from the barbarian Goth, and the various attacks on Rome by the Lombards, the state of the Campagna was rapidly approaching that desolate and disease-producing condition in which we see it today. Zachary, however, profiting by a year or two of peace, turned his attention to promote measures that might effect something in the way of retarding the destruction of the fertility of the Campagna, which he saw was but too rapidly going on. He accordingly established agricultural colonies—known as '*domuscultae'*—at suitable places. Dwellings and oratories or small churches were provided; and every effort was made by the Pope to induce men to settle there, and to procure by purchase sufficient land in their neighborhood to give the colonists plenty of employment. The *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the names of five such colonies. One that went by the name of St. Cecily was situated five miles from Rome on the Tiburtine road, and was incorporated with the Tiburtine 'patrimony', which included all the country between the Via Praenestina and the Tiber. A second was founded some fourteen miles from Rome in the Etruscan patrimony that stretched along the right bank of the Tiber. This 'colony' lay between the Claudian and Cornelian roads. Laurentum, now Capocotta, was the third; and Antius and Formia, in the old Volscian territory,

constituted the fourth and fifth. When the work of founding these agricultural colonies was accomplished, Zachary summoned a synod of the clergy of the Roman Church, declared before it that he had added the said colonies to the patrimonies and dominion of St. Peter, and forbade their alienation by any of his successors or by any other person whatsoever.

Of the regular intercourse which Zachary maintained with the Franks, very little has come down to us. The *Caroline Code* has preserved only one of his letters, addressed to "the most excellent and most Christian Pippin, Major Domus, to all our most beloved bishops and religious abbots, and to all the God-fearing princes of the Franks". This document furnishes a series of replies to questions on various points of the canon and moral laws, sent to him for solution by Pippin, acting on the advice of Frankish bishops. The Pope gives his answers in accordance with the tradition of the Fathers, the authority of the canons, and his own decrees, which he has issued by his apostolical power. Further, the letters of St. Boniface reveal the fact that Zachary vigorously cooperated with that great apostle of the Germans by securing for him the active support of the Franks. And lastly, a letter already alluded to, a letter of which the authenticity has been questioned on seemingly insufficient grounds, shows him in that role of peacemaker which he knew so well how to play. The brothers Pippin and Carloman lived on the best of terms after the death of their father Charles Martel. But this was not the case with their half-brother Grifo, the son, whether legitimate or otherwise is not known, of Charles Martel and the Bavarian princess Swanahild. Whether Grifo was dissatisfied with the share of power left to him by his father, or whether the two brothers were jealous of what had been done for Grifo, certain it is that war ere long broke out between the latter and his half-brothers. Grifo was soon subdued and imprisoned (741). When Carloman renounced the world, Pippin released Grifo (747). It was kindness thrown away. Grifo was soon in arms again. And once more did the sword fail him. It was at this juncture that the Pope intervened (750-1). He implored the clergy to add their efforts for peace to those which were being made by the monks whom Optatus, the abbot of Monte Cassino, and his princely subject, Carloman, had sent to the court of the Major Domus, Pippin. It is, to say the least, likely enough that this mediation saved Grifo. Yet once more was he forgiven by the generous Pippin. But Grifo was impervious to kindness, and it was while scheming with Pippin's foes, Tassilo of Bavaria, and Aistulf, the king of the Lombards, that he was slain by some of Pippin's followers (753).

Though the authority is anything but contemporary, the *Annals* of Metz (not written till towards the close of the tenth century) are probably but relating a fact when they tell of a rebellion of Otilo (the predecessor of Tassila III), against Pippin. The Bavarian dukes were ever chafing against the yoke of the Franks, and consequently they were frequently in arms against them. They were invariably worsted. And so on the banks of the Lech, Otilo was defeated by Pippin and Carlomann in 743. In the fight there was captured on the side of Otilo the priest Sergius, the missus of Pope Zachary. The same authority says that on the day before the battle he had been sent by Otilo to the Franks, and, pretending to speak in the name of the Pope, had forbidden the battle and ordered the Franks to depart from Bavaria. When Sergius fell into the hands of Pippin and his brother, they took good care to impress upon him that he could not have

been speaking in St. Peter's name, because it was by the intercession of Blessed Peter and the just judgment of God that they had been victorious, and that "Bavaria and the Bavarians were to belong to the empire of the Franks". We may conclude that *the Annals had* no authority for much more than the fact of the Pope's attempted mediation between the combatants.

But the most important of Pope Zachary's relations with the Franks,—indeed, one of the most memorable events in the history of the popes of the Middle Ages up to this date—was his decision with regard to the election of Pippin to the throne of the Frankish empire in place of Childeric. No action of the mediaeval popes up to this period has been more discussed or more variously viewed. While some writers would condemn the conduct of the Pope, others would approve of it; and there are those who would minimize and those who would perhaps magnify its importance. Before entering upon the details of the matter, there are one or two points which unquestionably stand out from the historical documents of the period. The number of writers who speak of it—both at the time and in the years more immediately following the event—shows unmistakably that the affair was then regarded as one of no mean importance; and the way in which it is spoken of by these writers shows that the appeal to the Pope and his judgment on the matter were looked on at the time as *most natural*. This is a very important point to bear in mind, first because many are apt to judge of the doings of men in the past by the different laws and the different recognized criteria of judgment of the present day; and again because we have not such a deep knowledge of the facts of the case as to warrant us in forming a different judgment on it to that formed by the historians and men of the time.

What are the facts of the case as they have come down to us, it will be our task now to set forth with but as little admixture of comment of our own as need be. The later descendants of the kings of the Merovingian race were men practically without vigor of mind or body. All real power slipped or was plucked from their feeble grasp. While they were once a year saluted as kings, throughout all the year the so-called mayors of the palace were looked up to as kings, and had in reality all the power of kings.

Originally only 'masters of the household', they were, at the time of which we are now speaking, the chief ministers of the kingdom, and had control over the chief departments of the State. Such an important place did they occupy that even before the declaration of Pope Zachary we sometimes find them spoken of simply as kings. And so Desiderius, Bishop of Cahors, addresses Grimoald, the son of Pippin 'of Landen', and mayor of the palace in the kingdom of Austrasia, as "the ruler not only of the royal court but of the kingdom".

The nominal king of the Franks in the year 752 was Childeric III, one of the weakest of the weak. He is described as a man of "not the slightest account, of no sense, as useless and good for nothing". It does not require any deep political insight to see that such a condition of things was to the last degree dangerous to a State. And the danger was intensified at this period by the rebellions of Grifo, Pippin's half-brother. Among the Franks, as among the Anglo-Saxons, the monarchy was at least so far elective that it lay with the nobles to choose their kings from amongst the various

members of the royal family. And the records of both peoples show that the eldest sons did not always succeed to their fathers' thrones. Matters had now come to such a pass with the Merovingian race, from a continued succession of mere boys, that there does not appear to have been at the time of Childeric III any member of that family worthy of holding the kingly power, at any rate in comparison with such 'mayors of the palace' as Charles Martel and Pippin the Short. Consequently the chief men of the Franks, both cleric and lay, felt that the interests of their country imperatively demanded a change. There can be no difficulty in believing that Pippin helped on their deliberations, and named himself as the most fitting man both to be and to be called king. But it is equally clear, from the quiet way in which the resolution that actually made him king was accomplished, that his pretensions were regarded as just by the nobles at large. However, though themselves convinced that it was within their power and right for sufficient reason to depose one sovereign and replace him by another, they were men of sense, and understood well enough that their contemplated action might form a dangerous precedent. And so, knowing that no one is a judge in his own case, and that they might be deceived in supposing they had reason enough to dethrone Childeric, they resolved to get the opinion and decision of another on the merits of their proposed conduct. To whom, then, could they turn more naturally on this, which was as much a question of morals as of politics, than to the Pope, to whom they looked up not only as the author of their Christianity, but as the representative of Our Lord on earth, and so the chief pastor of all Christians?

Arguing from the fact that one of those sent by Pippin to consult Zachary on his wishes was Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, one of St. Boniface's friends, that according to many ancient authors, Boniface anointed Pippin as king, and that in 751 Boniface sent Lull to Rome to discuss some secret matters with the Pope, not a few authors think it by no means improbable that St. Boniface was the chief of Pippin's supporters and advisers in the contemplated revolution. However that may be, it is certain that there went to Rome (probably at the close of the year 751) two ambassadors from Pippin, and the whole nobility of the Franks, *viz.*, Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fulrad, Pippin's chaplain, charged to ask the Pope whether it was a desirable state of things that there should be in France men who with the name of king had no regal power. To this Zachary gave an authoritative reply that it was better, under the circumstances, that he should be and should be called king who had the power of a king rather than the one who had the name without the substance of a king. Accordingly, "that the good order of the Christian world might not be disturbed", he "ordered by his apostolic authority that Pippin should be made king", and "that Archbishop Boniface should anoint him". The decision of the Pope was followed by the public election of Pippin; and, raised on a shield amidst the applause of his cheering comrades, he was by them hailed as king, after in a most solemn manner he had been anointed king at Soissons by Boniface and other assistant bishops (752). As will be noticed in its proper place. Pippin was again anointed (754) by Pope Stephen (II) III. Childeric was tonsured and shut up in the monastery of St. Bertin in Sithiu, founded by St. Omer (or Audomar). His wife and son were also enclosed in convents.

As the history of this appeal is so important, our readers might perchance care to know a little more about the authorities on which it rests than can be gathered from the

preceding notes. Besides the testimony of the so-called *Annales minores* of Lauresheim, which chronicle the events between the years 741 and 788, there are those of *the Annals of Lauresheim,* and those, so-called, of Eginhard. Concerning these two latter, the illustrious Pertz gives it as his opinion that the annals of Lauresheim were composed in the monastery of Nazarius, and only reached down to the year 788; that they afterwards came into the hands of Eginhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, who continued them to the year 829; and that finally, after the earlier part, the work of the monks, had received some emendations from him, the whole chronicle (741-829), with a few slight changes in his continuation, was edited as the *Annals of Eginhard.*

The evidence of these contemporary chronicles is supported by a host of others, and is if possible excelled by one or two other documents now to be adduced. In an old MS. codex, containing the works of St. Gregory of Tours, *De vitis patrum* and *De gloria confessorum,* found in the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris, there was discovered, in the same characters, and written with the same ink, as the rest of the MS., the following interesting note by the scribe who wrote the MS :—"If, reader, you would care to know when this work in praise of the holy martyrs was written, it was in the year of Our Lord 767, during the sixteenth year of the reign of the most happy, peaceful, and Catholic Pippin, king of the Franks, and patrician of the Romans, in the fifth indiction ... The aforesaid most flourishing Lord Pippin, Pious King, was raised to the regal throne by the authority and command *(imperium)* of the Lord Pope Zachary of holy memory, by the anointing with the sacred chrism at the hands of the holy bishops of Gaul and by the election of all the Franks three years before". As Bartolini takes notice, the epithets, 'most flourishing, *etc*,' give us internal evidence that the scribe was contemporary with Pippin, as does also the title 'Lord'applied to Zachary, for it shows that that Pope must have been but comparatively recently dead. Another contemporary writer, cited by the above-named distinguished author from an inedited Vatican MS., speaks quite to the same effect when he says, that with the advice and consent of all the Franks an embassy was sent to Rome; and that on the receipt of the apostolic mandate Pippin was raised to the throne according to the ancient rite, by the election of the Franks, the consecration of the bishops, and the homageof the nobles.

From the contemporary authorities, which the reader now has before him, he can have no difficulty in concluding that the Pope intervened actively in Pippin's elevation, and that, as results showed, his intervention was most salutary. An important revolution of the greatest benefit for Church and State was thus brought about without the slightest disorder. A strong government was established, under which civilization, which, if true, means improvement in the welfare of the people from all points of view, made considerable progress in Western Europe. Only sticklers for "the right divine of kings to govern wrong" (which right, we believe, in the eyes of sound thinking men, does not exist) could object to Zachary's decision, a decision the lawfulness of which was not called in question by any of his contemporaries. Well would it be for modern Europe if its rulers would refer their differences or their difficulties to the popes once again. Their disagreements would lead to much less fatal results.

Not much remains to be told of the doings of this great Greek pontiff. In reply to a letter of Theodore, Bishop of Pavia, he forbids a son to marry a girl to whom his father has stood as godparent, a decision that was inserted among the decretals on the subjects

of spiritual relationship, and was consequently the law of the Church for a long time. By the Council of Trent, however, spiritual relationship was limited to the first degree—to the godparents themselves and to their godchildren and their godchildren's natural parents, as well as to the baptizer, the baptized, and the parents of the baptized.

Zealous for the preservation of order, we find Zachary in the last year of his life condemning Ausfred, Bishop of Siena, for presuming to consecrate an altar in the Church of St. Ampsanus against the wishes of the Bishop of Arezzo, under whose jurisdiction the said church was. The bishops of Siena, however, as the Church was within the limits of their diocese, thought that sufficient attention had not been paid to their side of the question. The case reappeared again at intervals even till the beginning of the eleventh century (1029).

In the midst of all the weighty matters of Church and State in which Zachary was ever immersed, to the great profit of both, he found time, like his great model the first Gregory, for deeds of charity and for literary pursuits. Not only did he cause food from his own table to be taken by the masters of his householdto the poor and pilgrims who dwelt in the hospitals in the neighborhood of St. Peter's, but looked after the poor and sick of the whole city. And like a true bishop he showed in a most substantial way that he had a genuine love of his clergy; was, indeed, their father. Justly regarding it as an important point that the clergy should be in such a position as to appear respectable in the eyes of everyone, he more than doubled the donativewhich the popes were wont to bestow on the Roman clergy once a year, in addition to the regular revenues they derived from the property belonging to the Church to which they were attached. This was called 'one *donative',* because, as Bartolini observes, it was granted once a year. His biographer might well say of Zachary that he would not suffer anyone to be in distress.

In the department of literature we know that he translated the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory I into Greek, and we have the authority of the heresiarch Photius that, to the general gain, he translated many other of his works in addition.

Zachary, the great and good, went the way of all flesh, March 14 or 22, 752, and was buried in St, Peter's the following day. His name is to be found inscribed among the saints in the earliest martyrologies that are extant, written after his death, such as those of Ado and Usuard. In the Roman martyrology he is commemorated on March 15.

To serve as a natural introduction to a few words on the temporal power of the popes at this period, mention of one act of Zachary has been hitherto delayed. The act referred to is the fact of his having issued money bearing his own name.

After the Romans threw off their allegiance to the emperor Leo in the reign of Pope Gregory II, it is only natural to conclude that the need for new coins would have to be met, as of course the supply from the mints of Constantinople would cease. The need for coins of small value would probably be the first felt. The smaller coins would be the ones in the most constant use—for the Rome of this age especially must have been a city of poor—and consequently from this cause, and from the very fact of their small value, would be soonest lost. Though there is extant a silver coin that bears no name, and whichmay belong to an issue of St. Gregory II, small square bronze coins of Gregory III are, as far as we know, the first that were struck by order of a Pope. The

coins that we have of Pope Zachary are also small, square and bronze; for a silver coin that is shown bearing the name of Zachary is acknowledged on all hands to be spurious. On the obverse of the coins of Zachary, enclosed in a circlet of raised dots, and with an initial cross, we have the letters ZACCHARIAE, and on the reverse, with the same circlet and cross, the letters PAPAE. These coins, both of Gregory III and Zachary, are in the Kircherian Museum at Rome. According to Cinagli, the coin of Zachary there preserved weighs 27'51 Roman grammes, or 1'35 French.

Since writing the above, a visit to Rome has furnished facts which render necessary a modification of the preceding paragraph. There are no longer any papal coins in the Kircherian Museum. When the Italian government seized the Gregorian University buildings, in which was the Museum founded by the Jesuit, Father Kircher—an act of robbery with violence which is glossed over by saying that the buildings were made *national property*— the papal coins which used to be there were transferred to the Museo delle Terme. But the *coins* of Gregory III, etc., are not forthcoming. It may be that after the confusion caused by transportation has been remedied they will be found. As it is, however, the obliging director of the Museum, Cavaliere Pasqui, informed us that at present the *national* collection of papal coins does not go further back than Gregory IV.

Specimens of the said *coins* were, however, seen by us in the Vatican collection of papal coins, which, through the great kindness of Signor Serafini, who is the director as well of the Vatican collection of coins as of the Municipal, we were able to examine. Through the recent purchase of the collection of Cardinal Randi, the Vatican has now the finest collection of papal coins in the world. It is composed of over 30,000 specimens, of which 16,000 are different. Whatever may be thought of the *coins* of the popes before Hadrian I, the series of papal coins unquestionably begins with him and goes down till towards the middle of the twelfth century. Coins of Pascal II (1099-1118) exist in the Vatican and elsewhere. Then, for about a century and a half, money in Rome was struck by the *Senate.* During that period, though at the height of their power abroad, the popes had not much of it at home. From Blessed Benedict XI, (1303-5) to our own times (Pius IX) there is an unbroken series of papal money. The *Senate* (1252) were the first to strike money in gold. They also coined in silver, copper and in some alloy. The papal coins, however, from Hadrian I to Pascal II are all in silver; and so, as the *coins* of Gregory III and Zachary are of copper, and for the most part square, Promis and Serafini, whose opinion is entitled to very great respect, believe that they are only *tesserce,* and were used for the same purposes as our soup-tickets. Still, the appearance of such pieces of stamped metal for the first time, just when political considerations would lead one to expect to find traces of a papal coinage, is so striking that we cannot but subscribe to the view of Pizzamiglio, and maintain that they are the first essays of the popes in the direction of coining money. Even if they are regarded as *tesserce,* they must be considered as having the relation to money that bank notes have.

Now if there is one thing that history makes clear, it is that whoso coins the money in a State holds, practically at least, the supreme power in that State. A prince always justly considered himself as practically independent of any central government if he issued his own money; and, on the other hand, it has ever been the aim of such as have wished to extend their sway to reserve to themselves the sole right of coining

money throughout the territories they wished to claim as theirs. The fact, then, that Gregory III and Zachary issued a coinage of their own, shows us that at this point in the eighth century the civil rulers of the city of Rome were the popes and not the emperors; for it has never been contended that any special permit to coin money was given them by the rulers at Constantinople.

So much passion and prejudice is generally brought to bear on this subject of the temporal power of the popes, that it behoves us to approach it with the greatest circumspection. Some half century ago the non-Catholic writers of the *Cabinet Cyclopedia of History* did not hesitate to declare that "modern writers especially, speaking of the Papacy, had almost always aimed at perverting the truth of history, and that in no country under heaven has this abominable dishonesty been so prevalent as in England". Though, with the rapid publication of original documents that has of late years gone on in the more advanced nations of Europe, and with much greater and deeper attention on the part of the 'many' to historical studies, this damning charge stands in need of some modification, there is still much truth in it. And even yet many writers cannot bring themselves to speak on the popes, and especially on their temporal power, in accordance with a fair temperate deduction from historical facts

In considering this question of the temporal power of the popes, it may be well first again to emphasize the facts of the case and then to enquire into their causes. As a matter of *fact*, then, there can be no doubt that from the days of Gregory II Rome was to all intents and purposes independent of the emperors and subject to the popes. On this point of fact there is abundance of non-Catholic testimony. Though the supremacy of the Eastern Empire was still recognized, says Finlay, "from this time, *AD* 733, the city of Rome enjoyed political independence under the guidance and protection of the popes".

There is by no means so much agreement as to the cause or causes that brought about this temporal sway of the popes over the Roman duchy. Many non-Catholic writers ascribe it to the bad ambition of the popes themselves in this age. At this conclusion they can but arrive by imputing evil motives (knowledge of which they can only draw from their imaginations) to acts which, simply considered as history presents them, are quite innocent. But anyone who may have taken the trouble to read the preceding pages will, we imagine, have seen for himself that practically independent temporal power did not come to the popes all at once in the eighth century, but that civil authority gradually accumulated in their hands from the days of Pope Gregory I; and, as will be shown presently, long before his time. It will, doubtless, have been observed how, from the unwillingness or incapability of others, it naturally fell to the popes to take measures for the defence of the Roman duchy, and how in time, equally naturally, the people of Rome at last came to recognize only those as their rulers who had proved themselves their sole preservers. We say it fell naturally to the popes, inasmuch as they were the most distinguished men in Rome, as well from the material resources at their command, as, of course, still more from the regard had by the people to their spiritual power. On the other hand, if the power of the Eastern emperors had been greater, had they honestly done their best for their Italian provinces, instead of endeavoring to use them merely as a means to raise money, or as an area through which their dogmatic edicts had to be propagated, there would, humanly speaking, have been no independent

temporal power in the hands of the popes. For certainly the popes never tried to throw off the yoke of the Eastern Empire.

It has just been said that temporal power began to be exercised by the popes even long before the days of Gregory the Great. From the earliest times, the popes had that at least indirect temporal power which the possession and free use of wealth give to its owners in every civilized land. Of the early wealth of the popes, Eusebius has preserved evidence enough. The letter of St, Dionysius of Corinth to Pope Soter (175-182) tells of the previous generosity of the Roman Church being outdone by Soter, who "furnished great supplies to all the saints"; and Eusebius adds that the liberality of the Church of Rome was continued to his time (fourth century). The wealth of the Roman Church, which enabled its bishops to be so liberal, was largely increased by Constantine and others after Christianity had overthrown paganism in the Roman world. So that by the time of Gregory the Great, the bishop of Rome had landed property (known as the patrimonies of St, Peter) in every province of the empire. And long before his time, the wealth of the bishop of Rome had furnished the pagan with subject matter for pleasant raillery or bitter sneer, as the case might be.

After the conversion of Constantine, the popes had not only that influence in temporal matters that follows wealth and station, they had the direct power in civil affairs that was given to all Christian bishops by the laws of the empire. Constantine bestowed on all bishops considerable judicial power. "He permitted", says Sozomen, a lawyer of Constantinople who wrote about the middle of the fifth century, "all who had law-suits to decline the jurisdiction of the civil magistrates and to appeal to the judgment of the bishops; he even ordered that the sentence of the ecclesiastical tribunal should be more binding than that of secular judges, that they should have the same authority as those given by the emperor himself; finally, that the governors of provinces and their officers should be obliged to enforce their execution". Though part of these powers was somewhat restricted by some of the successors of Constantine, still, in what may be called the final expression of Roman law, the Code of Justinian, the powers given to bishops in civil affairs are both numerous and important. A glance at the first book of the Code will convince anyone that there is no exaggeration in this statement. The bishops had not only to watch over the interests of youths, women, slaves, orphans, prisoners and poor, and to aid the magistrates to suppress gambling, but to take their share in seeing to the defence and other interests of the cities—such as the safe custody of the standard weights and measures —and, with the chief men in the different provinces, to select suitable persons for the purposes of local government. It is only to be expected, then, that if bishops in general had such powers, those of the great patriarchs of both East and West would be more extensive. To confine ourselves to the Western patriarchs, *i.e.*, to the Roman pontiffs, we have evidence of their great authority in temporals in the words of Socrates, a lawyer of Constantinople, like Sozomen in the fifth century, who, if not a Novatian himself, was certainly a great admirer of that heresy and its votaries. Because the popes had taken measures to suppress the Novatians, Socrates seizes the occasion to rail at them for "going beyond the limits of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction", and for what he is pleased to call "degenerating into their present state of secular domination".

This ‘secular domination’, which roused the wrath of Socrates, because he found it adverse to his pet sect, went on increasing, and was very largely exercised, as we have seen, by St. Gregory the Great; so much so that Dr. Hodgkin notes that “the distance from the seat of empire, the interruption of communication with Ravenna, the lordship of the vast patrimony of St. Peter, were all tending to turn the Pope, with his will or against his will, into a temporal sovereign”. As time went on one act of jurisdiction after another was performed by Honorius, by Sisinnius, by Zachary; and, on the other hand, one act of rebellion after another against the emperors on the part of the Romans themselves under Constantine, and under Gregory II, forced the hands of the popes ever more and more. So that before the end of the first half of the eighth century the popes were independent rulers of the duchy of Rome. The stamping of his own name on the coins of the duchy by Zachary was but a legitimate consequence of the people of Rome refusing in the time of Pope Constantine to receive coins stamped with the name of the emperor Philippicus. This full independent civil power which accrued to the popes in the eighth century was a natural result of temporal authority wielded well and wisely for several centuries previously. It is but a physical law that everything that is well used grows. And notoriously, of all things, power increases as it moves forward. And, on the other hand, it is equally in accordance with nature that what is ill used should cease to grow, nay, should shrink. Nature and not ambition, then, is the key to the temporal power of the popes.

Men who are not Christians will, it may be presumed, accept the temporal power of the popes on what must be to them the sufficient ground that it was well gotten. But there are among those who profess that name, men who hold that, as Our Lord declared that “His kingdom was not of this world”, it is not right for those who claim to be His vicars to hold the power of kings. Apart from the truth that Our Lord’s kingdom, if not ‘of’, i.e., ‘sprung from’ this world, is certainly ‘in’ this world, we have it on the word of Our Lord that the children of the bridegroom were to do in His absence what they were not to do in His presence. And so, though the ‘temporal power’ cannot be said to be necessary in itself, for it was not much in evidence during the centuries of persecution, and is at present in abeyance, still ‘temporal power’ may be said to have become necessary with the rise of the Christian nations. It would not have been so, of course, with ideal Christian peoples. With human nature such as it is and always was, however, temporal power both was and is necessary to the popes if they are to be the common Fathers of all nations alike. A glance at the treatment meted out to them by the Byzantine emperors or other tyrants will show the absolute need the popes have of an independent temporal power to enable them fearlessly to proclaim the faith of Christ, as various non-Catholic writers have admitted. Passing over the persecutions of Liberius, St. John I, Silverius, and Vigilius, as their names do not occur in this part of the history of the Papacy on which we are now engaged, we have seen St. Martin I dragged off to exile and death, and Sergius, John VI, and Gregory II, only escaping a similar fate by the devotion of the people. And it may be added that the history of the popes of the tenth century, of those of Avignon and of Pius VII in the hands of Napoleon, clearly points to the same moral. The Pope must be an independent ruler over some State that he may be truly free to administer the affairs of the Church in the best way. It is, then, obviously the duty of everyone who has at heart the true interests of the Church to do all that lies in his power that the ruffianly brigandage perpetrated in 1870, when in the

name of 'Italian patriotism' Rome and the adjoining territory were wrested from their rightful owners the popes, may be undone. Italy lawfully belonging to Rome is the evidence of ancient history, but never has history shown us Rome lawfully belonging to the Italians. Mediaeval and modern Rome have been made and preserved by the genius of the popes with the aid of the wealth of the Christian world. Rome, then, belongs to the popes; after them to the Christian world, particularly, perhaps, to the countries of Western Europe. Certainly not to the Italians alone, unless, forsooth, right and justice are to be gauged by geographical position. The sooner, then, Rome is restored to its proper owners the sooner will another great wrong be set right.

To sum up what we have said. The foundation of the temporal power of the popes was their paramount spiritual authority. For there can be no doubt that, at least in the very earliest records that we have, in which the relative position of the great rulers in the Church is touched upon, the bishop of Rome is always set forth as the Head of the Church Catholic—whatever may have been the difference of opinion as to how far that headship extended. This, their spiritual position, naturally brought them wealth and station even during the era of the persecutions. With the triumph of the Church under Constantine, they shared in a pre-eminent degree the powers he gave to all bishops. With the transference of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, with the coming of the barbarians, the hold of the emperors on Italy and the West kept lessening, whereas the influence of the popes in Rome kept increasing—the more that they were frequently its saviors. And with the decay of the municipal system in the fourth century, the most important position in the great cities of the West was in the fifth century occupied by the bishops: Mr. Dill, while telling us that "the municipal system, once the great glory of Roman organizing power, had in the fourth century fallen almost to ruin", assures us that "the real leader of the municipal community in the fifth century, alike in temporal and in spiritual things, was often the great Churchman".

In Rome and in Italy in the sixth century, even under the Ostrogoth, Arian though he generally was, considerable power was left in the hands of the Catholic bishops and the popes. And when in the same century the Ostrogoth was crushed out of existence, and the 'Roman' empire once more asserted itself in Italy, the Pragmatic Sanction of Justinian did but put the popes on a higher pedestal of temporal power than ever. In 568 came the Lombards into Italy. From that the cause of the Roman empire in Italy was lost. *Sauve qui peut* was the only possibility. Preserving Rome from the ferocious Lombard, all power in it was forced into the hands of the popes. They had to take charge of its water and corn supply, to raise and pay troops, to repair its walls. And when, in return for saving Rome to the Empire, their persons were maltreated, and their faith outraged, the Roman people would endure the cupidity and weak tyranny of their emperors no longer. They threw off the yoke of the Greek, which oppressed them, and chose that of the Popes which was easy.

STEPHEN II, (752), and STEPHEN (II) III,

A.D. 752-757

EMPEROR.

CONSTANTINE V (COPRONYMUS), 741-775.

KINGS.

AISTULF, 749-756.

DESIDERIUS, 756-774

EXARCH.

EUTYCHIUS, 727-752 LAST OF THE EXARCHS

IMMEDIATELY after the death of Pope Zachary, "the whole people" elected a certain priest Stephen as his successor. But after being formally conducted into the Lateran Palace, he was, on the morning of the third day after his election, stricken with apoplexy whilst in his chair transacting some of his domestic affairs. Death ensued on the following day. One consequence of the premature death of this Stephen before his consecration as bishop has been to cause great disorder in the numbers assigned to the different Stephens that have followed him. Thus a great many historians call the immediate successor of this unconsecrated Stephen, Stephen II, but as many more Stephen III. For ourselves we shall call the second Stephen, who succeeded Zachary, Stephen III, for two reasons. First, because we hold that election on the one hand and consent on the other are enough to make a Pope. From the time, at least, of St. Benedict II, the popes elect have exercised full jurisdiction in the Church, and hence were acting as Heads of the Church, as popes. And secondly, in the official list of the popes published yearly in Rome in the "Diario" (Almanac), the number II is affixed to the Stephen whose name is omitted by many in their lists of the popes; and as still further showing the tradition of the Roman Church, the portrait of the Stephen who reigned but for three days appears among the mosaic medallions of the Popes which adorn the basilica of St. Paul *outside-the-walls.*

In this same month of March, "the whole people of God" assembled in the venerable basilica of St. Mary Major, and there, after pouring forth ardent prayers to God and Our Lady, unanimously elected another Stephen, a deacon. Amidst the greatest rejoicings, the newly-elected Pope was conveyed, first to the Lateran basilica, and then, "according to custom", to the adjoining palace. He was consecrated on March *26;* for we are told in the *Life* of Zachary, in the *Liber Pontificalis,* that the bishopric of Rome

was vacant twelve days; and, as Stephen II was never a bishop, we arrive at this date for the consecration of Stephen III.

From a very early age Stephen was brought up in the Lateran Palace. On the death of his father, he was entrusted to the care of the popes, and thoroughly imbued with the doctrine and spirit of the apostles by the great pontiffs Gregory III and Zachary. Hence, in his pontificate he showed himself a lover of God's Church, a firm upholder of ecclesiastical tradition, a ready supporter of the poor of Christ, a constant preacher of God's word, and a bold defender of his flock. His love for the poor Stephen showed in a most practical manner. Four hospitals within the city walls, which by the ravages of time had fallen into decay, he completely restored, enriched with presents and protected by a bull of interdict. Another he reestablished for daily supplying food to a hundred poor; and outside the city walls, on the Vatican hill, near St. Peter's, he built two new hospitals, and attached them to the already existing deaconries of Our Lady and St Sylvester. That glorious title, "lover of the poor", the special appanage of the good Christian, was not given to Stephen in vain.

Under Pope Stephen there began in real earnest the last desperate attempt on the part of the Lombards to bring all Italy, the duchy of Rome included, under their barbaric sway. A contest which, after some twenty-two years' duration, was to end in the destruction of the Lombard kingdom, and leave the popes in peaceful rule over central Italy, was now begun between the popes, naturally and justly anxious to preserve the independence of the Roman duchy, and the Lombard kings bent on aggrandizement. Aistulf, whom even Muratori, with his Lombard leanings, allows to have been a man of little conscience, and less judgment, attacked the territories still under the exarch with great vigor. His victorious troops overran Istria and the Pentapolis. Either in this year (752), or in the preceding, Ravenna fell into his hands, and thus, after some 180 years' duration, the power of the exarchs was broken for ever! Stephen heard with alarm that preparations were being made by Aistulf for the conquest of the Roman duchy. Whilst "his enemy was still afar off", the Pope, "in the third month after his consecration" (June 752), sent with presents to the king his brother the deacon Paul (afterwards Pope), and Ambrose, the primicerius of the notaries, to arrange for a peace. Soothed with gold, the Lombard agreed to a peace of forty years. But in four months all thoughts of peace had left the breast of the ambitious Lombard. He made no secret of his intention of subjecting to his rule Rome and its dependencies; and, to bring matters to a head, calmly demanded an annual tribute of a golden solidus (12s. 6d.) from every inhabitant of Rome. Again Stephen made another effort to preserve the peace. And in the autumn the abbots of the two great monasteries of St. Vincent's, on the Vulturnus, and Monte Cassino were sent to the Lombard king. To their words Aistulf paid not the slightest heed but sent them off to their monasteries, forbidding them to return to the Pope.

Whilst, on the news of this rebuff, the Pope, according to his wont, was engaged in recommending his cause "and that of the people committed to him " to God, there arrived in Rome from Constantinople, John, the Silentiary, with, not an army, but imperial rescripts for the Pope and Aistulf, demanding from the latter the restoration of the exarchate. Stephen at once dispatched John, along with the deacon Paul, "to the said most wicked king" at Ravenna. But John was sent off by the cunning Aistulf, with words and a companion, in the shape of an envoy from himself to the emperor. The

Pope took good care to send ambassadors of his own also to Constantinople along with John; and through them he begged the emperor to send an army for the defence of Rome, and the liberation of the rest of Italy, from "the jaws of the son of iniquity", as he had "so often asked him to do in writing".

In describing the sequel of events at this epoch, we cannot do better than continue to keep as close as possible to the very words of the *Book of the Popes.* Meanwhile Aistulf continued his preparations, and his threats. He would put every Roman to the sword if they did not submit to his rule. But Stephen called the people together; and exhorted them to implore God's pardon for their sins, assuring them that He would yet free them from the hands of their foes. Accordingly a great procession was formed to go to the Church of St. Mary Major. Litanies were chanted and images of Our Lady and Our Lord carried by the priests. The Pope himself, walking with bare feet, bore on his shoulders a famous picture of Our Lord, thought to have been miraculously painted while, fastened to the "adorable cross" was also borne along the "treaty" which Aistulf had violated. With ashes on their heads, most fervently did the people beg help from God. The Pope improved the occasion by doing all he could to advance both clergy and people in virtue. The former he collected in his palace at the Lateran, and exhorted to devote themselves to the study of the Scriptures and sacred learning with the greatest earnestness; and he was indefatigable in preaching to the people to keep from evil and lead holy lives. And for the safety of the country and of all Christians, he ordered the litany to be said every Saturday alternately at St. Mary Major's, St. Peter's and St. Paul's. Well may we ask with Mark Antony : "Was this ambition?" ... Ambition should be made of sterner stuff". But Stephen knew that if "we ought to pray as though our affairs were wholly God's, we ought to act as though they solely rested with ourselves". And so, realizing that his efforts for peace, and his treasures, which he had freely scattered "for the flock divinely entrusted to his care and for all the province of Italy", were all thrown away, and "especially because he saw that there was no hope of help from the emperor, then, as his predecessors of blessed memory, the two Gregorys and Zachary, had done to Charles (Martel), he (Stephen) sent secretly, by a pilgrim, letters to Pippin, king of the Franks, unfolding to him the wretched state in which the Roman duchy was, owing to the hostile action of Aistulf, and imploring him to send ambassadors to Rome, who might ensure him (the Pope) safe conduct to their master". It is not often that any of the papal biographers in the *Liber Pontificalis* assign any motives for any action whatsoever which they relate. In this instance, however, it is most positively affirmed that the reasons why Stephen III had recourse to Pippin were that diplomacy had failed to avert the invasion of the duchy, and that no help could be looked for from the East. Historians, then, of today, who set forth other motives for Stephen's action than the two just given, may be set down as rather following conjecture, if not prejudice, than the records of history. And writers who blame the popes for appealing to the king of the Franks must be strangely forgetful that the yoke of foreigners is ever hateful; and foreigners to the Romans of the eighth century were certainly the Lombards, aliens to them in blood, language and customs. And surely they cannot call in question the right of one who is unjustly attacked in his goods, person, or liberty, to call anybody to his assistance.

In answer to Stephen's letter, there came first Abbot Droctegang (Spring 753), and then another messenger from Pippin, to assure the Pope that their master would do all that the Pope wished. By the hands of the abbot the Pope sent off two letters, one of thanks to Pippin, telling him he had given Droctegang a verbal answer to his (Pippin's) communication, and begging him not to fail in the work he had begun. The other was addressed "to all our glorious sons and dukes of the Franks". There was the more reason for this that some of the Prankish leaders were opposed to war. Eginhard assures us that Pippin was much hampered, "because some of the chief men of the Franks, his councilors, had been much opposed to his wishes, and had gone so far as to declare that they would desert the king and return home". "We have full confidence", writes the Pope to them, "that you fear God and love your protector Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles; and that for his interests you will, at our request, with all earnestness, come to our aid. And you may take it as certain that in return for your efforts in behalf of your spiritual mother, his holy Church, your sins will be forgiven you by the Prince of the Apostles, and that for your toil you will receive a hundredfold from God". In conclusion he begs them to support the petition he is addressing by Droctegang to their king.

Meanwhile the Lombards were pushing on, and had just taken possession of a place occupied by the serfs of the Church, when there returned from Constantinople the Silentiary John, and those who had gone with him from the Pope and Aistulf. John brought nothing but another rescript, bidding the Pope go in person to the Lombard king and try and win from him the restoration of the lost provinces. A safe conduct for the Pope and his suite was obtained from Aistulf; and Stephen was on the point of setting out for the North when some new ambassadors arrived in Rome from Pippin. These were Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of this age, and Duke Autchar, who had come to escort the Pope into *France (i.e.*, Frankland), in accordance with his wishes. With these various ambassadors, and a number of the Roman clergy, nobility, and military leaders, the Pope, though out of health, left Rome (October 14, 753), amidst the greatest signs of grief on the part of the people not only of Rome itself, but of the other cities of the duchy. When Stephen drew near to Pavia, he was met by envoys from Aistulf, who bade the Pope on no account to dare to speak to their master in behalf of Ravenna, or of any other conquest made by him or any of his predecessors. Sending word that no threats would make him keep silence on this matter, Stephen entered Pavia; and at once, after presenting the king with numerous presents, begged him to restore "their own to each party". But neither could the Pope nor the Imperial ambassador obtain anything from Aistulf. It required the strongest representations on the part of Pippin's envoys before Aistulf would give the Pope permission to continue his journey towards France. He fretted and fumed, and used every means to prevent the Pope from fulfilling his intention of going to France. He evidently instinctively feared what would be the result to his ambitious schemes. His opposition was vain. As soon as his verbal consent was passed, Stephen, with his clergy, among whom are names that are not here mentioned for the first the archdeacon Theophylact, a candidate for the papacy; the deacon Gemmulus, a correspondent of St. Boniface, etc.), set out (November 15, 753) with the greatest haste. But only did he feel at ease when they had reached those passes of the Alps that were in the hands of the Franks. Stephen made his first considerable halt at the monastery of St. Maurice at

Agaune in Valais, on the Rhone, above Lake Geneva. Here, to escort Stephen to their king, came the Abbot Fulrad and Duke Rothard. And here the poor Pope had need of rest. In the weak state of his health, he tells us himself how the long and arduous journey affected him. The distance, the snow and the cold, the heat, the floods and the rushing rivers, the atrocious mountains, caused his weak frame absolutely to wear away.

When Pippin heard of Stephen's approach, he sent forward his son Charles to meet the Pope; and himself, his wife, and a large number of his nobles advanced some three miles from the royal residence of Ponthion to welcome the Pontiff. As soon as Pippin saw the Pope, he dismounted, prostrated himself to the ground, and for some distance walked by the Pope's side as his groom. Arrived at the palace (January 6, 754), Stephen, with tears in his eyes, implored Pippin to take up the cause of "Blessed Peter and the republic of the Romans". Pippin at once engaged himself on oath, after making a solemn treaty with him to fulfill the Pope's wishes with regard to the exarchate and the republic to the very best of his abilities.

After the interview at Ponthion, the Pope went to the famous monastery of St. Denis to pass the winter; and here he soon afterwards anointed Pippin and his two sons as kings of the Franks (754), and declared them "patricians of the Romans". Furthermore, we have it on the authority of the author of the *Clausula,* already referred to, that he forbade, under pain of excommunication, any to presume for the future to elect as their king one who was not of the blood of Pippin. Thus did a Pope in person confirm what had been already done by the direction of his predecessor. A little later, according to the annals in March, at the earnest prayer of the Pope, Pippin caused to be confirmed at a general assembly of the nobility at Kiersey (or Quiercy), on the Oise, what he had already undertaken to do for Blessed Peter and his successors. We shall hear of the "Kiersey treaty" again.

At present we refrain from any comment on these interesting and important transactions, that the simple narrative of the events themselves may make their due impression on the mind of the reader. It shall merely be added that subsequent testimony of various kinds, which will be noticed in the sequel, make it certain that a deed of gift *(donatio)* of the exarchate, etc., was at this great assembly presented to the Pope by Pippin.

One or two events occurred just at this juncture, and prevented the immediate putting of this resolution into effect. In the first place the Pope fell ill, but at length suddenly recovered. So rapid, however, was the recovery, that it was soon given out that it was not without the miraculous intervention of SS. Peter and Paul, and St. Dionysius (or Denis), as the Pope himself was made to proclaim in a document on the subject, which gratitude was said to have impelled him to put forth. It is interesting to note, in this curious forgery, that the title of "most Christian", which the *Book of the Popes* has now begun to prefix to the name of King Pippin, is here also assigned to the same sovereign.

The next event was the arrival in France of the monk Carloman. Aistulf, finding that Pippin was evidently determined to go to extremities with him, tried to put pressure on him to make him hang back, in a rather unexpected manner. The wily Lombard gave the abbot of Monte Cassino to understand that it would go hard with him and his

monastery if Carloman was not at once sent to his brother to induce him to stay in France. Thither, then, went the unwilling monk; but he was doubtless not much distressed when he found that Pippin was not to be turned aside from his purpose. To avoid complications, the Pope and Pippin decided that Carloman must retire to the monastery of Vienne. Thither the humble monk accordingly went, and there he died in peace in the following year (August 17, 755).

After no less than three embassies, which the wish of the Pope for peace had caused Pippin to send to Aistulf, had failed, even with offers of money, to induce the Lombard king to surrender what he had seized, Pippin at length set his forces in motion. Even at this eleventh hour, nothing would content the peace-loving Pope but that Pippin should send yet another embassy to Aistulf; and Stephen himself wrote to him, begging him by the thought of the Day of Judgment to restore, without causing a loss of Christian life, their rights to the Church and the Republic of the Romans. For sole answer came insolent threats. But Aistulf's arm was not so powerful as his tongue. The Frankish forces moved forward. Commending himself to his prayers Pippin parted from the Pope at Maurienna, in sight of Italy's mountain rampart. The passes of the Alps were triumphantly forced by the Franks, and the month of September or October saw Aistulf besieged in his own capital of Pavia. A few days' fighting and Aistulf's resistance was at an end. Once again, at the suggestion of the Pope, terms of peace were proposed, and this time they were accepted by Aistulf. The Lombard gave hostages to Pippin, and swore to restore Ravenna and the other cities that he had captured.

No sooner had Pippin returned to France, and the Pope to Rome, when the false Lombard was in arms again. To ensure victory he aroused the whole nation; and, as appears from the Pope's letters, contrived meanwhile to throw dust into the eyes of Pippin. But Stephen was not slow to make known the situation to the Frankish king. Two letters were dispatched to him, one after the other (755?), pretty much to the same effect, but sent to let Pippin see that affairs were becoming daily more critical. They were both written at the close of the year 754 or the beginning of 755. Both were addressed to the Pope's "Most excellent sons, Pippin, Charles and Carloman, kings and patricians of the Romans". The Frank is exhorted not to let his reverence and devotion to St. Peter inoperative, but to see that he withdraw not his hand from the plough now that he has begun to help the Church. "From the day on which we separated, Aistulf has endeavored to afflict us, and to reduce the Church of God to such a depth of ignominy that the tongue of man cannot describe it ... Not an inch of land has he returned to St. Peter, the church and the republic of the Romans ... Haste to restore to St. Peter what, under your hand and seal, you promised for the good of your soul ... To you have we committed the care of the cause of Holy Church, and you will have an account to render to God at the last day of how you have striven for that cause, of how you have labored to bring about the restoration of his (St. Peter's) lands and cities ... For you know that the Prince of the Apostles holds your deed of gift as it were handwriting against you". This deed of gift *(donatio),* so frequently mentioned in these two letters, refers, of course, to the gift by Pippin at Kiersey to "Blessed Peter", *i.e.,* of course to his vicar the Pope, of Ravenna and the Pentapolis. They were Pippin's to give by the right of conquest. Unable or unwilling to defend them, the Greeks had left them to fall into the hands of the Lombards. Taken from them by the Frankish king, they were of his free

will given to the Pope. These States are always said in the documents of the time to be "restored", because they were snatched from the hands of plunderers and were "given back", if not to the same men who ruled them before (*viz.*, the Greek emperors), at least to the same people who lived in them before, and to a ruler of their own nationality, a ruler of their own religion, and a ruler of their own choice, whom they loved, and for whom they had taken up arms. The "image-breaking" emperors of Constantinople were nothing to Pippin; but the popes were his benefactors, and to him, as successors of St. Peter, the earthly representatives of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

At length, laying waste everything with fire and sword, and carrying off many of the bodies of the saints from the catacombs, Aistulf encamped before the walls of Rome in the beginning of January, and began the siege with considerable vigor. The attack was met with equal vigor by the besieged, who were animated by the valor of the abbot Werner, one of Pippin's envoys who accompanied the Pope on his return to Rome, and by the Franks who had formed his escort. News of all this was not long in reaching Pippin. But the siege pressed, and Pippin did not appear, so that, about the close of February, the Pope managed to get some letters sent off to Pippin by the abbot Werner and others, who went by sea.

The first of these letters was addressed to Pippin and to all the clergy, nobles and army of the Franks, by the Pope, clergy, nobles, people and army of Rome, all in affliction. It opens by describing the arrival of the different divisions of the Lombard forces in the beginning of January, the different portions of the walls that they severally attacked, and Aistulf's demand on his first approach : "Give up to me your bishop, open the Salarian gate, and I will be merciful to you; otherwise I will overthrow your walls, and put you all to the edge of the sword, and I would like to know who will then snatch you out of my hands". Then follows a narration of their doings, which proves, up to the hilt, that the Lombards were but little less barbarous than they were when they first darkened the soil of Italy; that they were indeed the worst of the hordes that devastated that unhappy country on the break-up of the Roman empire in the West, and that those not subject to their sway might well resist them by every means in their power. And this, too, even if we allow that the picture drawn was as highly colored as possible for the benefit of Pippin.

"Houses and churches they burnt to the ground, images of the saints they broke in pieces or cast into the flames, and the sacred gifts, the body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, they put into certain of their polluted vessels which they called "folles"; and after they had sated themselves with other food, they eat these same sacred gifts; the sacred vestments they applied to their private uses; monks they put to the sword, and nuns they violated and then treated in the same way. All the *domus cultae* of the Church they burnt ... the vines and crops they rooted up… All the serfs of the Church and of all the Romans they killed or led captive. They inflicted greater evils on the Roman province than were ever done to it by pagan nations". Next is set forth the vigor of the attack, the various engines that day and night were directed against the walls, and the taunts flung at them by the Lombards, who cry out to them : "Let the Franks come now and pluck you from our grasp". The letter concludes with an earnest appeal for help, as the Franks hope for help from God.

Another letter, conceived in similar terms, was addressed by the Pope in his own name to Pippin alone. In it Stephen asks for help because to the king of the Franks has he entrusted "God's holy Church and *our* people of the Roman republic to be protected". Still the troops of Pippin did not appear, and still the Lombard assaults continued, and so the Pope, to use the absurdly melodramatic language of certain authors, "took the impious step of writing a letter, as from St. Peter himself"—"ventured on the awful assumption of the person of the apostle", etc., etc. That the Pope should write in the person of St. Peter is not in the least extraordinary, when it is considered, on the one hand, that Pippin had always before his mind that the Pope did occupy the place of St. Peter, for he ever spoke of helping "St. Peter" and giving the exarchate to "St. Peter"; and on the other, that the Pope himself believed, as *most* Christians have at all times believed, that he was the successor of St. Peter; was, as such, the Rock on which the Church of Christ was founded, and consequently had a supreme right to speak in St. Peter's name. Nor is there, in the domain of fact, theleast reason for believing that either Pippin or the Pope regarded this impersonation of St. Peter as anything more than a specially earnest and solemn mode of writing. To such as look at this letter with the eyes neither of Pippin nor the Pope, but with non-Catholic and nineteenth centuryideas, not modified by a few grains of common sense, it may doubtless appear sufficiently awful.

The superscription of the letter is as follows: "Peter, called to apostleship by Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God; ... and, through me, the whole Catholic and of St. Apostolic Roman Church of God ... and Stephen the head of that same Church ... to the most excellent men Pippin, Charles and Carloman, and to all the clergy and people of the Franks".

After this the letter begins : "I, Peter the apostle, have been set by the power of Christ, the son of the living God, to be a light to the whole world ... To this apostolic Roman Church of God, entrusted to me, your hope of future reward is attached. And so I, who have adopted you as sons, call on you to defend this Roman state from the hands of its enemies ... Our Lady also in like manner and all the saints exhort you to have compassion on this city ... Give help to my people of Rome now, that I may be able to help you hereafter at the day of judgment ... Of all peoples, your nation of the Franks has shown itself most well disposed towards me; and so, by the hands of my vicar, I have entrusted to you, to be delivered, from its enemies, the Church, which the Lord has given into my keeping ... If you come quickly to my aid, then, helped by my prayers, you will, after overcoming your enemies in this life, and being happy here, enjoy the gifts of eternal life; but if, as I trust you will not, you delay your assistance, know that you are cut off from eternal life".

Whilst this letter is on its way to the Frankish monarch, for the sake of those who love to read of "war and war's alarms", we would be glad to give a description of this first sustained siege of Rome that we have yet had to chronicle. But few details of it have come down to us. The Pope's letters to Pippin describe the approach of the Lombard forces in three great divisions. The army of Tuscany blockaded the entire west front of the city; that is to say, they were encamped along the length of the Tiber, which runs pretty well north and south through the city, from the gate of St. Peter and that of St. Pancratius (the old Aurelian gate) to that known as the Porta Portuensis. The royal

standard was planted opposite the Salarian; and so the king's division would blockade the north and part of the east of the city; the rest of the east wall and the south of the city, to the gates of St. John and St. Paul, were watched by the army of Beneventum. The command of the waterway to the sea, however, seems to have remained with the besieged, as it was by sea that the Pope's envoys contrived to get to Pippin. It should be noted in passing that the fact that the Lombards never became a naval power in any sense of the term is one of the many proofs of the barbaric condition in which their nation ever remained. Nor had they even such knowledge of engineering as is necessary to subdue walled cities. So that, though the Pope speaks of the various engines and contrivances with which they assaulted the city, it held out month after month. Distinguished in the defence of the city was the abbot Werner, whom the Pope describes as ever on the walls in his cuirass. We can well imagine this bold Teuton warrior-monk and his body of Franks doing yeoman service against the Lombards. It would be doubtless on account of his brave martial spirit that the Pope entrusted to him the conveyance of his first two letters to Pippin, after the siege had lasted some fifty-five days.

The letters of the Pope must have had a prompt effect on Pippin. For as we are told by the *Liber Pontificalis* that the siege of Rome lasted three months, and that Aistulf broke it up to resist Pippin in the north, we may conclude that the Frankish monarch forced the passes of the Alps for a second time about the month of April 756. Whilst Pippin was thus engaged, there again arrived in Rome, with more words, the imperial envoy John, the Silentiary, accompanied by George, the Chief Secretary of State. Scarcely would they believe the Pope when he told them that Pippin was again on his way to free the Roman duchy from the Lombards. They resolved to see for themselves. However, when, along with a papal envoy, they reached Marseilles, they had the mortification to find that what the Pope had told them was only too true. Their one object was then to get at Pippin by themselves, and before the envoy of the Pope could obtain access to him. Accordingly they used all the artifices in their power, and put as much pressure on him as they could, to keep the Pope's ambassador at Marseilles. Finding that he was bent on going forward, George hurried into Italy by himself, and overtook Pippin as he was drawing near to Pavia. Offering him presents from the emperor, and promising him more, the imperial secretary implored Pippin to hand over the exarchate again into his master's hands. In vain Pippin declared stoutly that he would not on any account alienate it from the power of Blessed Peter and the jurisdiction of the Roman Church and the Apostolic See. Then on his oath he added : "It is not to please man that I have so often engaged in battle. It is only for love of Blessed Peter, and to obtain pardon of my sins. No amount of treasure can move me to take back what I have once offered to Blessed Peter".

Pippin then pushed on to Pavia, and began the siege of it at once. In the autumn Aistulf was again at Pippin's feet. This time he did not escape so easily. He had to pay a war indemnity, become tributary to the Frankish king, acknowledging his dependence by an annual payment, and fulfill with regard to the Pope what he had promised in the former treaty; and, as a further punishment for his perfidy, he had to surrender to the Pope the city of Comiaclum (Comacchio) in addition.

As what follows is of considerable importance in connection with the temporal power of the Holy See, we will give it almost "verbatim" in the words of the *Book of the Popes.* "He *(i.e.,* Aistulf, as is clear from the position in which the word—misit *or* emisit—occurs) drew up in writing a donation of all the cities (which he had to surrender) to be kept for ever by Blessed Peter, the Holy Roman Church and the Pontiffs of the Apostolic See, which deed is still preserved in the archives of our Holy Church. To take possession of the said cities, the most Christian king of the Franks sent his counselor, the venerable abbot and priest Fulrad, and himself returned to France. In company with envoys from Aistulf, Fulrad went through the Pentapolis and Emilia, took formal possession of the various cities, and with the keys and hostages from each place, reached Rome. There, on the confession of St. Peter, he deposited the keys of Ravenna and the other cities of the exarchate, along with Aistulf's donation. And to the same apostle and his vicar, and all his successors to be *for ever possessed and ordered* by them, he handed over the following cities : —Ravenna, Ariminum (Rimini), Pisaurum (Pesaro), Conca (La Cattolica?, on the coast below Rimini), Fanum (Fano), Cesenae (Cesena), Senogallia (Sinigaglia), Aesium (Jesi), Forum Pompilii (Forumpopuli), Forum Livii (Forli), with the castle of Sassubium (Castro Caro?), Monteferetri (Montefeltro), Acerragio (not yet identified), Montem Lucati (Monte Luco), Serra (among the mountains that separate Umbria from the March of Ancona), the castle of San Marini (between Rimini and Pesaro), Bobium (not Bobbio in Liguria, but Sarsina, in the Pentapolis), Urbino, Callis (Cagli), Lucioli (Luceoli on the Flaminian Way; the modern Cantiano), Eugubio (Gubbio), Comiaclum (Comacchio), and Civitas Nariensis or Narni, which, though belonging to the duchy of Rome, had been for some years in the possession of the dukes of Spoleto". These cities, with the exception, of course, of Narni, meant practically the exarchate of Ravenna, considered as including the two Pentapolises, *i.e.,* the territory bounded on the north by the Po, on the west by the Panaro and the Apennines, on the south by the Miseo (Musone), and on the east by the Adriatic.

The Pope was now undisputed sovereign not only of the "duchy of Rome", over which he had ruled with rapidly-increasing power from the Iconoclast disturbances in the times of Gregory II, but also of the "exarchate". The authority, which the voluntary action of its inhabitants, in the first days of the" image-breaking" troubles, had given to the Pope in the exarchate, and which supplies us with the reason why all the deeds and histories of this period speak of the "donations" of Pippin and Aistulf as "restitutions", had now, by the valor and generosity of Pippin, and the "indifference of New Rome", developed into full sovereignty. The subsequent course of this history will, it is hoped, afford further evidence of the truth of this proposition—the extent of the Pope's temporal power.

Stephen at once took possession of the exarchate. Sergius, the archbishop of Ravenna, was naturally named the Pope's representative in the exarchate, as the most important and powerful resident in that locality. But the inferior officers, or at least many of them, were sent out from Rome. There cannot, therefore, be any doubt that henceforth the Pope is the real lord of the exarchate.

As, however, some authors have imagined that by bestowing the dignity of "patrician of the Romans" on Pippin and his sons, Pope Stephen thereby limited his own

power in the papal states, it will be to the point here to inquire into what was connoted by that title. According to Gibbon, it was Constantine who "revived the title of *patricians,* but he revived it as a personal, not as an hereditary distinction (as it used to be in the palmy days of old Rome). They yielded only to the transient superiority of the annual consuls. But they enjoyed the preeminence over all the great officers of State, with the most familiar access to the person of the prince. This honorable rank was bestowed on them for life; and as they were usually favorites, and ministers who had grown old in the imperial court, the true etymology of the word was perverted by ignorance and flattery; and the patricians of Constantine were reverenced as the adopted *Fathers* of the emperor and the republic. They, *i.e.,* the patricians, were thus the highest class in the empire; from their ranks came the exarchs and the other higher officers of the State; and the name "patrician" itself was often used to denote some high office for which there was another more distinctive or peculiar name. Thus we often read of the "patricians of Italy, Africa", etc., instead of "exarchs" of Italy, etc. And so it came to be thought that the title of "patrician" implied the duty of protecting and defending those provinces. Hence Pippin spoke of himself as "defender" of the Holy Roman Church; and so was he spoken of by the Pope. Whatever, then, may have been the social position of a patrician, or whatever the power he possessed, it is certain that the emperor, in creating one, neither created a superior nor an independent ruler. Even if the patrician represented the sovereign, he still remained second and subject to the emperor. Any power he exercised in the provinces he administered in his master's name, and it was but delegated power. And when the popes named the Frankish kings "patricians of the Romans", they did not create officials who were to exercise power over the Romans independent of themselves. The patriciate, whatever else it implied, at least argued dependence. In appointing Pippin "patrician of the Romans", Stephen III appointed him to be his defender and helper. It is true that history has often shown that there is danger in calling in "defenders". Powerful protectors often become the lords and masters of those whom they "protect". People with the best of intentions often find it hard to discriminate between the end of protection and the beginning of interference. We need not then be surprised if the Frankish rulers sometimes acted as if they were kings, and not simply patricians of the Romans.

Towards the close of the year 756, the treacherous and cruel Aistulf, whilst meditating how he might most conveniently break his oaths to Pippin, lost his life while hunting. Desiderius, Duke of Istria, forthwith proclaimed himself king, but, to his astonishment, met with a rival in Ratchis. Whether it was that he had grown tired of the cloister, and once more sighed after the bustle of the world, or whether it was that he so far despised Desiderius that he thought that such a man could never be allowed to succeed his brother, sure it is that Ratchis suddenly left his monastery and took up arms to oppose the pretensions of Desiderius. The latter turned to the Pope, and promised, on condition of obtaining his help, "to restore the cities which still remained in the hands of the Lombards *(i.e.,* of course, certain cities in the exarchate), and, moreover, to present the Pope with a large sum of money". Acting on the advice of Fulrad, Stephen sent to Desiderius, his brother, the deacon Paul, one of his counselors Christopher, and the abbot Fulrad himself. Desiderius renewed in writing the previous promises he had made by word of mouth. The Pope, accordingly, heartily embraced his cause, sending a certain "venerable priest Stephen" to Ratchis, to point out to him his duty of returning to

his monastery, and the abbot Fulrad with his Franks to the aid of Desiderius. The result of these measures was that the whole difficulty was settled without bloodshed. Ratchis again withdrew to his monastery, and Desiderius was recognized as king about March 757. Before Stephen died, there had been surrendered to him the cities of Faventia (Faenza), along with the castle (*castellum*, a fortified place) of Tiberiacum (Bagnacavallo), Cavello, and the entire duchy of Ferrara.

Much of all this is confirmed by the last extant letter of the Pope to the king of the Franks. This letter was written in the beginning of the year 757. After thanking Pippin very effusively, Stephen begs him to see that the rest of the cities, etc., of the exarchate be restored to the Church, because it stood to reason and was in accordance with the express declaration of the abbot Fulrad, "who had inspected everything, that the people in their neighborhood could not live in security without the possession of those cities which had always been joined with them under one government".

Then, in language stronger than, *as events go,* we should expect to hear in these days, but which the recollection of the treachery and fearful barbarity of Aistulf caused to flow spontaneously from the Pope's pen, Stephen went on: "That tyrant, follower of the devil, devourer of Christian blood, and destroyer of God's churches, Aistulf, has, by the judgment of God, been struck dead and buried in hell". By his own influence and that of the abbot Fulrad, the Pope continued, Desiderius, "a most mild man", had been declared king, and had undertaken, on oath, "in the presence of Fulrad, to restore to Blessed Peter the remaining cities (of the exarchate), viz., Faventia, Imola and Ferrara, with their territories, as well as Ausimus (Osimo), Ancona, Humanum; and afterwards through Duke Garinodus, and Grimoald, he promised, that Bononia (Bologna), with its territories, should be restored to us; and he promised ever to remain at peace with that same Church of God and *our* people. He (Desiderius) likewise asked us to beg you to promise peace and concord with himself and the whole Lombard nation". Hence the Pope begs Pippin to grant his request in behalf of Desiderius, "if, as he (Desiderius) has promised, he render full justice to the Church, the republic of the Romans and Blessed Peter, and with his nation continue in peace with the Church and *our* people, as is set forth in the treaties which you (Pippin) have confirmed". Meanwhile Pippin is asked to apply quiet pressure, so that Desiderius will not fail to make the required restorations; and, in his negotiations with the Greeks, so to act "that the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith may through you remain inviolate for ever, and that the Holy Church of God may be rendered free and secure from their pestiferous malice, and may recover its property; so that the service of the lamps in the churches may not diminish, and that there may be food in abundance for the poor and the pilgrim".

As we have remarked, Stephen lived to see the "restoration" of some of the cities mentioned in this letter, but not all. Desiderius was too much of a Lombard to be faithful to his word. Stephen's successor had to continue the struggle for the complete restitution of the exarchate.

Like his predecessors, Stephen did not fail, soon after his accession, to remind Constantine that it was his duty to restore the sacred images. His efforts were, however, no more successful than those which had been already made from Rome. Occupied for many years with the rebellion of Artavasdus, plagues, and wars with the Saracens,

Constantine at length found time to make serious efforts to put down image worship. In the same year that he received the Pope's letter in behalf of the sacred images, Constantine caused a number of deliberative assemblies *(silentia)* to be held in the different cities, with the object of deluding the people into embracing his views. And then, after the death of Anastasius, patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor summoned (754) a council to meet in the Hieria Palace near Chalcedon. Though none of the patriarchal Sees were represented in the council, no less than 338 bishops were ready at the bidding of an emperor to pass one decree after another against the worship of images, "sanctioning their private opinions by their private authority". While denouncing "the evil art of painting", the council found it also necessary to denounce those who rob churches "under the presence of destroying images", a method of proceeding by no means unknown to religious reformers who have appeared in England during the last three centuries. The immediate result of this base truckling of the Byzantine bishop to the emperor was a wholesale destruction of beautiful monuments and a general flight from the neighborhood of Constantinople of the monks, who were staunch opponents of the despotic decrees of Constantine. Thus (interfering in the domain of conscience, and decreeing deposition to those of the secular clergy who would not conform to his will, and ordering that recalcitrant monks and laymen should be handed over to the arm of the State) was Constantine occupied when the whole undivided energies of himself and the empire should have been devoted to combating the Saracens and Bulgarians.

St. Boniface

After following the history of St. Boniface through the three successive pontificates, we have now only to speak of the closing year of his life (755). In the beginning of that year he wrote to Pope Stephen to beg him to act towards him (Boniface) as his predecessors had done. For they had helped and encouraged him by the authority of their letters. Any good he may have done for the past thirty-six years (since 719) for the Roman Church he desires to continue; and he promises with all readiness and humility to amend anything that that Church may find wanting in his conduct. In conclusion he begs the Pope not to be annoyed that he has not written to him before, because he has had on his hands the restoration of no less than thirty churches, burnt in one of the inroads of the pagans (Saxons).

Soon after this first letter Boniface dispatched another to the Pope. It appears that Hildebert, Bishop of Cologne, claimed jurisdiction over Utrecht (a place that the saint himself had formerly furnished with a bishop, in succession to St. Willibrord, or Clement, the apostle of the Frisians), and did not wish it to remain "an episcopal See, subject to the apostolic See, with a special mission for the conversion of the Frisians". But St. Boniface gave Hildebert to understand that the regulations of Pope Sergius in the matter must be adhered to, and wrote to Stephen to ask him to confirm his (Boniface's) decision if it seemed good to his Holiness. As Utrecht remained an episcopal See, the Pope must have confirmed the saint's action.

And now, feeling that his end must be drawing nigh—for had he not passed the allotted threescore years and ten?—Boniface, sighing for the martyr's crown, wished to end his missionary labors where he had begun them, *viz.*, in Frisia. For in that country a considerable number of the people were still savage pagans. Accordingly, to provide for his flock, with the consent of Pippin and the clergy and nobility of his diocese, he consecrated his friend, countryman, and fellow-laborer, Lull, as his successor, in accordance with permission previously obtained from Rome, as Otho is careful to add. Then after commending those who had worked so well with him to the care of King Pippin, he took boat for Frisia, and, with a large number of devoted followers, received the crown of martyrdom (June 5, 755) on the plains of Dockum, near the stream of Bordue (Bordau). Thus, laying down his life for the truth he had so long preached, did Boniface gloriously terminate a useful and noble career, a career which elicits, indeed, the praise of God himself—"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace: of him that sheweth forth good, that preacheth salvation!"—but a career which many men think of little account. "The good man dieth, and no one taketh any heed". But it is men such as Boniface that are the truly great. Many unreflectingly bestow the title of Great upon those who have really been their scourges, who have deluged the world in blood, and have but degraded and brutalized our race. The reflecting will, however, see that it is those who have devoted their strength and energy to raising men from the level of the brute creation, and inspiring them with high and noble thoughts, who have the strongest claim on our gratitude, and whose memory we can never hold in honor enough.

Before, however, we take our final leave of Boniface and his letters, which shed so much light on the history of his times, we may be permitted another word or two in connection with this great Englishman. With pardonable patriotism Bishop Healy endeavors to claim him as a countryman. "There is very good reason to believe", he says, "that Boniface, though born in England, was himself of Irish origin". What that reason is we do not know; but there are two passages to be found among his letters which seem to show that he himself acknowledged that he was English not merely by birth but by descent. Asking the English to pray for the conversion of their continental brethren (the Saxons), he writes "Pity those who are wont to say, We are of the same flesh and blood" And, on the other hand, Torthelm, writing to him from England, says : "Who would not exult and rejoice in your good works that *our race (gens nostra)* may believe in Christ, the Omnipotent God?" In the first case Winfrid undoubtedly seems to identify himself with the English to whom he is writing, and with the Saxons about whom he is speaking, and in the second case Torthelm would certainly seem to class Winfrid himself and the English as men of one race with the Saxons.

The other word we would say is this. Winfrid's letters are so full of grave matters in connection with Church or State, that it is exceptional to find in them remarks of a lighter kind. When, however, they are found, they must not be passed by unnoticed, as they are of the first importance in throwing light on his character, and do no little to increase the warmth of our feelings towards him. In writing to Egbert of York, "In place of a kiss", he says, "I have sent you a little wine, and I beg you by the bond of love between us, spend in consequence a happy day with your brethren!"

Stephen, too, did his share in the matter of the preservation of the ancient buildings of Rome. Among his other restorations is mentioned that of the basilica of St. Lawrence, "super S. Clementem" in the third region. This we take to be the third ecclesiastical region, which is thought to have included the third (Isis and Serapis) and the fifth (Esquiline) civil regions; and hence it may be supposed that the particular basilica mentioned is St. Lawrence's "in Formoso", or "in Panisperna" as it is variously called. This basilica was built on the highest point of the Viminal hill, and on the spot where the saint was martyred.

Before Stephen died he had to face trouble from within as well as from without in the matter of his sovereign rights in the exarchate. It would seem that he had named Sergius, the archbishop of Ravenna *(c.* 752-770), his deputy-governor over the exarchate. Sergius, however, had not long tasted power, ere he thought he would like it for himself. He, accordingly, began to rule the exarchate as though he were its independent ruler. Naturally displeased at this, Stephen had him promptly conveyed to Rome—in what year cannot be ascertained—and there he had to remain during the rest of Stephen's life. On this and on other counts he was examined at Rome; and, from a letter of Pope Paul I to Pippin, it is clear that, though that Pope was pushing on Sergius' cause, he had not then (757) been restored to his See. By the year 761, however, Sergius was again in possession of his See, and acting as a true and loyal subject of the Pope. Men easily find imitators of their evil deeds; the disloyalty of Sergius found an imitator in Archbishop Leo (770-777) in the time of Pope Hadrian.

In case the spiteful gossip, Agnellus of Ravenna, may have preserved for us any true details concerning Sergius amidst much that is certainly false, we will give the story of the archbishop of Ravenna as it appears in the pages of the silly abbot of St. Mary's and St. Bartholomew's. Considering that Archbishop Sergius only died some thirty-five years before the birth of Agnellus, it is clear that that worthy could not have taken the slightest pains to find out the truth of what he relates. For he confuses Stephen (II) III with Zachary, and what was done by Stephen III he assigns to Pope Paul, and *vice versa.* He plays equally fast and loose with the Lombard kings, and makes Aistulf change places with Liutprand, and in his three-page biography gives frequent occasion to his learned modern editor (Holder-Egger) to note "this is false", "this fabulous", and "this is very doubtful and fabulous".

A layman and married, Sergius, while still young, was elected to the See of Ravenna, probably by the influence of the Lombard king Aistulf. This, indeed, is not stated by Agnellus, but he tells us later that when Sergius came into collision with Rome, he was relying on the support of the Lombard king. His wife became a deaconess and retired to a convent. Succeeding in satisfying or hoodwinking the Pope in the matter of his election, he was consecrated at Rome. Supported by the papal authority, and helped by his own bland words, he got the better of a schismatical opposition to him on the part of his clergy. According to Agnellus, Sergius lost favor at Rome because he did not go to meet the Pope (Stephen III) on the occasion of his journey to *Francia.* The real cause was doubtless as stated above, and hence, no doubt, he was not brought to Rome till after the cession (756) of Ravenna to Pope Stephen. Hence there can be no difficulty in believing that he failed to obtain the support of Aistulf at such a juncture. And even according to Agnellus he was brought to Rome by his own citizens. The

abbot continues: Arrived in Rome, he was brought before a synod to be deprived of his episcopal rank. And thus was he addressed by the Apostolicus (the Pope): "You are a neophyte; you did not belong to the (clerical) fold, nor had you served in the church of Ravenna, as the canons require. You took possession of the See like a robber, and, driving away those who were worthy of the Church's honors, you obtained possession of the See by secular favor and force". To this Sergius replied : "I obtained the See not by my ambition, but by the unanimous election of the clergy and people. By the canonical questions you put to me yourself, you learnt all about me—that I had a wife, and had been elected while still a layman; and yet you said there was no impediment, and consecrated me yourself". It seems certain, however, that he was consecrated by Pope Zachary. On hearing this defence, opinions were divided, and at length the bishops declared they could not judge a superior. Thereupon the Pope angrily declared that on the following day he would himself tear the pallium from the neck of Sergius. But, says Agnellus, "by the judgment of God" he died during the night. At dawn Paul, the brother of the deceased pontiff, came to Sergius, who had passed the whole night in prayer, and asked the archbishop what he would give him if allowed to return home in peace and with increased honor. The captive at once promised Paul the treasures of the church of Ravenna. Whether this compact became known or not, Sergius, even according to Agnellus, got but a poor welcome on his return to Ravenna when released. Paul, however, was very nearly getting a much rougher one when he came to claim the treasures. Some of the clergy proposed to "suffocate" the Pope, others to throw him down a cistern when he was looking for the treasures. Wiser counsels, however, prevailed; and in order, as one of them put it, that the Pope might depart with honor, their hands be kept unstained, the word of their pastor preserved, and yet their treasure for the most part maintained intact, it was resolved to hide as much of it as they could without the knowledge of the archbishop. Paul, however, arrived on the scene in time to get a considerable quantity of gold and precious vessels. Moreover, evidently becoming acquainted with the designs against his life, he managed to bring it about that the conspirators were sent to Rome, among them being the grandfather of Agnellus himself. They were there imprisoned for life. Though most of this narrative of Agnellus is unworthy of the slightest credence, there may lurk some grain of truth beneath it all. At any rate, it is not without its value as a specimen of the style of the worthy abbot of Ravenna, and as showing his weight as an historian. His imagination is quite suggestive of that of Matthew of Paris.

In the midst of his struggles against enemies from Stephen, within and without, Stephen fell ill. Tenderly was he nursed by his brother and successor Paul and by his friends. But to no purpose. Death found him out; and he was buried with great pomp in St. Peter's, April 26, 757. "His", writes Dr. Hodgkin, "is certainly one of the great epoch-making names in the list of bishops of Rome. As Leo the First had turned aside the terrible Hun, and had triumphed over the Eastern theologians, as Gregory the Great had consolidated his spiritual dominion over Western Europe, and rescued for it a great province from heathendom, so Stephen II won for himself and his successors the sovereignty over some of the fairest regions of Italy, gave a deadly blow to the hereditary Lombard enemy, and in fact, if not in name, began that long line of Pope-kings which ended in our own day in the person of the ninth Pius".

The one-line epitaph of Peter Mallius,

Subjacet hic Stephanus Romanus Papa Secundus,

is thought to be only the first line of a fuller production.

ST. PAUL I

A.D. 757-767

EMPEROR.

CONSTANTINE (V) COPRONYMUS, 741-775.

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

DESIDERIUS, 756-774.

KING OF THE FRANKS.

PIPPIN THE SHORT,752-768.

To write the history of Paul I is far from an easy task. The letters in the Codex are practically all undated. The answers to them are not forthcoming. And as it is from the Caroline Code that most of the details of the life of Paul have to be gathered, it will be readily understood that the view of the character of this Pope presented by an historian may largely depend on the chronological order in which he decides to arrange Paul's letters. And each succeeding editor of them has arranged them differently! The order adopted by Cenni, the most widely known editor of the Caroline Codex, is often considerably different from that given by Jaffé and Gundlach.

Another reason that makes the biography of Paul hard to deal with is that we have to treat rather of the fleeting shadows of great events than of actual transactions; the events of his life were, so to speak, more negative than positive. His reign was more distinguished by what might have happened than by what really did take place; *i.e.*, by unceasing diplomatic effort, Paul prevented the Lombards on the one hand, and the Greeks on the other, from effecting anything of any moment against the newly-acquired increased temporal power of the sovereign pontiff; he caused great events never to get beyond the eve of happening.

The exertions of Paul in the matter of the states of the Church have furnished an occasion to certain historians to sneer at him, as though he had no thought nor time for anything else but to look after temporal affairs. No doubt, to the reader who judges of things as they look at first sight, these sneers may seem to be justified by what they may read in this very biography. But one must ever remember, in the words of the homely proverb, that "the coat must always be cut in accordance with the cloth". And in the life of Paul, the historian has nothing else to write about except his endeavors in behalf of the temporalities of his See, because chance has preserved the record of his doings in

that direction, while the documents that would have enlightened us as to his other deeds have perished.

Besides, it is only natural to suppose that the establishment in the exarchate of a new authority, such as the papal, would cause a great deal of trouble in any case, even if there was peace without. And, after all, thirty-one letters on one subject in the course of ten years is not much, even if they were wholly occupied with the one subject, which they are not.

It may be useful at the outset to give a short sketch of the principal occurrences of Paul's pontificate, which may serve as a guide through the details. The interests of Desiderius and Constantine V would naturally lead them to work to increase their power in Italy. Accordingly, throughout the whole of his reign, Paul had to face attacks or threatened attacks on his temporal authority either from the Lombards, Greeks, or both. Paul's correspondence proves that to keep their independence for his people was just as much as he was able to effect. For, as may be well imagined, it took no little exhortation and asking to induce Pippin to take sufficient interest in the welfare of a distant people, when there were no immediate and tangible advantages to be gained for himself by his exertions. The more so that he had his own difficulties in Bavaria, and especially in Aquitaine. It was only the untiring watchfulness of Paul, and his ceaseless efforts in sustaining the goodwill of Pippin, that saved Rome from the truly 'unspeakable' misfortune of falling into the hands of the Greeks or Lombards. It was the latter of these two powers that gave the most trouble at the beginning of Paul's reign. Then, from fear of Pippin, Desiderius toned down in his dreams of aggrandizement, and we shall find the Pope writing to Pippin to direct Desiderius to protect him (the Pope) against the Greeks. The trouble with Desiderius was not smoothed over before the difficulties with the Greeks began. In a word, the political situation in the time of Paul I may be thus summarized. On the one hand, on the defensive, was the Pope relying on Pippin; and, on the other, on the offensive, were the Lombards and the Empire. Desiderius was striving for territory; Constantine for both territory and heresy (Iconoclasm). Whether from mutual jealousy or mistrust, or because the Bulgarians and Saracens gave the Greeks enough to fully occupy their thoughts, there was not any practical cooperation between the Lombards and the Greeks. But so irate were the latter against the Pope for his opposition to them, that they affected to consider him as a tool in the hands of the primicerius Christopher, whom we shall see playing a very important part, at least under Stephen IV.

Stephen III was still lying ill in the Lateran Palace, when certain eager partisans began to make preparations for the election of their own candidate. A number of them, to be ready, gathered together in the house of the archdeacon Theophylactus. But a still larger number both of the magistracy (*judices*) and the people made known their adhesion to Paul. However, as the papal biographer observes, Paul himself did not move in the matter, but continued his devoted attention to his dying brother. After the death of Stephen, the party in favor of Paul, which was much the stronger, elected him as Pope (April 757), and the opposition broke up.

On this election the reflections of Dr. Hodgkin may well be quoted. "We have already, in the case of Silverius, seen the son of a pope chosen for the papacy, though

not in immediate succession to his father. Now brother follows close upon brother as wearer of the Roman mitre, almost the only instance of the kind that has occurred in the long annals of the papacy [Benedict VIII and John XIX—1012-1033—were brothers]. The choice in this instance seems to have been a good one, but it might have been a dangerous precedent. Considering the immense power which the popes have wielded, it must be considered on the whole an evidence of statesmanship and courage on the part of the electors that mere family claims have so seldom determined the succession to the papal throne".

To the candidate thus elected a most charming character is given by the contemporary author in the Book of the Popes. Paul is there described as a man of exceptional kindness and mercy. The testimony of 'many' is adduced to prove that during the night he was in the habit of going about among the abodes of the poor and the sick and administering to them every comfort both for soul and body. Still under the cover of night, that his right hand might not know what his left was doing, he visited the various prisons, and oft set free those who were under sentence of death; and, by himself paying their debts, he redeemed the poor debtors "from the yoke of slavery". Widows, orphans, all who were in need of help, found in him a strong and willing support. He was careful to prevent, as far as he could, oppression on the part of his subordinates; and never did he render evil for evil. There is, however, reason to believe that Paul was not always too firm in checking at once acts of oppression perpetrated by his subordinates. "If for a short time", writes his biographer, "any were oppressed by his wicked satellites, it was not long before the Pope in his compassion administered the balm of comfort to the injured". It is easy to see that this weakness of the Pope must have earned him a certain amount of unpopularity. No doubt he would never hear of many who had been wronged, and many who have once been maltreated are not soothed by subsequent kindness.

John, the Neapolitan deacon, has preserved for us a pleasing little anecdote of Pope Paul, during the time when he was a deacon. A Neapolitan deacon, of the same name as the Pope, who was in the habit of often coming to Rome on public business, formed a close friendship with the Roman deacon. On one occasion when they were enjoying a chat, the Neapolitan said, "God grant I may live to see you Pope". "May I see you Bishop of Naples", was the prompt rejoinder. And so it fell out. But, adds John, owing "to the detestable image controversy which was at that time going on between the apostolic authority and the abominable madness of Constantine Caballinus, nine months passed, and still the Neapolitan Paul could not be consecrated. For the Neapolitan people favored the power of the Greeks". Thereupon the bishop elect betook himself secretly to his friend, who was now Pope. He was at once consecrated by his old friend and sent back to Naples. "But, on account of the Greek connection, his fellow-citizens would not receive him", although they recognized him as their lawful bishop and allowed him to administer the revenue of his See. They relegated him to the Church of St. Januarius, which was not far from the city. This extraordinary state of things lasted nearly two years. At length, however, the chief men of the city, perceiving that the people were yearning for their bishop, with one accord installed him in his episcopal palace within the city. He died 766 or 767.

Paul's first act, as "deacon and in the name of God elect of the holy Apostolic See", was to address a letter to Pippin, "king of the Franks and patrician of the Romans", in which he informed that monarch of the death of his brother and his own election by "the whole body of the people". With "the approval of our nobility, we have decided to retain your envoy Immo, the letter went on, until after our consecration. Then, with our own messengers, he shall return to you .... our helper and defender. Meanwhile know that we are true to that fidelity, love and treaty which our brother offered to and made with you, and, with people, we will ever remain in the same alliance".

After his consecration, which took place on May 29, 757, inasmuch as he was "a stout defender of the orthodox faith", Paul commenced sending a series of envoys and letters to the emperor, exhorting him in strong terms to restore the sacred images. But apparently all without any other effect than to increase the bitterness of Constantine against the worshippers of images generally—the Pope included. With the exception of a list of his labors in the way of church restoration, this is practically the last fact of Paul's life that his biographer has recorded of him. We must therefore turn to other sources. Before entering on his relations with Pippin, as made known to us by the Codex Carolinus, a word or two on Paul's building operations may not be unacceptable.

Finding that from age, and the vandalism of Goth and Lombard, the catacombs were, many of them, falling into decay, Paul with great ceremony conveyed thence to the city, from the more ruinous among them, the bodies of the saints, and placed them in the various churches. Among the other catacombs to which Paul turned his attention was the catacomb of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, or of Domitilla, as it was sometimes called, on the Via Ardeatina, about a mile from the Appian Gate (now Porta S. Sebastiano). From this catacomb, in accordance with the wishes of his deceased brother, and along with the clergy and people of Rome, he transported (probably October 8, 757) the body of St. Petronilla, believed to have been the daughter of St. Peter, to the mausoleum of Honorius on the Vatican hill, near St. Peter's. This circular structure had already been made into a chapel by Stephen III in preparation for the reception of the saint's body. The honor of this foundation was assigned by the Pope to Pippin. It came to be known as the "chapel of the kings of France".

In the fourteenth century there was still in existence a church which Paul built or rebuilt in honor of the apostles SS. Peter and Paul (760), "by the Via Sacra, near the temple of Rome (or Romulus)". There were there seen, by the author of Paul's life the impressions said to have been made by St. Peter's knees on the stones where he knelt in prayer asking God to humble the diabolical efforts which Simon Magus was making to fly and thus to seduce the people. These identical stones are now preserved in the neighboring Church of Sta. Francesca Romana (Sta. Maria Nuova).

As a last example of Paul's work in this direction, we will mention the fact that he built an oratory in St. Peter's in honor of Our Lady, and there placed a silver statue of the Blessed Virgin, and made himself a sepulcher. In imitation of St. Gregory I, and other popes, he turned his paternal mansion into a monastery in honor of popes Stephen I (Martyr) and Silvester; and entirely rebuilt, decorated and endowed the old church that stood by it. This church, now known as San Silvestro in Capite, is doubly interesting to

us, as it was in it that St. Gregory I preached many of his homilies, and as it was given by the present Pope (Leo XIII) to the English Catholics. Into the renovated church the Book of the Popes tells us that Paul brought the remains of St. Silvester; and an inscription, still to be read at the end of the nave, near the Sanctuary, on the right hand side, after setting forth that fact, adds that Clement VIII in his turn, some eight centuries later, renewed the church, and, finding the body of the saint under the high altar, there left it. In his new monastery Paul placed a number of Greek monks, doubtless some of those whom the violence of the Iconoclast Constantine had driven into exile.

In the first year of his reign, Paul had occasion to write to Eadbert, King of Northumberland. Though the brother of Egbert, Archbishop of York, Eadbert did not hesitate to give an early example of a style of conduct that has found imitators in those who have since ruled in this country. He rewarded his courtiers with property that was not his to give—with monasteries. The result was that an abbot Forthred appealed to Rome with regard to three of such monasteries. Paul wrote to the king, and exhorted him as an obedient son and out of love for St. Peter to restore the monasteries to their owner, the abbot Forthred. From the fact that Eadbert resigned his crown in this same year to end his days in the cloister, we may fairly conclude that the Pope's letter was successful in its object.

Here it may be observed that it would be a great mistake to judge of a pope's relations with a country from such few facts with which the actual name of an individual pope is connected as have escaped the ravages of time. So with regard to our own country, though the loss of the papal registers has prevented us from getting to know much of the personal relations of the different popes of this century with England, we have records enough to let US see that they must have been very numerous. For in the eighth century there was a perfect *furore* in England for Rome and its bishops. Of this enthusiasm for Rome, St. Boniface was not, as some imagine, the cause; he was only an instance. The See of Rome was to our eighth century countrymen "the glorious See". In Rome they established a special quarter, called after their own language the (burgh). There, they declared, they found "the rest of life" they had long sought. Thither they went for the forgiveness of their sins. There our archbishops met the great churchmen of other lands and formed friendships with them. Thither there journeyed on pilgrimage—kings and "noble and simple, men and women, soldiers and private persons, moved by the instinct of divine love". Those who could not go yearned to go. So many, indeed, went that, as might have been expected, not a few scandals arose in consequence. Many of those who in this century set out for Rome were women—those who had been consecrated to God (nuns) and those who had not. And, of course, many of them had not properly calculated the difficulties of the journey—its length, its dangers, and its expense. Beautiful, but in want of money and protection, many of them fell a prey to the passions of the foreigner. Hence St. Boniface, whilst begging the ecclesiastical authorities in England to discourage women from going on the Roman pilgrimage, declared that there was scarce a city in Lombardy, Frankland (Francia), or Gaul, where there were not Englishwomen leading a notoriously bad life. But this ugly fact tells the story of the love of the English in the eighth century for Rome and the popes even more eloquently than the others which edify. So phenomenal was this devotion of our race to the Apostolic See, that in speaking of the English, a Frankish

monk of this age could find no more suitable description of them than to call them the people "who were ever on the most friendly terms with the Apostolic See". No wonder, then, that an archbishop of Canterbury declared that with those sacred doctrines with which the Roman and Apostolic See was in accord, all his countrymen were in full harmony.

Turning our attention now to the Caroline Codex, we find that, in reply to the letter which the Pope sent him, Pippin returned (757) a kind letter, asking Paul to stand godfather to his daughter Gisela. The white garment given to the little princess when baptized was sent to the Pope. In acknowledging (757 or 758) the receipt of this mark of Pippin's goodwill, Paul did not fail to point out that the Lombards had not manifested any intention of completing the restoration of territory which they had promised. For Pippin had requested the Pope to keep him informed as to the course of events. This letter Paul followed up (757 or 758) with another to the whole nation of the Franks, in which he thanked them for what they had done for the Church, and hoped that in return God would render them victorious over all their enemies, to the great gain of the faith and the Church.

Very likely at the same time when he acknowledged the receipt of Paul's letter, in which the Pope had notified his election to him, and at the same time asked him to be godfather to his little daughter (who was born in 757), Pippin, knowing their unsteadiness of character, addressed a letter to the Roman people, in which he exhorted them to be loyal to the Pope. To this the "whole senate—i.e., the nobility—and people of Rome returned an answer". After thanking God for giving them in the Frankish monarch such a "defender of His holy Church"; and declaring that in accordance with Pippin's letters they will ever remain faithful to Blessed Peter, and to "our lord Paul, the chief bishop and universal Pope, because he is our father and good shepherd, and never ceases toiling for our welfare, like his brother, Stephen of blessed memory", they beg Pippin, "their defender after God", to continue to exert himself for the exaltation of the faith and their protection. And "by the living God, Who caused you, by the hands of His blessed apostle Peter, to be anointed king, we entreat you to order the completion of the enlargement of this province". That is, they requested Pippin to see that the whole of the exarchate was surrendered by the Lombards. "The Romans, evidently recognized Paul as their ruler, and the king as his defender".

A last letter of this year (757)—if, indeed, it does not belong to a later date—of the Pope to the Frankish king, in reply to two received from him, is especially interesting, as it is generally credited with containing the notice of the first appointment, at the intercession of a prince, to what was afterwards known as a cardinalate, *viz.*, to the possession of one of the titular churches of Rome. And so we find Paul granting to the priest Marinus the title of St. Chrysogonus, "with all the lands and property belonging to it, whether in town or country". Along with this letter, the Pope sent Pippin, in addition to a 'night-clock' and an antiphonary, the dialectics of Aristotle, the works of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, and various other works by different Greek authors.

On the death of Aistulf, and during the disputed succession to the Lombard crown, the dukes of Spoleto and of Beneventum, who had been always striving for

independence, placed themselves under the suzerainty of Pippin. They were rightly convinced that the further away their overlord was, the greater would be their practical independence. Gregorovius, indeed, states that "Stephen had incited them to revolt against their lawful sovereign". But for this he adduces no proof. The letter he cites in connection with his assertion affirms the fact that the dukes did place themselves "under the power" of Pippin, but it is quite silent as to any share the Pope had in their act.

Taking advantage, probably, of Pippin being at war with the Saxons, Desiderius resolved to bring back the dukes to his own obedience. On his way south he laid waste the Pentapolis, and was soon master of Spoleto and Beneventum. Alboin of Spoleto and his chief nobles, "who had taken oaths of fidelity to St. Peter and to you", were taken prisoners. But Liutprand, the Duke of Beneventum, managed to escape to the ends of his kingdom, and established himself in Otranto on the Ionian Sea. Infuriated at the escape of Liutprand, Desiderius nominated a new duke of Beneventum (Arichis), and entered into communications with the Imperial envoy, George, who was then at Naples, and endeavored to form a treaty with the emperor. He proposed that Ravenna should be attacked by the combined Greek and Lombard forces, and that, on its capture, the emperor was to be free to work his will in every particular. With the aid of the emperor's Sicilian squadron, Otranto was also to be besieged by the allied forces. Provided that Liutprand was given up to Desiderius, the emperor might have the city. When he had started this plan, the would-be wily Lombard king made a peaceful visit to the Pope to see if he could over-reach him. Before Desiderius could well openly break with Pippin, it was most desirable that he should get back the Lombard hostages still in the hands of the Frankish monarch. Accordingly he promised Paul that, if the hostages were sent back to him, he would restore Imola, the ancient Forum Cornelii, and the other places still in his hands. But the Pope was not to be deceived in that matter. However, to blind Desiderius, he dispatched a letter to Pippin (758), by Bishop George and the priest Stephen, afterwards Stephen (III) IV, in which he asked him (Pippin) to restore the hostages and keep at peace with the Lombards. However, Paul furnished his envoys with another letter, in which he unfolded to Pippin the ravages of Desiderius, as well as his perjury in not fulfilling his engagements. The Frank is warned not to attach any importance to the first letter, which was simply written that the Pope's messengers might have something to show that would save them from being detained by the Lombards. In conclusion, Paul begs Pippin to see to it that Desiderius completes the promised restitution, and sends him, as a present, a jeweled sword, a ring and cloak, and rings for his sons Charles and Carloman.

The result of the Pope's appeal was an important embassy from Pippin to the Lombard king, consisting of Remedius (or Remigius), brother of Pippin and Archbishop of Rouen, and Duke Auchar. They met Desiderius in the month of March (760 or 759), and he promised, before the end of the following month, "to restore to the Pope all the rightful claims of Blessed Peter, to wit, all the patrimonies, rights, localities, and territories of the different cities belonging to the republic of the Romans". This promise Desiderius kept in part. But giving up territory was to the Lombard like giving up his heart's blood, and his promise was not wholly fulfilled. However, soon after this, more cordial relations began to spring up between Desiderius and the Pope. For, as we shall

see presently, Paul had no difficulty in asking Pippin to request the Lombards to aid him against the Greeks. But that time had not yet come.

Pippin about this time became involved in a war with Duke Waifar, or Waiffer, of Aquitaine. It may have been knowledge of that which emboldened Desiderius still to withhold the restitution he had so solemnly promised, and which induced the emperor to begin to turn his attention to the affairs of Italy. It would seem that he made no attempt to join in the alliance already proposed by the Lombard king to the imperial envoy at Naples. Why, we do not know. Perhaps on account of his difficulties with the Bulgarians. With them he was at war, generally successfully, from 753-775. Though he had sustained a severe defeat at their hands in the Balkans (759), he so far recovered from its effects that he became free (761) to turn his attention to the image question. He at once began a fierce persecution of the image worshippers; and, about the same time, commenced to interest himself in Western affairs. He intrigued in Rome, and gained over to his views, as we have seen, the priest Marinus. He made lavish promises to the Frank. He seems also to have intended to accompany his words with a display of force. At any rate, it appears to have been about this time that the Pope wrote to Pippin to tell him that "most trustworthy subjects of your spiritual mother, our Holy Church, have sent us word that six patricians, with three hundred ships, and the Sicilian fleet have left Constantinople and are sailing for Rome. With what object this is being done, we know not. All we do know is that they are to call here first and then proceed to your Excellency in Frankland (Francia)". Paul had good reason to fear the diplomatic wiles of the Greeks. Just before his death, Stephen (II) III had had to warn Pippin against them. Constantine's envoy, the Silentiary John, was at the Frankish court, and Constantine's presents were interesting all the Franks. The Silentiary John was succeeded by the imperial missus, George, whom we find in Francia, in Naples, and in communication with Desiderius. Paul had to repeat to Pippin the exhortation of Stephen against "the impious arguments and empty promises" of the "enemies of the orthodox faith".

If, however, at this time the Greeks came not, Desiderius did. Not only did he not keep his promises, made in presence of the envoys of the Pope and of Pippin, with regard to coming to terms on the basis of a mutual concession of claims, but he renewed his depredations in the papal territories and dispatched threatening letters to Paul himself. The ravages the Pope complained of were committed in the neighborhood of "our city of" Sinigaglia, and in the Campagna. Paul accordingly begged Pippin for help, and asked him to send envoys both to Rome and Pavia. Desiderius also sent to Pippin and calmly denied having committed any acts of violence at all. The Frankish monarch accordingly confined himself to promising aid when it was required and to sending *missi*. These envoys soon found out the truth.

Still help came not, only firm assurances from Pippin that he would stand by the promises he had made to Pope Stephen (II) III to do all he could "for the defence of the Holy Church of God, the Roman people, and the whole province". Paul therefore reminded him that now was the day and now the hour when he should bring speedy help to the Church and "this province by you set free". In his euphuistic style he wrote: "Accordingly I beg and beseech you, my most excellent son and spiritual fellow-father, and, by Almighty God and the body of Blessed Peter, whose most faithful servant you

are, I entreat you, nay, with the most earnest supplications implore you, to keep that carefully stored up in your holy, God-inspired and mellifluous heart, which the most blessed lord Pope Stephen, of holy memory, my brother, by divine inspiration, admonished and besought you to accomplish".

But at this juncture Pippin could only help the Pope, by promises and by diplomacy. He was in the midst of his struggle with Waifar of Aquitaine, and his cause had been rendered well-nigh desperate by the sudden desertion (763) of the young Duke of Bavaria, Tassilo (III) II (748-788). In the light of subsequent events, *viz*., the duke's marriage soon after this date with Liutperga, the daughter of Desiderius, and his long alliance with his father-in-law against the Frankish monarchs, there is considerable likelihood in the supposition that this defection was brought about by the machinations of Desiderius himself. The consternation of the Pope can be easily imagined. It manifested itself in a letter which he wrote to Pippin, begging him to let him know how the war was progressing, as a long time had elapsed since he had heard from him, and the enemies of both of them were spreading alarming rumors. The combinations of Desiderius, however, were destined not to succeed. The Greek emperor, either because he mistrusted him, or because, with the Bulgarian war and the persecution of the image-worshippers, he had more than enough on his hands, had up to this shown no disposition to cooperate with the grasping Lombard. And when, to the Pope's great joy, Pippin extricated himself for the time from the Aquitaine campaign, Tassilo lost courage and repeatedly begged the Pope to intercede for him with his outraged sovereign. To this request Paul acquiesced, and dispatched two envoys, the priest Philip and his chamberlain Ursus, to negotiate a reconciliation between Pippin and the Bavarian duke. That they should be reconciled, however, did not coincide with the schemes of Desiderius. He detained the Pope's envoys and would not allow them to proceed beyond Pavia. Of this highhanded conduct, Paul duly informed Pippin. But with Waifar still unsubdued, the king of the Franks did not feel prepared just then to take warlike action against the Lombard. Although the day did come when the Franks exacted retribution from both Desiderius and Tassilo, Pippin confined himself for the present to diplomatic measures.

His envoys and those of the Pope were in communication not only with Desiderius but with Constantine. Paul informs Pippin that owing to the severity of the winter—numerous Frankish chroniclers tell of the hard winter of 763-4—he has no word to give him in connection with their ambassadors at Constantinople. These different embassies were not all undertaken to no purpose. Some kind of an understanding, more or less amicable, must have been arrived at about this time between Desiderius and the Pope. For when at Rome fear of Greek interference became acute, we shall see Paul begging Pippin to bid the Lombards help him if any attempt were made from Constantinople on Italy. And so when at last there arrived in Rome a messenger from some of the Pope's officials in Ravenna, "who were wont to supply him with reliable intelligence", to report that "the most unspeakable Greeks, enemies of God's Holy Church and foes of the orthodox faith, were forming plans for a descent upon Rome and Ravenna", Paul in three letters begged Pippin to induce the Lombards, their dukes as well as their king, to hold themselves in readiness to help him against any hostile movement of the Greeks, and to send him a missus who might take up his

residence in Rome and so be ever ready to summon aid. “For as your Excellency knows right well, it is for no other reason that we are annoyed by the Greeks than because we hold to the holy and orthodox faith and the tradition of the fathers, which they are eager to destroy”. On this occasion there seems to have been general alarm all along the coast of the Adriatic. The Venetians, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the maritime cities of the Pentapolis, all were in anxious expectation.

Frankish envoys were accordingly dispatched to Italy. As usual at this time, the embassy was composed of both clerics and laymen. It consisted of two abbots, Widmar of St. Riquier and Gerbert, and a *vir illustris*, Hugbald. They had to assure the Pope that their master would exert himself for the exaltation of the Church and the orthodox faith, and would stand by the promises he had made to Pope Stephen. They had also to try and adjust matters between the Lombards and the Pope, and to be a comfort to the Pope.

The *missi* had no difficulty in arranging the preliminaries of peace. In presence of the Pope they met the envoys of the Lombards, and from the Pentapolis and “the rest of our cities”, and a mutual restoration of plunder was agreed upon. No territory was, however, restored by the Lombards; hence, in relating these transactions to Pippin, Paul urged him to insist on the full restitution of both territories and patrimonies “in accordance with the terms of the treaty”. For, as he very sensibly pointed out, if the Lombards were not made to give up everything to which they had no right, they would soon strive to recover what they had already (760) surrendered.

Free to try and adjust the differences between the Pope and Desiderius were the Frankish envoys. They had not to trouble themselves about armaments from the East. Constantine had enough to do at home. A terrible storm in the Euxine wrecked the whole of a transport fleet destined for the Bulgarian war. The greater part of 3000 ships and their crews were lost (766). He had also to deal in the same year with a real or pretended conspiracy, one result of which was the cruel torture and execution of the patriarch of Constantinople (Constantine), whose Iconoclastic beliefs were thought by the emperor to be on the wane. Copronymus had no other alternative but to fall back upon diplomacy. He accordingly sent envoys to Pippin, in the hope of winning him over to his Iconoclastic views. If he could make Pippin a heretic, the cause of the Pope was lost.

The imperial envoys, Authi, a Spatharius, or one of the emperor’s personal bodyguard, and Sinesius, a eunuch, were bearers of both letters and verbal instructions for Pippin.

They were, if possible, to shake his orthodoxy, his devotion to the Holy See, or both. To gain time, or to conceal their master’s real views, they were to pretend that the Western envoys, notably Christopher, the papal primicerius and *consiliarius*, had not made their reports to the emperor in accordance with the instructions they had received. But Pippin was not to be easily gained over to either the political or religious ideas of Constantine. He was convinced that it was politically advantageous for him to side with the Pope against the Greek and the Lombard, and he was steadfast in his adherence to the Catholic faith. For the Pope had taken care to keep him informed of the belief of the Catholic world on the image question. About this time the patriarchs of Jerusalem (Theodore), Antioch (Theodore), and Alexandria (Cosmas) anathematized Cosmas,

Bishop of Epiphania in Syria, because he had gone over to the emperor's heresy; and Theodore of Jerusalem, in a synodal letter to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, undertook the defence of images; and they, after signing it, sent it to Rome (to Pope Paul) as their confession of faith in this matter. A letter of this Cosmas of Alexandria to the Pope was by him duly forwarded to Pippin, "that you may learn what is addressed to us concerning the integrity of the faith by the Oriental prelates and the rest of the nations". The synodal letter just alluded to, which was also signed by "very many Oriental metropolitans", reached Rome after Paul's death, but was forwarded to Pippin by the antipope Constantine. Pippin, then, had no difficulty in knowing what was the faith of the Catholic world on the image question. With regard to the political situation, he once again assured the Pope that no specious arguments or promises would ever induce him to be false to the engagements he had entered into with Pope Stephen. He further informed the Pope that he had sent Authi, along with *missi* of his own, back to Constantinople, but was detaining Sinesius till an assembly of his bishops and nobles might be held, to discuss the religious questions raised.

In the early part of the year 767 there was held at the royal villa of Gentilly, near Paris, where Pippin spent a 767. great deal of his time, a synod of Frankish bishops. It is the general belief that this was the gathering which Pippin informed the Pope that he intended to bring together. All we know of this diet is, that there were discussed at it the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and sacred images. With regard to the former subject, there can be little doubt that it was "the Procession of the Holy Ghost" which was discussed. It may be that the Greeks brought up this abstruse question to cover the little they had to say on such a clear point of Catholic doctrine as the image question. Whether any good resulted from this great synod is not known. Paul himself does not speak of it. He died (in June) not many months after it was held.

As far as the chronological uncertainty attending the order of Paul's letter will enable us to speak, it seems that tension between the Lombards and the Pope continued to decrease with his declining years. And so, in a letter which may belong to the close of the last complete year (766) of Paul's reign, and which has just been quoted, we find Paul writing: "Your Excellency made known to us that you had directed Desiderius to restore to us our runaway slave Saxulus. But your Excellency should know, nay, we believe does know, that last autumn Desiderius himself came *ad apostolorum limina* to pray, and brought the slave with him and handed him over to us. Moreover, after a discussion with him on the question of settlement of claims, it was agreed that *missi* of both of us should go through the different cities and there arrange all differences. By the mercy of God things have been settled in the Beneventum and the Tuscan territories. In the duchy of Spoleto some matters are settled, and every effort is being made to bring the rest to a conclusion, in a postscript your Excellency informed us that you had instructed Desiderius to bring pressure upon the people of Naples and Gaeta to restore to your protector, Blessed Peter, the Neapolitan patrimonies, and to allow their bishops-elect to come to this apostolic See for consecration as usual. For this and all else we return your Excellency most hearty thanks".

At all this Pippin manifested his pleasure, and expressed a hope that the Pope "would endeavor to remain at peace with the Lombard king". "If that most excellent man" replied the Pope, "will stand by the promises he has made to your Excellency and

to the Roman Church, we will remain in peace with him". So friendly had the Pope and Desiderius become, that, in this same letter, Paul tells the Frankish monarch that he has agreed to go with the Lombard king to Ravenna, that together they may devise means of protection against the Greeks, who are daily threatening a descent on that city. It would appear that Paul died in the peace which his skillful diplomacy had brought about with that most excellent man Desiderius, king of the Lombards.

Though most of Pau's letters to the Franks and their rulers were taken up with the "Lombards or the Greeks", friendship it must not be concluded that every part and all of them the Pope were so. In two of them we see first the Pope giving pippin, the monastery of St. Silvester on Mount Soracte, where Carlomann had lived as a monk, to Pippin, and then Pippin giving it back to the Pope. Another letter shows us the Frankish clergy eager to become perfect in the Roman chant; and the Pope entrusting a number of Frankish monks to the head of his school of cantors to be thoroughly trained in church music. It was still in Rome that the arts of civilization were preserved. In return for the various presents which Paul made to Pippin, the latter sent the Pope an altar. This Paul had erected in the "confession" of St Peter; and after he had consecrated it, he offered Mass on it for Pippin's spiritual and temporal welfare. Finally, another letter gives us a glimpse of the work of the Pope for the interests of others besides his own, a branch of Paul's work which the poverty of historical material that has come down to us enables some historians to call in question. We refer to the letter which treats of the efforts made by Paul to bring about the reconciliation between Pippin and Tassilo of Bavaria, of which we have already spoken.

Here we must confess we are not sorry to leave the letters of Paul. Their monotony, with their opening of thanks to Pippin and their closing with prayers for his welfare, is anything but cheerful. It was doubtless as necessary for Paul to write them as it was for Ovid to write his "letters from Pontus". The effect on the reader is the same in both cases. Melancholy he can scarcely escape from. To their sameness, as one source of weariness in the student, must be added, as another such source, the uncertainty as to their year of issue. The student has only the grim satisfaction of feeling that his presentation of the events of Paul's reign may be all wrong!

However, before taking our final leave of the letters of Paul I, it will be useful to listen to what they have to say in general as to the character of their writer and his relations to Pippin. They may indeed weary the reader from their verbosity and sameness, but they certainly impress him with the conviction that Paul's presentation of his case is the true one. They show him constantly sending to Pippin the documents which he has received from Desiderius and others, constantly asking him to send his *missi* to examine into matters in dispute on the spot, and constantly reminding him that his envoys have convinced themselves that the truth is with the Pope, the falsehood with the Lombard. They make it obvious that the Pope is the real ruler of the duchy of Rome, of Ravenna and of the Pentapolis. His are the cities. His are the nobles and the people. They, on the other hand, proclaim themselves his subjects. Pippin, on the contrary, in every, variety of phrase, is spoken of as the Pope's helper, protector, and guardian. He after God is Paul's security, under his protection is the Pope's province which must not be withdrawn from his (Paul's) power and jurisdiction. The letters of Paul exhibit him not only as pursuing a straightforward policy in a truthful way, but as possessed of a

forgiving character. He pleads for Tassilo, who, as the foe of Pippin, was his enemy also; and, at the prayers of a blind mother, he punishes the traitor Marinus by getting him made a bishop. Finally, they prove that the Kiersey treaty, by which both the Pope and Pippin expressed their determination to stand, was to be set for the ruin and the resurrection of many!

To avoid the great heat of the summer in Rome, Paul had retired to St. Paul's outside the walls. He was, however, stricken down there with a mortal sickness; and though, when others abandoned him, probably in fear on account of the stormy events to be related in the life of Stephen (III) IV, he was as carefully nursed by his successor Stephen as he himself (Paul) had attended his brother, he died June 28, 767.

Here for three months was left the body of Paul. At the end of that period, however, "all the Roman citizens and the other nations", who lived in special quarters in Rome, and were spoken of as *scholae*, transported the said body by water to St. Peter's, whilst singing the Psalms for the dead. The body was then placed in the oratory, in which Paul had himself prepared his tomb. Over his sepulcher were written the simple words : "Hic requiescit Paulus Papa". In the Roman martyrology he is honored as a saint on June 28.

STEPHEN (III) IV.

A.D. 768-772

EMPEROR.

Constantine V Copronymus, 741-775

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

Desiderius, 756-774

KINGS OF THE FRANKS.

Pippin, the Short, 752-768.

Charlemagne and Carloman, 768-771.

Charlemagne, 771-800.

THE election of Pope Stephen IV was unfortunately, preceded by a series of disorders that had a very tragic termination. These disturbances were brought about by the ambition of a man, who was, as it seems, one of the papal governors. Very desirous that the great spiritual and now considerable temporal power also of the papacy should be wielded by one of his own family, he would not even wait for the death of Paul to begin his nefarious designs. Accordingly this aspiring noble, Toto, duke or governor of Nepi, began to plot against the life of Paul. His schemes were for a time frustrated by the watchfulness of Christopher, the primicerius of the notaries, who brought together into his house Toto and other notables, and made them swear that the new Pope should only be chosen by common consent and from the Roman clergy, and that none of the country-people should be introduced into the city. Toto, however, had no intention of allowing himself to be fettered by an oath. He retired to Nepi, and, with the aid of his brothers, Constantine, Passivus, and Paschal, collected troops from Nepi and other parts of Tuscany, as well as a crowd of armed peasants. Before Paul had breathed his last, this armed band broke into the city by the gate of St. Pancratius. On the death of Paul, Christopher, in his deposition before the Lateran Council, said that all at once assembled in the "Basilica of the Apostles", and that before they parted he had made all swear that they would respect one another's rights. No sooner, however, had the meeting broken up than Toto's adherents assembled at his town residence and elected Constantine, though yet a layman, Pope. At the point of the sword, the antipope was introduced into the Lateran Palace.

Next an attempt was made to force George, Bishop of Praeneste, to give the tonsure to Constantine. This at first George refused to do, but threw himself at the feet of the usurper and adjured him by all that was sacred to give up his impious attempt and

not be the cause of such a wicked novelty being introduced into the Church. But the conspirators very soon gave the poor bishop to understand that he must do their behests or take the consequences. In fear, therefore, George performed the ceremony of giving the tonsure, and Constantine was a cleric. The next day, Monday, the same bishop had to make the antipope a subdeacon and a deacon, quite, of course, against the canons, which require an interval between the giving of the major orders of at least a day. The people were then forced to take an oath of fidelity to Constantine, who, again by the persuasive action of the sword, was consecrated bishop (July 5, 767) by George, Eustratius of Albano and Citonatus of Porto, and contrived to hold the See for over a year.

One of the antipope's first acts was to write to Pippin, with a view of securing that prince's adhesion to his election. He boldly declared to the Frankish king that, contrary to his wishes and merits, the people of "Rome, and of the cities adjoining it", had raised him to the high dignity of successor of the apostles, and begs for a continuation of the friendship which Pippin had shown to Stephen III and to Paul. In answer to his request, he sends Pippin such of the *Lives of the Saints* as he could find. The request had, of course, been made during the lifetime of Paul.

Of this letter Pippin, who had doubtless been more or less correctly apprised of the true state of affairs from other sources, took not the slightest notice. Accordingly Constantine sent him another letter, in which he again affirmed that the united action of the multitude had forced him to accept the heavy burden of taking charge of the Lord's "rational sheep". Then, after hypocritically introducing a considerable number of Scripture texts, he earnestly begs Pippin for his friendship, promises that "he and his people" will cherish the Franks and their king even more than his predecessors have done, and so begs Pippin not to put any faith in what may be said against him.

Of special interest in this artful document is the paragraph in which the antipope tells Pippin that he is sending him a copy in Greek and in Latin of a letter, which, on the 12th of August, he had received from the East. This letter addressed to Pope Paul, Constantine describes as a synodical letter of faith *(synodica fidei)* sent by Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, and endorsed by the patriarchs of Antioch (Theodore) and Alexandria (Cosmas), and a considerable number of Oriental metropolitans. Constantine, after reading it publicly to the people, sent a copy of it to Pippin, "that he might see", he said, "what zeal there was in the cause of the holy images throughout the whole Christian East".

There was at this time, and there had been for some time previously, considerable activity in that part of the East not under the sway of Constantine V, in behalf of the holy images. Pope Paul had received a profession of faith on that subject from Cosmas, patriarch of Alexandria, who there restored the Catholic succession. This profession Paul had sent to Pippin, "that he might know the letters which the Pope received in connection with what was being done for the integrity of the faith by the Oriental bishops and by the other nations". Unfortunately Charlemagne, when he caused the collection of papal letters, which bears his name, to be drawn up, did not order the letters which accompanied them to be included in the collection. Hence these letters, of such importance for showing the true faith of the Eastern Church on the image question

at this time, have perished. The bishops under Moslem rule were free from the tyranny of the Byzantine emperor. Hence their letters and synods show that their faith on the subject of images was as that of the Pope and the West. Owing, however, to the obscurity which envelops the history of the Oriental patriarchate at this period, it is quite impossible to state with any certainty the occasion of the drawing up of the letters sent to Pope Paul first by Cosmas, and then by the united East.

Retribution for his violence and deceit was all this while being prepared for Constantine. Christopher, the primicerius of the notaries, and his son Sergius, treasurer of the Church, had, at the outset of the antipope's usurpation, made some show of resistance. Finding, however, that their lives were in danger, they soon gave it up and fled for their safety to St. Peter's. When the first violence of the outbreak had passed away, the two officials, "who preferred to die rather than witness the success of such impious presumption" on the part of the antipope, came to a secret understanding with others within the city of a like mind to themselves. They then feigned a great desire to enter a monastery, and begged Constantine, with the greatest humility, to allow them to leave the city and become monks in the monastery of Our Saviour, near Rieti, in the duchy of Spoleto. Exacting an oath from them that such was their intention in leaving the city, Constantine gave them the required permission. Once outside the city (after April 10, 768), the two thought no more of their oath, but went straight to Theodicius, Duke of Spoleto, and begged him to take them to his sovereign, Desiderius. In answer to their prayers that he would bring to a close the scandal which was afflicting the Church, Desiderius gave orders that they should receive the support of the Lombards. In conjunction with a Lombard priest, Waldipert, Sergius marched on Rome with a force of Lombards from the duchy of Spoleto. Admitted into the city by his friends at the gate of St. Pancratius (July 30, 768), Sergius and his party seized the walls, but were, or pretended to be, afraid to descend the Janiculum.

As soon as he heard of the entry of the Lombards, Toto hastened to meet them, along with Demetrius, the secundicerius, and Gratiosus, the chartular, afterwards duke, who were secretly in league with Sergius. Seeing Toto strike down one Rachipert, the most formidable of their number, the Lombards would have fled, had not Toto himself fallen, pierced through by Demetrius and Gratiosus. On the death of the daring Toto, his brother Passivus fled to warn Constantine to fly ere it was too late. The two brothers rushed from one part of the Lateran to another, and finally shut themselves up in the oratory of St. Cesarius. Here, after some hours, they were discovered. Dragged thence, they were thrown into prison by the officers of the Roman army.

Matters now took an unexpected turn. Unknown to Sergius, and doubtless with the intention of getting a Pope favorable to his master, Waldipert collected a number of Romans, went to the monastery of St Vitus on the Esquiline, took thence a priest named Philip, declared that St. Peter had chosen him Pope, and conducted him (July 31, Sunday) to the Lateran basilica. Here, after the prescribed prayers had been said by a bishop, Philip proceeded to hold the customary banquet in the Lateran palace, at which assisted a certain number of the dignitaries of the Church and State. But, like Baltazzar, Philip was condemned whilst at the feast. Christopher had meanwhile arrived before the city gates, and, hearing of the election of Philip (so far irregular that he was not one of the *cardinal* priests or deacons from whom the popes were wont at this time to be

chosen), declared on oath to all the Romans who had gone out to meet him that he would not enter the city till Philip was driven from the palace. Philip did not require much driving. He quietly returned to his own monastery.

The first care of Christopher was to bring about a lawful election. Accordingly he summoned (August 1, 768) not only the chief men among the clergy and the army, but everybody, "from the greatest to the smallest". They met together in front of the Church of St. Adriano, a spot called, by the *Book of the Popes,in tribus Fatis*, from statues of the three Fates which stood near. It was that part of the Forum known as the *Comitium*, where of old the *Comitia Curiata* held their deliberations. On this historic ground the Romans unanimously resolved to elect Stephen. Going to his church of Sta. Cecilia in Trastevere, they escorted him with every demonstration of joy to the Lateran as Pope-elect. Thus closed one of the first of those struggles between the ecclesiastical and secular nobility of the new papal state, which were destined to last so long and to bring at times, through the too frequent triumph of the secular nobility, especially in the tenth century, so much disgrace on the Papacy and the Church. As the troubles caused the Papacy at this period by its external foes—Greeks and Lombards—were decreasing, those caused by its enemies at home were destined to increase. The latter evil was, however, the lesser. The foes at home only aimed at seizing the papal dignity; those abroad aimed not merely at the persons of the popes, but, the Greeks at least, at their principles.

The man thus elected was a Sicilian and the son of Olivus; and, according to his biographer at least, was a man of strong character, well versed in Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition, and a doer of good works. When he came to Rome from Sicily, Pope Gregory III placed him in his monastery of St. Chrysogonus, where he became a cleric and a Benedictine monk. As he was only a child under Gregory, he must have been born about the year 720. Hence when he became Pope he must have been about fifty. He was taken from the monastery by Pope Zachary, who ordained him priest, and, charmed with his modesty, kept him in his immediate service in the Lateran. For the same reason he also found favor with Zachary's successors; and, as was noted above, he remained by the bedside of the dying Pope Paul when all others through fear had left him.

During the interval between Stephen's election and consecration, there were perpetrated a series of revolting deeds of cruelty. The cause of this outbreak of wild revenge is hard to trace. The history of Rome in the Middle Ages has not, up to this time, as far at least as we know it from the sources at our disposal, revealed any such traces of lawlessness as would have prepared us to expect the scenes of blood we have now to portray. We may, therefore, presume that they are evidence either that the unceasing conflicts with the Lombards had caused a gradual decline of morality in the city, or that they were the results of civil strife, rendered more sanguinary than usual from some more or less accidental cause. Civil strife is ever waged more cruelly than any other. And if one side gives the slightest exhibition of extra cruelty, then such passions are set ablaze that no act of barbarity seems too diabolical for either side to think out and to put into execution. We shall give the account of these outrages practically in the very words of Stephen's biographer, so that the reader may judge how

far he may unreservedly accept the conclusion of Gregorovius that Stephen "did not seek to prevent" these horrors, meaning, thereby, we take it, that he connived at them.

Whilst that most holy man (Stephen) was still but Pope-elect, says the papal biographer, there was gathered together a band of men who had before their eyes neither the fear of God nor His terrible judgment, in obedience to the orders of certain wicked wretches, whom God's just retribution has overtaken. The gang began by seizing Bishop Theodore, Constantine's *vicedominus*, and depriving him of his eyes and tongue. Passivus was also deprived of his eyes. The houses of both the unfortunate men were plundered, and Theodore, thrust into the monastery of Clivus Scaurus—the monastery, it would seem, that was founded by St. Gregory I on the site of his paternal house—was left to die of hunger and thirst. The antipope Constantine was driven through the city in mockery on horseback, seated on a woman's saddle, with heavy weights attached to his feet, and then lodged in a monastery near the Church of Sta. Saba on the Aventine. This church, from the fact of its being, along with the monastery adjoining, the first asylum of the Greek (Basilian) monks in Rome, was known as *ad Cellamnovam.* Thence he was taken (August 6) to the Lateran basilica, and canonically degraded. His pallium was cast at his feet by a subdeacon, and his shoes, the special ones worn by a Pope, cut off!

The next day Stephen was consecrated in St. Peter's; and by the mouth of Leontius, one of the papal secretaries, the people confessed their guilt for not resisting the antipope.

Unfortunately the consecration of Stephen did not put an end to the violence that was being perpetrated in the name of justice. One of the towns of the Campagna, which one of the MS. of the *Liber Pontificalis* sets down as Alatri, a mountain town not far from Anagni, and which its ancient lords, the Hernicians, boasted to have been built by Saturn, held out for the antipope Constantine. Its governor, the 'tribune Gracilis, as he is described in the *Book of the Popes*—a title which, like consul, was at this period a *nomen sine re*—relying on the natural and artificial strength of his position, considered he was safe in defying the new power, and commenced to ravage the Campagna. He was mistaken, however. His stronghold was stormed by a force of Romans, Tuscans, and troops from various parts of the Campagna, and he himself taken prisoner to Rome. From his prison he was ruthlessly dragged by certain "wicked Campanians .... who were urged on by some most impious men more wicked than themselves", and deprived of his eyes and tongue.

A few days after, these same strangers, with the approval of the chartular Gratiosus, and his chief officers, "by whose authority these terrible deeds were done", dragged the unfortunate Constantine from his monastic prison, early in the morning, put out his eyes, and left him lying in the street.

Finally, on a charge of conspiring to kill the primicerius, Christopher and other nobles, and to hand over the city to the Lombards, orders were issued to arrest the Lombard priest Waldipert. The poor priest fled to the Church of Our Lady *ad Martyres,* or the Pantheon. Thence, still clinging to Our Lady's image, Waldipert was drawn, and so cruelly was the usual brutal work of blinding performed that he soon died.

While gladly finishing with these deeds of blood, we would observe that the only one whom history in any way connects with them, as a responsible agent, is the chartular Gratiosus. Stephen is represented as merely passive.

In the very outset of his pontificate, Stephen had sent to inform Pippin and his two sons, Charlemagne and Carlomann, of his election. He begged them to send to Rome bishops learned in the Scriptures and in canon law to assist at a synod which would take steps to prevent the repetition of such a usurpation of the Holy See as had just been perpetrated. On their arrival in France, the papal envoys found that the great king Pippin was no more. He had died September 24, 768, and Charlemagne and Carloman were reigning in his stead. The two kings gladly complied with Stephen's wishes, and twelve of their bishops set out for Rome.

In April (769) the Pope opened a synod in the Lateran basilica of some fifty bishops, and a considerable number of the inferior clergy and of the laity. The first work to which the council turned its attention was that of examining into the doings of the antipope. The blind Constantine was introduced, and was asked how he had ventured, being a layman, to intrude himself into the Apostolic See and be guilty of such an unheard-of impiety. In reply, Constantine urged that he had acted under compulsion, inasmuch as the people hoped thus for a remedy from the evils that Pope Paul had brought upon them. Then he threw himself on the ground, confessed that he had sinned, and begged the synod to forgive him. At the second day's examination, however, Constantine was by no means so submissive, but argued that he had done nothing new. This barefaced attempt to defend his usurpation was more than the assembly could endure. They ordered him to be beaten and cast forth from the Church. Then the acts of the antipope were publicly burnt before the whole synod, and the Pope and the bishops, along with the Roman laity, prostrated themselves, sang the *Kyrie eleison* and declared that they had sinned in receiving Holy Communion at the hands of Constantine. After the imposition of a suitable penance, and after a careful discussion on the canons, it was decreed, under pain of interdict, that no layman could be made Pope, and that only cardinal deacons or priests, who had passed through the minor orders, were to be eligible for the honor of the papacy. The laity, moreover, were forbidden any share in the election for the future; express prohibition being urged against the presence of armed men, and of the troops from Tuscany and the Campagna. But when the election had been held by the clergy, the Roman army and people were to salute the elect before he was escorted to the Lateran Palace.

Decrees were next passed with regard to the ordinations held by the antipope. It was decided that the bishops, priests, and deacons whom he had ordained were to again rank only from the degree from which the antipope had raised them. However, if those who had been consecrated bishops were re-elected in the ordinary canonical way, they might be reconciled and restored to the episcopal grade by the Pope. In the same way he might reinstate the priests and deacons. But such laymen as had been ordained priests or deacons by Constantine had to do penance in the religious habit all their lives, and none of those whom the antipope had ordained were ever to be promoted to a higher grade. These stringent regulations were made with the very desirable object of preventing the recurrence "of such impious novelties in the Church of God". The bishops who had been consecrated by Constantine seem to have been all reconciled by the Pope. But

Stephen would never re-establish the priests or deacons in the rank to which the antipope had raised them. Furthermore, in general, the sacraments which Constantine had administered, except baptism and confirmation, were to be repeated.

Finally, after a careful examination of various testimonies of the Fathers, it was decreed that holy images had to be venerated by all Christians; and the late synod of Constantinople (754) against the sacred images was anathematized.

When the business of the council was over, a great procession of the clergy and people, all barefooted, was made to St. Peter's. There the decrees of the council were solemnly announced to all, as well as the anathemas to which any who dared to violate them were exposed. It was the wholesale disregard of the decrees of this council in the matter of papal elections that some two centuries later reduced the Papacy to its lowest level.

The example of violent interference with canonical election offered in the case of Stephen was not long in being followed. On the death of Sergius, Archbishop of Ravenna (770), the archdeacon Leo was duly elected to succeed him. But Michael, a lay secretary of the Church, procuring the connivance of Desiderius, the Lombard king, who was, of course, not averse to promoting trouble in the Pope's dominions, and the armed assistance of Maurice, Duke of Rimini, got himself elected by force. Leo was safely imprisoned by Maurice in his ducal city; and the two conspirators, with the, probably enforced, cooperation of the judges *(judices)* of Ravenna, at once sent to offer the Pope large sums of money if he would consecrate Michael. This Stephen refused to do on any account, and sent both letters and envoys to induce Michael to withdraw. For a time, a year and more, the usurper was able to set the Pope at defiance—the ornaments of the cathedral and the episcopal palace supplying him with the means of buying the support of Desiderius. But at length Stephen, taking advantage of the presence in Rome of one of Charlemagne's envoys, Hucbald, sent him to Ravenna along with his own legates. Emboldened by the appearance of the Frankish ambassador, the party of law and order took courage, rose, sent Michael in chains to Rome, and reasserted the rights of Leo. Accompanied by a large number of his clergy, Leo at once went to Rome, where he was consecrated bishop by the Pope.

The short pontificate of Stephen IV brought him many serious troubles from first one quarter and then another. Whilst the difficulties at Ravenna were still unsettled, Stephen was filled with fear lest the mortal enemies of the popes, the Lombards, might gain a solid advantage over him from a new line of policy suddenly developed by Desiderius. This affair, which touches on Charlemagne's wives, is involved in no little obscurity for that very reason, as well as from the ever-recurring difficulty of the want of dates to the letters in the Caroline Code. To writers with theories, of course, nothing presents a difficulty. From our ignorance of many crucial facts and dates, the reigns of many of the popes simply present to the writer a mass of facts, like so many pieces of colored marbles, out of which each man can make a mosaic for himself according to his own design. We will endeavor to give the facts of the case so that the reader may judge of their bearings for himself.

Pippin, as we have said, was succeeded by his sons, Charles (Charlemagne) and Carloman. If we can rely upon Andrew of Bergamo, who wrote a century after this, the

elder brother, Carloman, was a man of savage temper. At any rate, whatever the cause, there was no love lost between the brothers; and the tension between them, while it brought the greatest anxiety to their mother and to the Pope, would, of course, be viewed with complacency by Desiderius. By the efforts of those, the Pope among them, who wished the brothers well, some measure of harmony was established between them, perhaps in 769. In a letter to "Charles and Carloman, kings of the Franks and patricians of the Romans", in which Stephen expressed his pleasure at the good news which they had sent him regarding their reconciliation, and their firm intention to stand by the promises which, with their father, they had made to the vicars of St. Peter, he begged them to fulfill their engagements, to see to the full restoration of the *justitiae* of St. Peter, and not to believe any story to the effect that he had already received them.

Accordingly, in prompt compliance with Stephen's request, an embassy was dispatched by the Frankish kings to put pressure upon the Lombard monarch Desiderius. One of the envoys was Ittherius, Charlemagne's chancellor, and apparently with them went Bertrada (Bertha), his mother. That the *missi* were at least partially successful in their errand is certain, not only from contemporary chronicles, but from a letter of the Pope to Bertrada and her son, in which he commends to them the exertions of Ittherius in obtaining the restitution of the Beneventan patrimony.

But the envoys, and the queen-mother particularly, had another end in view besides furthering the cause of peace between Desiderius and the Pope. She went to Italy, indeed, "for the sake of peace", but she went also "on account of the daughter of King Desiderius". Her *role* in this matter of the daughter of King Desiderius has, we believe, been much exaggerated by some modern authors. She has been represented as its prime mover, and as acting from the highest political motives. That she was not its prime mover would seem to be proved by the letter of Pope Stephen, soon to be quoted. This letter must be regarded as the most important authority on this matter—the more so that there is nothing to oppose to its statements. However, when "she had finished the business for which she came to Italy, and paid her devotions at the shrines of the Apostles at Rome, she returned to her sons in Gaul". Let us hear what the business of the daughter of King Desiderius was.

Perhaps in the year 769, at any rate early in 770, *Desiderius* proposed that his daughter should marry one or other of the Frank kings, doubtless with the view of attaching them to himself and alienating them from the Pope. Tassilo of Bavaria was already his son-in-law. He would do well if he could make one of the Frankish kings another. It appears to have been also proposed to give the little Gisela to Adelchis, the son of Desiderius.

When Stephen heard of this proposal, he was naturally alarmed and shocked, for both the young kings were already married. He at once, therefore, wrote to them. After warning them that they must be on their guard, because the devil is ever on the watch to get the better of us by assailing us on our weak side, just as he ruined Adam through the feebler nature of a woman, he proceeds to say that noble Franks ought not to dream of uniting themselves with Lombards, who are such a loathsome people, as the fact of the lepers originating from them shows. If that is the case with the nation of the Franks in general, how much less ought you two kings to unite with Lombards, "you who are

already, by the will of God and the commands of your father, lawfully married to noble wives of your own nation, whom you are bound to cherish. And certainly it is not lawful for you to put away the wives you have and marry others, or ally yourselves in marriage with a foreign people, a thing never done by any of your ancestors ... It is wicked of you even to entertain the thought of marrying again when you are already married. You ought not to act thus, who profess to follow the law of God, and punish others to prevent men acting in this unlawful manner. Such things do the heathen. But they ought not to be done by you who are Christians, "a holy people and a kingly priesthood". Stephen then uses other arguments. He reminds the two young kings that their father Pippin, at the exhortation of Pope Stephen, his predecessor, refrained from putting away their mother; that they had promised the same Pope that they would ever count his friends and enemies theirs also; and that their father, at the wish of the Pope, refused to give his daughter Gisela even to the son of the emperor Constantine, and had with them promised obedience and love to the Pope. In conclusion he exhorts them by the living God and His dreadful judgment, and by the body of St. Peter, not to wed the daughter of Desiderius, nor "to dare to put away their wives", and not to give their sister Gisela to the son of Desiderius; but, on the contrary, mindful of what they had promised to St. Peter, to resist the Lombards and force them to fulfill the promises they had made to restore the rights of the Church. For so far from keeping their word, the Lombards never cease to oppress the Church. "This letter, after having placed it on the *Confession* of St. Peter, and celebrated the holy sacrifice over it, we are sending to you with tears. But know that if anyone, which God forbid, should contravene this letter, he is excommunicated and given over to eternal flames with the devil and the wicked".

For some cause or other the proposal of the Lombard king recommended itself to the queen-mother, Bertrada (Bertha). In the course of the year 770, as we have seen, she came to Italy to escort Desiderata to France. The young kings Charlemagne and Carloman were, we have already noted, anything but perfectly united, and had it not been for the forbearance of Charlemagne, there would have been war between them. Bertrada *may* have argued that if their thoughts could be turned "to marriage and giving in marriage", war between them would be averted. Or perhaps her object may have been to get an ally for Charlemagne (to whom she seems to have been more attached) in the event of war between the two brothers, just as it was doubtless the object of Desiderius to attach to himself one of the brothers—he did not mind which—and then foment trouble between them and weaken both of them. To say the least of it, these conjectures are perhaps as likely to be true as the many others put forward in this connection. And though she failed to induce Gisela to marry the son of Desiderius, or Carloman to marry his daughter, she succeeded in persuading Charlemagne to marry Desiderata. When exactly the marriage took place we do not know. At any rate, in less than a year Charlemagne divorced her, for some cause unknown even to Eginhard, and to the great chagrin of his mother. If Andrew of Bergamo could be safely quoted as an authority on this point, what has been said of Bertha's wish to secure an ally for Charlemagne would receive no little support. He avers that it was Carloman who forced his brother to repudiate Desiderata! Withal, it is as likely as not that the remonstrances of the Pope prevailed in the end.

Probably whilst Charlemagne was still united with Desiderata, Stephen had another and more serious difficulty to face, and a difficulty that is to us now more involved in obscurities than the marriage question of Charlemagne. To begin with, we will narrate the affair as it appears in the contemporary author in the *Liber Pontificalis*, noting how far his story is supported by the words of the Bavarian envoy, the secretary of Tassilo III, the so-called Creontius or Crantz.

Christopher and his son Sergius, who had been the prime movers in Stephen's elevation to the popedom, continued to be his right-hand men after his consecration. By their advice every effort was made through Charlemagne and Carloman to force Desiderius to surrender various rightsbelonging to the Holy See in different parts of Italy over which the Lombard had control, and which he had repeatedly promised to restore. Christopher was certainly a masterful man. So boldly did he fulfill his mission to Constantine, that the emperor expressed his belief that the envoy must have exceeded his commission; and we have seen how, in the election of Stephen, he thwarted the designs, first of the rough noble Toto and then of the Lombard Waldipert. Convinced, then, that Sergius and his father were his ablest opponents, and inflamed with anger against them, Desiderius resolved to destroy them. He accordingly managed to buy the tongues of the Pope's chamberlain, Paul Afiarta, and others, and directed them to be used in blackening the characters of Christopher and Sergius before the Pope. Then he gave out that he intended to go to Rome to offer up prayers to St. Peter. But Sergius and his father were not easily deceived. They straightway collected troops, closed the gates of the city, and made all the necessary preparations for resistance. When Desiderius and his army arrived before the city, he sent to the Pope to request an interview. To this Stephen agreed, and after a conference on the *justitiae,* returned to the city. In his absence Paul Afiarta and his party had endeavored to raise the people against Christopher and his son. But these leaders were ready and attacked their opponents, who seemed to have fled to the Lateran palace. Thither the victorious party pursued them, following them even into the Pope's presence in the basilica of Pope Theodore. It was apparently at this juncture that, according to the Bavarian, the Pope was forced "to take an oath to be true to Christopher and Sergius, as they suspected him of having come to an understanding with the enemy". They knew Desiderius' hatred of them, and they feared that in his interview with the Pope he might have put pressure upon him to give them up. To resume from the biographer of Stephen. Indignant at this violation of his rights and person, Stephen soundly rated the attacking party and ordered them to withdraw, an order which they immediately obeyed. The next day the Pope again went out to St. Peter's, which was at this time outside the walls of the city, to have another conference with the false Lombard. Creontius speaks of this as a flightand goes on to say that the Pope and the king again conspired against Christopher, endeavored by threats, money and every means to turn the people against him, and threatened to destroy the city unless he were given up.

Following the *Liber Pontificalis,* Stephen left the city to continue the discussion on the 'claims' of St. Peter; but Desiderius would not again discuss the question of the usurped 'rights'of the Holy See, but only what he was pleased to call the treachery of Christopher and Sergius towards the Pope. It would then appear that, failing to make any impression on the Pope with words, in violation of all the sacred rights of

ambassadors, he had recourse to violence. For the papal biographer goes on to relate that Desiderius imprisoned the Pope and his suite in St. Peter's by closing all the gates, and that *then* the Pope sent two bishops to parley with Christopher and Sergius, and to tell them that they must either retire to a monastery or come out to him at St. Peter's. According to the Bavarian, the bishops cried : "Pope Stephen bids you not to fight against your brethren, but to expel Christopher from the city, and save it, yourselves, and your children". He adds that Christopher was at once given up in chains. It may be noted, in passing, that the testimony of Creontius cannot be said to be of the same value as that of the *Book of the Popes,* as it is impossible to tell from the work of Aventinus precisely how much is from the pen of the sixteenth century German and how much from the eighth. This message, clearly, as it seems to us, dictated by Desiderius, naturally caused distrust to arise among the adherents of Christopher and Sergius. Their followers rapidly fell away from them, and, though at first they were loath to leave the city, first son and then father betook themselves to the Pope during the night. Next day the Pope returned, or was allowed to return, to the city, leaving, doubtless because he had no choice in the matter, Christopher and Sergius in St. Peter's, but hoping to be able to find some means of bringing them back to Rome by night. From the Bavarian narrative we learn that during this eventful day the superiors of the monasteries near St. Peter's, who went thither to try to obtain mercy for Christopher and his son, were not only completely unsuccessful in their mission, but were even maltreated by the Lombards. Before night arrived, Paul and his party, after arranging matters with Desiderius, seized the unfortunate pair and put out their eyes. The father died after three days in the monastery of St. Agatha in Trastevere, but Sergius lingered on in a cell of the Lateran. "All these evils", concludes the papal biographer, "were brought about by the machinations of Desiderius, the king of the Lombards". Such is the clear and consistent narrative of these events in the *Book of the Popes*; and it is, in its principal features, corroborated by what can be gathered from John Turmair of the report of Tassilo's secretary.

Had we no further materials than the *Liber Pontificalis* supplies us with, we might be said to have an easily intelligible account of the downfall of Christopher and Sergius. But there exists in the Caroline Code a letter from the Pope, addressed to Queen Bertrada and Charlemagne, which gives a very different account of the part played by Desiderius. In that letter, those "most wicked men", Christopher and Sergius, are represented as having come to an understanding with Dodo, the envoy of Carloman, and as having attempted to kill the Pope. By good fortune, Stephen managed to escape to Desiderius, who happened to be at Rome at the time, as he had come to treat about the 'rights' of the Holy See. On the Pope's flight the city was barred against him. But by degrees, as the perfidy of Christopher became clearer, his party fell away from him, and at length, much against their will, Christopher and Sergius were brought out to the Pope. Stephen was, with difficulty, able to save their lives, "which the whole people were anxious to take", and whilst he was making arrangements to bring them back into the city during the night, "those who were ever on the watch for them seized them and put out their eyes, without our concurrence in any way". Stephen assures Charlemagne, in conclusion, that but for the help of God, and "his most excellent son Desiderius", he, his clergy, and his people would all have been in danger of death; that Dodo was to blame

for the whole trouble, and that he had received from Desiderius full satisfaction with regard to the 'rights' of the Church.

So improbable seem the statements in this letter, that many authors, "with some show of reason", have maintained that it was written by the Pope under compulsion, when he was in the hands of Desiderius. If the statements in this letter were true, it would mean that four men suddenly showed themselves false to the characters they had previously borne. Christopher and Sergius had, up to this time, proved themselves most devoted adherents of the popes. They had risked all they had in their service, had been duly appreciated by them, and had done everything for Stephen himself. Dodo also had received warm praise as a friend of the popes; whereas, on the contrary, Desiderius, who both before and after these events showed himself anything but a friend of the popes, and had given abundant evidence of being a man of no character, a liar and a knave, is in this letter represented as the savior of the Pope. If the letter were written under compulsion, its object is obvious. Dodo's name is dragged into it to foment discord between, the two brothers, Charlemagne and Carloman, an object we shall soon see Desiderius more openly working to bring about.

Of course it may have been that the calumnies of Afiarta and his friends did their work, and that the Pope became suspicious of his two chief and powerful ministers. And as suspicion begets suspicion, it may have been that Christopher and his son began to mistrust the goodwill of the Pope towards them. Hence it may have been that Desiderius temporarily hoodwinked the Pope, and thus wrought his end in contriving the ruin of his able opponents. But of all these things, the reader, now in possession of the facts of the case, must judge for himself.

It is quite certain that if the Pope had been deluded by Desiderius, the delusion did not last long. For when he sent to Desiderius to ask for the fulfillment of the promises he had made on oath over the body of St. Peter, he received this sarcastic answer: "Be content that I removed Christopher and Sergius, who were ruling you, out of your way, and ask not for 'rights'. Besides, if I do not continue to help you, great trouble will befall you. For Carloman, king of the Franks, is the friend of Christopher and Sergius, and will be wishful to come to Rome and seize you". Well might Pope Hadrian, who is our authority for this reply of Desiderius, add, "See of what value is the good faith of Desiderius!"

Paul Afiarta seems to have retained considerable power in the city. For as soon as Stephen was struck down with his last illness, he at once exiled a number of the most influential as well of the clergy as of the laity, and imprisoned others. Moreover, as we shall see in the *Life* of Hadrian, eight days before Stephen died, the wretched Sergius was dragged forth from his place of confinement in the Lateran, by the orders of the same brutal chamberlain, and strangled. We shall also, with no little satisfaction, see, in the same place, that Paul, even in this life, reaped the just reward of his iniquity.

To work out his purpose of subjecting all Italy to his trouble in sway, Desiderius caused trouble not only in Rome but in other places. We have seen that it was decided that the bishop of Grado should be primate of Venetia and Istria. But Desiderius, correctly concluding that if the bishops of these provinces were subject to Aquileia instead, he would have more power over them, sometime during Stephen's reign

actively employed himself in fomenting a schism in those parts. His efforts were crowned with success, and the bishops of Istria took it upon themselves to consecrate others without the consent of the patriarch of Grado. The patriarch accordingly appealed to the Pope. Stephen at once wrote to the rebellious bishops and to John of Grado himself. The bishops he suspended, and commanded to return to their obedience under pain of excommunication, John he consoled; and assured him, that, like his predecessor Stephen III, he would always consult the patriarch's interests; and that the subjectsof Blessed Peter would strive to defend Istria against its enemies, as they did to protect "our province of Rome and the exarchate of Ravenna". To urge the Pope to adopt strong measures in support of the patriarch of Grado, Maurice, the doge of Venice, sent an embassy to Rome. But the death of Stephen prevented the negotiation from having any practical issue.

Before bringing this Pope's biography to a close, it is worthwhile mentioning that in the *Liber Pontificalis* he is said to have been a diligent observer of ecclesiastical tradition in the matter of church ceremonial. In connection with which, he decreed that every Sunday one of the seven *cardinales hebdomadarii*, now known as cardinal or suburbicarian bishops, should in turn say Mass in the Lateran on the altar of St. Peter, and should say at it the prayer *Gloria in excelsis Deo*. From this weekly duty these cardinal bishops (who are here mentioned for the first time) were called *hebdomadarii*. The altar of St. Peter here spoken of is a table of wood, on which it is believed that St. Peter himself offered up the Holy Sacrifice; and which is enclosed at this day in the marble High Altar of the Lateran basilica. And to this day also, as in the other patriarchal basilicas, only the Pope or a specially appointed cardinal can say Mass at the High Altar. A writer of the thirteenth century, John the Deacon, enumerates these cardinal bishops as follows: "First is the bishop of Ostia, whose office it is to consecrate the Pope; then the bishops of S. Rufina or Silvia Candida, Porto, Albano, Tusculum, Sabina and Praeneste". No doubt they were the same as were attached to the Lateran from the beginning. Nowadays there are six cardinal bishops. For in the beginning of the twelfth century, Porto and St Rufina were united.

Stephen, whom some modern historians, with no little reason perhaps, call weak, and others, with no reason, call unscrupulous, died February 1st or 3rd, 772, and was buried in St. Peter's.

On the question as to whether or not Stephen was really a man of weak character, we may remark that he was not so indeed to his biographer, who, as we have already noticed, calls him a man of character. He was much respected by his successor Hadrian, who is, on all hands, allowed to have been an exceptionally strong-minded man. And it may be urged that it is easy to call a man weak who has to give way before overwhelming odds. King Pippin, the great support of this Pope's predecessors, was dead. Pippin's successors, Charlemagne and Carloman, were young, disunited, and with formidable enemies around them, whereas Desiderius had had considerable experience in the art of ruling. And whether he bullied or hoodwinked Stephen in the matter of the murder of Christopher and Sergius, he did not attempt, under him, that violent seizure of papal territory that he began under Hadrian. Though it may be granted that the current of events in the beginning of his reign flowed too strongly to be stemmed by the most powerful, still, in the abandonment of Christopher, if the current was strong, it can

scarcely be questioned that the swimmer was weak. The treatment of his primicerius by Stephen looks very like the cowardly surrendering of Wentworth by Charles I. Hence, though from his tender nursing of Pope Paul and what his biographer tells us of his pious works, it may fairly be concluded that Stephen's heart was good, it can scarcely be questioned that his will was weak. The events of his reign may serve as another illustration of the fact that for the governed the rule of the weak is sometimes worse than that of the bad. The wicked prince is not infrequently strong enough to reserve the right of doing wrong to himself. But under the weak sovereign everyone does "what is right in his own eyes".

Cardinal Tripepi calls attention to the fact that various calendars, martyrologies, etc., such as the ancient a saint, calendar of the saints of Sicily, the calendars and martyrologies of Ferrarius, Menard, St. Malo, etc., number Stephen among the saints, and assign his feast to February I St; and that the inhabitants of Syracuse endeavored to induce the Holy See to extend the worship (the 'cult'), which was there paid to him, to the whole Church.

HADRIAN I

A.D. 772-795

EMPERORS OF THE EAST

Constantine (Copronymus), 741-775.

Leo IV, 775-780.

Constantine VI (Porphyrogenitus), 780-797.

Irene, 780-790.

KING OF THE LOMBARDS.

Desiderius, 756-774.

KING OF THE FRANKS.

Charlemagne, 771-800.

THE pontificate of Pope Hadrian is important, not only because it was the longest of any in the Middle Ages, but also because of the momentous events that took place during it, and in which he took a very great share. In his reign, not only was the temporal power of the popes placed on a still firmer basis by the confirmation of Pippin's deed of gift by his son Charlemagne, but the power of its greatest enemies, the Lombards, was broken for ever. On the one side, too, in the East, the heresy of the Image-breakers was dealt such a blow by the Seventh General Council that it never regained its former strength; and on the other side, in the far West, a new heresy was so promptly attacked that it disappeared not long after the death of the Pope. And that Rome, their dwelling-place, might share in the immortality decreed by our Divine Lord for the popes themselves, might be indeed 'eternal', as early imperial coins proclaimed it to be, Hadrian practically rebuilt the city on the seven hills. Its churches he restored, its walls he re-erected, its aqueducts he again caused to flow. And last, but not least, he greatly contributed to the advance of European civilization, by using the influence which he had with Charlemagne in helping that great prince (before whose time, as the old chronicler ingenuously remarks, no attention was paid to the liberal arts in Gaul), both by advice and by gifts of books and masters, in his efforts to light the torch of learning in his vast dominions. All this he did in despite of turbulent officials, both cleric and lay, whom it required all the power of Charlemagne to keep in check.

The author of all these noble deeds, "one of the greatest popes of the eighth century", writes Hodgkin, was, as is so frequently the case with the doers of great

things, himself of noble birth. He was a Roman, and not unworthy of the name. His family, at once noble and powerful, belonging apparently to the new military aristocracy, had their home in the fifth ecclesiastical quarter, that known as the Via Lata. Left an orphan whilst still very young, by the death of both his parents, the little Hadrian was carefully trained by an uncle, one Theodotus, who had formerly held the title of consul and duke, and was then primicerius of the notaries. There is still extant a marble tablet, in the Church of St Angela in Pescheria, which testifies to the piety of Theodotus. It records how, for the good of his soul, and the pardon of his sins, he restored the church whilst primicerius,

Under the care of such a tutor, we need not wonder that his biographer speaks of the hours which Hadrian spent, whilst still a young laic, in the Church of St. Mark, which was near the parental mansion. Not content with prayer, he strove to subdue his passions by fasting and the use of the hair-shirt. To the utmost of his ability also he gave alms to the poor. His good deeds were the talk of Rome. The knowledge of his virtues caused Pope Paul to order him to become a cleric. Paul then named him a regionary notary, and afterwards ordained him subdeacon. By Stephen (III) IV he was made a deacon. The reception of the diaconate made him work harder than ever at preaching the Gospel and the other duties of his office. Being such by birth and training, we can readily believe his biographer when he assures us that Hadrian was as polished and refined in his mind as he was shapely and handsome in body; that he was a firm upholder of his country and the faith, and that he was the father of the poor, and a most reverent observer of ecclesiastical traditions.

Before Pope Stephen was actually dead, the people came together to elect Hadrian, so great was their love for him, and no sooner had he passed away than Hadrian was elected to succeed him (February 3, 772) by the unanimous vote of clergy and people. The anonymous monk of Nonantula gives in full the decree of Hadrian's election, which, *mutatis mutandis,* is in the prescribed form which occurs in the *Liber Diurnus.* This document sets forth that in response to the prayer of all the clergy and people together assembled, the deacon Hadrian was, on account of his exceptional merits, unanimously elected, and that the decree of election was placed in the archives of the Vatican palace.

It would seem not at all unlikely that this prompt action of the Roman people in finding a successor for Stephen was to anticipate any measures on the part of Paul Afiarta to procure a pontiff who might be at the beck of the Lombard. The moment he was elected, Hadrian not only gave a striking proof of his determined character, but showed Paul who was to be master in Rome. The very hourhe was elected, he commanded the recall of those whom Paul had banished during the illness of Stephen. Further, in accordance with what was perhaps a custom, he set free those who were in prison for one crime or another. And certainly, in accordance with custom, he drew up a profession of faith, which he sent to "his most reverend brethren and to all the faithful".

No sooner was Hadrian consecrated (February 9) than he had to receive a deputation from the Lombard king.

That monarch had evidently made up his mind that it was to be now or never with him if he was to become lord of all Italy. Charlemagne, against whom he was personally

enraged, because that prince had repudiated his daughter, he thought he could afford to despise. He was young, was surrounded by enemies, especially the Saxons, against whom he had to struggle for thirty-three years (772-805), and had to fear the chances of a civil war. For when Carloman died, in December 771, his widow Gilberga, with her two sons and some of his chief nobles, had fled to the court of Desiderius, "for no reason whatever", says Eginhard. And as these sons of Carloman were but children, the great bulk of his people had offered his kingdom to Charlemagne, who had thus become sole king of the Franks.

Resolving, however, to try the fox's skin before the lion's, Desiderius sent an embassy to Hadrian, hoping to induce him to place his trust in him (Desiderius), and assuring the Pope that he wished to live at peace with him. When, in reply, Hadrian urged the previous bad faith of their king towards Stephen in the affair of Christopher and Sergius, the envoys took an oath that Desiderius would restore to Hadrian the 'rights' he had failed to restore to Stephen, and that he would really live in peace with the Pope. Trusting to their oaths, Hadrian dispatched Stephen, a regionary notary and *saccellarius* (paymaster), and Paul Afiarta to treat with the Lombard king. But they had not got beyond Perugia when they learnt that Desiderius, as usual without any better reason than his desire for the "unification of Italy", had seized Faventia, the duchy of Ferrara (both of which he had given up in 757), and Commacchio (Comiachium), had beset Ravenna itself, and was harrying the whole province. A deputation came from Archbishop Leo of Ravenna to implore help from the Pope. Hadrian thereupon ordered his envoys to proceed on their journey to Desiderius, with letters in which, as might be expected, the Pope upbraided the Lombard for his twofold breach of faith. Meanwhile Gilberga and her sons had arrived at the Lombard court, and their cause was at once espoused by the king. "And hence", says the papal biographer, in one of the rare passages in which, in set terms, he gives us any of the motives that prompted any of the acts he relates, "Desiderius used every art to try and induce the Pope to come and visit him, in order that he (the Pope) might anoint as kings the two sons of Carloman. For the Lombard was very desirous of bringing about a division in the kingdom of the Franks, a coolness in the friendship between the Pope and Charlemagne, and the subjection of Rome and all Italy to his own sway". Although Desiderius promised the Pope that he would restore the cities if he would come to him, Hadrian firmly refused to go. When the Pope's determination became known, Paul Afiarta assured Desiderius that he would see to it that Hadrian complied with the king's wishes, for, if necessary, he would put a rope round the Pope's legs and drag him to the Lombard court by the heels. He set off by Arimini to fulfill his engagement. But there was already a rope round the boaster's own neck.

When Paul left Rome, men had the courage to let the merit of Pope know that the unfortunate secundicerius Sergius had been dragged forth from his cell in the Lateran and strangled and stabbed in the via Merulana—a street as well known now as in the eighth century—by order of Afiarta. Hadrian made the most careful enquiries into the matter, had the accomplices of Paul arrested, and, in response to the wishes of all the people, handed them over to the prefect of the city to be tried for murder. Death, or exile to Constantinople, was meted out to the culprits.

In accordance with secret instructions conveyed to him from the Pope, Leo, the archbishop of Ravenna, caused Paul to be seized as he passed through Arimini. And when he received from Rome the account of the trial of Paul's agents, the archbishop went beyond the Pope's orders. He not only handed Paul over to the secular arm, to the consular of Ravenna, but, despite the strict orders of the Pope to the contrary, and despite every effort the Pope could make to save him, as he only desired exile for the accused, the archbishop had the wretched man put to death. Some days after, however, troubled in mind at his disobedience, Leo wrote to the Pope and begged him to excuse the act, as, after all, the blood of the innocent had been avenged in the death of Paul. But this Hadrian would by no means do; he told the archbishop that he must bear the blame of Paul's death, for he himself (Hadrian) had, on the contrary, wished to spare the man's life that he might have had an opportunity to do penance.

Whilst the affair of Paul was in progress, Desiderius was not idle. He marched southward with a large army, laying waste with fire and sword the whole country, from Sinigaglia on the Adriatic to Blera on the borders of Tuscany. The inhabitants of the last mentioned town, supposing that there was peace, were massacred by the Lombards whilst gathering in their harvest, and their town was reduced to ashes. And then "after the manner of his ancestors", he proceeded to harry the duchy of Rome. Can anyone be astonished that the popes resisted such barbarians by every means in their power?

Before appealing to the Franks, Hadrian tried every expedient. Letter after letter, embassy after embassy, was sent from Rome to the Lombard to induce him to pause in his career of violence, and restore his ill-gotten goods. If Desiderius made any reply, it was only to the effect that the Pope must come and see him. To which request Hadrian always replied that he would certainly do so when Desiderius had restored the cities.

Negotiation was clearly useless. The Lombard was the march for Rome itself with his son Adalgis and the widow and two sons of Carloman. But Hadrian was equal to the occasion. He not only, compelled by necessity sent messengers by sea to Charlemagne to implore his aid, but he collected troops from all parts, even from the Pentapolis, and hurriedly strengthened the fortifications of the city. He then sent three cardinal-bishops to Desiderius to forbid him, under pain of excommunication, entering the Roman duchy. Whether he had faith enough to fear a papal sentence of excommunication, or policy enough to dread the power of the Franks, certain it is that he fell back in confusion from Viterbo.

Desiderius had not long withdrawn from the papal boundaries ere there arrived in Rome ambassadors from Charlemagne (among whom seems to have been Alcuin), who came to see for themselves whether Desiderius had really made restitution to the Pope, as he had assured the Franks that he had done. Of course they found that anything but restitution had been effected by the false Lombard. Nor could they, though they interviewed Desiderius on their return journey, obtain any concessions from him. In company with ambassadors from the Pope, they returned to their king and told him the state of the case. Urged by the papal envoys to act in behalf of their master, Charlemagne at first tried pacific measures. His envoys were commissioned to offer Desiderius no less than 14,000 gold solidi, if he would give up the territory he had seized. But Desiderius was fanatically obstinate.

Charlemagne now prepared for war. His troops appeared at the passes of the Alps. Whether favored by treachery or not, he successfully accomplished the difficult task of conveying his forces over the Alps. Charlemagne's secretary and biographer, Eginhard, assures us that had he not been anxious to describe his master's character, rather than his wars, he would have told us "how great was the toil of the Franks in overcoming the trackless chain of mountains, with peaks towering to the skies, and sharp and perilous rocks". Desiderius fled to Pavia, and there prepared to stand a siege in that strong city. Adalgis, with the widow and sons of Carloman, shut themselves up in Verona.

One of the immediate results of the appearance of Charlemagne in Italy was the defection of part of the subjects of Desiderius, viz., the inhabitants of the duchy of Spoleto. Already, before the descent of the Frankish king into Italy, some of the chief men of the Lombard cities of Rieti and Spoleto placed themselves under the Pope, took an oath of fidelity to him, and cut their long hair in the Roman fashion. We have already seen evidences of a desire on the part of the duchy of Spoleto to attach its fortunes to those of Rome and the popes; and on the present occasion the entire people, but for dread of their sovereign, would have been glad to follow the example set them by their principal men. When, however, their countrymen came flying from the North and told them of the forcing of the passes of the Alps, the fear of Desiderius, which had up to this restrained them, disappeared, and they flocked to the Pope and besought him to accept them as his subjects. Hadrian could not but receive them. And in St. Peter's all swore to be the faithful subjects of the apostle, of his vicar, Pope Hadrian, and of all his successors. After the hair of all had been cut in the Roman style, Hadrian confirmed one Hildeprand, whom they had themselves chosen, as their duke. Certain cities of the exarchate (Fermo, Osimo and Ancona), which had either never been yielded up to the popes, or had again been seized by the Lombards, followed the example of Spoleto. Here, beyond all doubt, we have an example of one way in which temporal power was absolutely thrust into the hands of the popes by the people themselves.

Arrived before Pavia in the autumn (773), Charlemagne resolved to reduce it by starvation, and took measures accordingly by surrounding the city with lines of circumvallation. And that his purpose of staying there till the place was unconditionally surrendered might be clear, he sent for his wife and children. Whilst the blockade was still being maintained, detachments of the Franks were sent in all directions to bring about the reduction of the other cities. Verona surrendered on the mere approach of Charlemagne. After the siege of Pavia had lasted some six months, Charlemagne resolved to gratify his great desire of visiting the tombs of the Apostles, the more so as the festival of Easter was at hand. Taking with him a considerable number of his chief ecclesiastics and nobles, and a large body of troops, he set out with his accustomed speed so as to be in Rome by Holy Saturday (April 2). Astonished and yet delighted at the news of this sudden resolve of the Frankish monarch, Hadrian made haste to receive him with becoming honor.

Some twenty-four miles from Rome, at a place known as *ad Novas*, the ruins of which are to be seen near Lake Bracciano, Charlemagne was met by the judges with the military standards *(bandora)*. Nearer the city he was received by the 'trained bands' and all the schoolchildren bearing palm and olive branches in their hands, and chanting the praises of the Frankish king. There were also sent forth in his honor "the venerable

crosses and the sacred banners", as was wont to be done when, under the old *regime,* the exarch came to Rome. We are told that when Charlemagne saw the sacred crosses, he descended from his horse, and with his nobles proceeded on foot to St. Peter's. Arrived there, the king mounted the steps, devoutly kissing each one of them as he ascended. After embracing one another, Hadrian and Charlemagne entered the basilica together, which rang with the antiphon: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord". When all present had returned thanks to God at the confession of St. Peter for the victories He had granted to the arms of the Franks, through the intercession of His apostle, Charlemagne assured Hadrian that he and his Franks had undertaken this expedition not for gold or territory, but to secure "the rights of St. Peter", the Pope's safety, and the exaltation of God's Holy Church. He then begged the Pope's permission to enter Rome that he might pray in the different churches. The fact that before Charlemagne entered the city oaths of mutual good faith were given and taken by Charlemagne and the Pope "is not less demonstrative of the fact that the Pope held the supreme power in Rome, and that his sovereignty over the city was entirely independent of the Frank kings, than it is of the perpetual apprehension of violence and stratagem, which, in those ages of barbarism and constantly-recurring invasion, kept men's minds on the alert, as in time of war".

That same Saturday, and until the following Wednesday, the minds and the time of the Pope and Charlemagne were taken up with the different religious services in the great basilicas. But on the last-mentioned day, Hadrian, with his chief clergy and nobility, had a conference with Charlemagne on secular affairs in St. Peter's. As what follows is of the first importance in connection with the temporal power of the Pope, we will closely adhere to the narrative in the *Book of the Popes.* Hadrian, we are there told, begged Charlemagne to fulfill in every particular the details of the donationwhich his father Pippin, as well as he himself and his brother Carloman, had made to Blessed Peter and to his vicar Pope Stephen (II) III, on the occasion of that Pope's visit to the land of the Franks. This donation, continues the papal biographer, involved "the concession of various cities and territories *in this province of Italy* to Blessed Peter and to his successors, to be possessed by them for ever". When the said donation, which had been drawn up at Kiersey (or Quiercy-sur-Oise) had been read, Charlemagne ordered his chaplain and notary, Etherius, to draw up another donation, *like the former.* In it he granted the *same cities* and *territories* to Blessed Peter and the Pope, according to the description set forth in the donation.

Before proceeding further with the narrative in the *Liber Pontificalis,* it is worth pausing to note that Hadrian's biographer, who was perfectly familiar with the actual deed of donation, makes the gift of Charlemagne no more than a confirmation of the original donation of Pippin to Stephen III at Kiersey. Strictly speaking, therefore, Charlemagne did not augment his father's gift. But his donation was doubtless an increase of *Aistulf's,* with which the popes had hitherto been contented. There seems never to have been an attempt to enforce the 'Kiersey treaty'. To judge of this document by the "donation of Charlemagne", which is represented as nothing more than its renewal, it would seem that Pippin and his Franks had determined, if need be, to limit the Lombards to the territory first conquered and directly held by Alboin, their first king who ruled in Italy. The other parts of Italy, which the Lombards acquired later, or which

were only imperfectly subject to the rule of their kings, such as the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, were to have been handed over, by the terms of the Kiersey compact, to the Pope. This clipping of the Lombards' wings, by forming a powerful state under the Pope all round them, had not up to this time been put into effect. Aistulf's donation of the exarchate had been temporarily accepted. Now that the Lombard kingdom was to be extinguished, it was only natural that there should be a reversion to the original deed of gift.

Charlemagne's diploma, signed by him and his chief men, both of Church and State, was placed in the confession of St. Peter. A copy of the same deed, which they had all sworn to observe, was taken away with them by the Franks.

By this donation of Charlemagne there were made over to the popes, besides the full exarchate of Ravenna, the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, the provinces of Venetia and Istria, the island of Corsica, and, arguing from the towns mentioned, viz., Luna (Sarzana), Parma, Reggio, etc., what, in addition to the exarchate, would make the larger portion of modern Emilia. By the province of Venetia would be meant that part on the mainland which was subject to the Lombard sway. Later writers, such as Leo Ostiensis (eleventh century); Cardinal Deusdedit, in his collection of canons (eleventh century); and Cencius Camerarius *(Lib. Censuum)* thirteenth century, all, from earlier documents, *e.g.*, the *Book of the Popes,* describe the donation in more or less the same terms.

The originals of these charters have unfortunately been lost. And there are not wanting modern historians who in call in question, if not the fact that Charlemagne gave a donation at all, at least that it had the extent that the papal biographer gives it. These critics urge that it is not likely that the Frank monarch would give such extensive territory to the Holy See; and that, *de facto*, dominion over many of the districts mentioned in the donation was never held by the popes, nay, was not even in the hands of Charlemagne, much less of Pippin, when the donations were made.

That there are difficulties in the matter of these deeds should not surprise us, when only abridgments of them have come down to us. But the criterion for the authenticity of ancient documents is not what certain modern critics may or may not *think likely*. Documents cannot be rejected because there are obscurities connected with them, or because their contents seem 'unlikely' to this or that historian, but only on very solid grounds. And certainly, with regard to the passage in the life of Hadrian regarding the donation of Charlemagne, there is no more real reason to doubt its authenticity than there is to doubt of the passage in the life of Stephen (III) III concerning that of Charlemagne's father Pippin. And if to disprove the authenticity of the grant of Pippin it would be necessary to disprove the authenticity of a great many other accepted documents, notably of many of the letters of Pope Paul in the Caroline Code, so also to disprove the grant of Charlemagne it would be needful to show the unauthenticity of many of the letters of Hadrian (or Leo III) in the same Code which seem to support the text in the *Liber Pontificalis.*

The territory—nearly two-thirds of Italy—which, according to the text in the *Book of the Popes,* was made over to the popes by the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne, stretched as far to the south as did the boundaries of the duchy of Beneventum, and in

the north to a line drawn from Sarzana (Luna, close to the Gulf of Spezzia) northwards along the river Magra, across the Apennines at the Cisa Pass, touching Berceto, Parma, Reggio, Mantua, and Monselice, and then turning so as to embrace Venetia and Istria. To this tract of country must be added the isle of Corsica.

Now, in the first place it is not denied that the popes never actually held possession of all the country included within the limits just named. But we shall proceed to show that after the donation of Charlemagne, the extant acknowledged authentic documents prove that the sovereign pontiffs passed into actual possession, or at least proved their right to so much of the territory marked out in the *donation,* as given in the *Liber Pontificalis,* as to make it only reasonable to suppose that that donation really represents the gift of Charlemagne. The evidence which will be adduced to establish this point will also go to furnish us with a reason why the *donation* was never actually carried out. The evidence will show us that the Frankish ruler was not powerful enough to bring much of the territory mentioned in the famous passage under his absolute sway.

One extract from a letter of Hadrian to Charlemagne will suffice to make it plain that that king did make a donation to *St. Peter,* and that it was similar to that made by his father. "Deign", writes the Pope, "to accomplish what your father and you yourself promised to Blessed Peter, and what afterwards, on the occasion of your visit to the shrine of the Apostles, you yourself confirmed, making the *same donation* to the same Apostle in your own person and with your own hands".

And to establish the fact that the donation involved a grant of territory, and of regal jurisdiction over it, and not merely of *patrimonies, i.e.,* revenues or estates, it will be enough to note that Hadrian often distinguishes in his letters to Charlemagne between the latter's gifts of *patrimonies* on the one hand and on the other of territory over which he (the Pope) was to exercise sovereign powers. And so on one occasion Hadrian had to complain to Charlemagne that, in connection with certain cities in the Beneventan territory—*de civitatibus partibus Beneventanis*— the king's missi would only hand over to him "the bishops' houses, monasteries and the public buildings, along with the keys of the cities, but not the men. They are left free to come and go as they list. And how can we hold the cities without the men, if their inhabitants can plot against them? We desire, therefore, to have full power over them and to rule and govern them as we do in the case of the cities in Tuscany which you have given us". The difficulty of giving the exact sense of this passage, though its general drift is clear enough, makes one heartily wish that either Hadrian, his secretaries, or their copyists had written clearer and better Latin.

There is further, we hold, solid reason to believe not merely that Charlemagne made to Hadrian a donation, but that the text under discussion in the *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the substance of that donation. To begin with, one might be tempted to think that it was not likely that the island of Corsica should be given to the popes. And yet a letter of Pope Leo III shows that the popes did actually possess Corsica, and that, too, by virtue of Charlemagne's donation. For that his "donation might remain intact", LeoIII "entrusts the affairs of Corsica" to the king.

Then, too, no matter how unlikely it may seem that the duchy of Spoleto should be granted to the bishops of Rome, there can be no doubt that it was included in the

grant. For Hadrian could confidently write to his royal friend : "Moreover, you yourself in your own person, through our Insignificance, offered to Blessed Peter, your protector, the duchy of Spoleto for the welfare of your soul". Nor need we remind the reader that the Spoletans had already placed themselves under the Pope, and that, in testimony thereof, their duke, Hildeprand, who had sworn allegiance to the Pope, dated his documents "in the times of the thrice blessed and angelic lord, Hadrian, pontiff and universal Pope".

But what of Lombard Tuscany, *i.e.*, the country between Luna and the boundary of the duchy of Rome? Well, again the letters of Hadrian to Charlemagne show that at least half of it was sooner or later in the hands of that pontiff. For not only does he mention as his the southern towns of Suana, Tuscana (Tuscanella), Viterbo and Balneoregis (Bagnorea), etc., but others as far as Rosellae, Populonium and Castrum Felicitatis; unless, indeed, in the case of Populonium and Rosellae there was not merely question of *patrimonies.*

However, whether or not Hadrian ever possessed the whole of Lombard Tuscany, it is certain, at any rate, that he never held the whole of the duchy of Beneventum. But that does not make it certain that it was never given to him. On the contrary, we know, on the one hand, that he actually did become the lord of a part of it; and, on the other hand, a fragment of a report of Charlemagne's *missi* (envoys), which has come down to us, shows that the authority of the Frankish monarch was not strong enough there to enable him to put Hadrian in possession of the duchy. Besides, it is the less wonderful that Beneventum should have been included in the donation, when it is remembered that the Beneventans had *commended* themselves to Pippin *through* Pope Stephen (II) III.

Finally, there is a passage in a letter of Stephen (III) IV (768-772) to John of Grado, which would seem to allude to the donation of Pippin (and hence to that of Charlemagne, which does but confirm that of his father), and to the conferring of power on the Pope over even Istria and Venetia. "In the general treatywhich was drawn up between the Romans, Franks and Lombards", writes the Pope, "your province of Istria and that of Venetia were included. Hence let your holiness trust in God, that as the *men* of Blessed Peter engaged on oath to be true to the interests of the Prince of the Apostles and to his vicars, who will sit in this See to the end of time, they also engaged in writing ever to defend your province from the oppression of enemies, just as this our province of the Romans and the exarchate of Ravenna". The import of the passage is certainly not too clear, nor do I know whether it refers to the marriage treaty of 770 arranged between Charlemagne and Desiderius by Bertrada, or to some other. But as Stephen IV quotes the example of his predecessor Stephen (II) III's interest in Istria, it would appear that rights over it conceded to Stephen III were asserted by Stephen IV.

In a period when the records of history are as scant as they are at the close of the eighth century, it would be difficult to find an historical text better supported by supplementary documents than is the *donation passage* in the biography of Hadrian I.

With evidence, then, such as this before us, we cannot doubt that Charlemagne, by a fresh donation, confirmed that of his father, and that both donations included other territories besides that of the exarchate, *viz.*, those mentioned in the disputed text. On the other hand, it is also certain, as has been said, that those additional territories did not

all come under the power of the popes immediately after they had been granted to them. And, in fact, *dominion* over some of them, such as Istria, etc., was never acquired by the popes at all. This is to be accounted for to some extent by the fact that both Pippin and Charlemagne promised to give that of which they were not actually possessed. And when Charlemagne afterwards obtained more or less complete control over the whole of the districts enumerated in his donation, one cause and another—perhaps a certain unwillingness to part with what he had won only with considerable cost; but certainly, still more, because his hold on some of the conquered provinces was not too firm—stood in the way of his fully carrying his donation to completion. And though it is no part of the duty of the defenders of the authenticity of the donation text to be able to state why a promise made was not kept, it may be suggested, with Duchesne, that Charlemagne's promise of 774 was, with the consent of the Pope, restricted as useless and incapable of fulfillment on the occasion of the king's visit to Rome in 781. And if the popes never had full jurisdiction over all the lands named in the donation they certainly received fresh rights over them and additional revenues from them. And by the end of the year 787, Pope Hadrian was the actual ruler not only of the duchy of Rome and the exarchate, but also of various cities in Lombard Tuscany, as Suana (Sovana), Tuscana (Toscanella), Viterbo, etc., and in the duchy of Beneventum, as Sora, Arpinum, Aquino, Capua, etc.

Hitherto in connection with our account of the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne no mention has been made of the famous so-called 'Fantuzzian Fragment'. In the year 1500 the Venetian Government made a collection of some 270 of the more important documents which concerned their relations with various popes and princes. The original collection is now lost. Two faulty copies of it, however, still exist. From one of these Fantuzzi published the 'fragment' which bears his name. The document purports to give a detailed account of the transactions between Pippin and Stephen (II) IIIat Quiercy. It begins by asserting that, bitterly oppressed by the Lombards, Stephen asked and obtained leave of the Greek emperor to apply to the Franks for aid. It then states that, with the consent of all his chief men, Pippin undertook, if God should grant him to become conqueror of the Lombards, to bestow for the good of his soul on Blessed Peter, the "keybearer of the heavenly kingdom", and on the Pope, his vicar, Corsica and the other territories, already mentioned from the *Book of the Popes.* To which, in this fragment, Naples seems to be added.

The writer of this document, from his mention of the emperor Leo IV, would seem to have lived at the close of the eighth century.

This document has had its authenticity as stoutly attacked as defended. Without going into the pros and cons of the matter, we may sum up the pros with Jungmann. "The style of the fragment, with its barbarous Latinity, points to its origin in Lombard times. The accuracy of various minute details given in the document, and the way in which it squares with the lives of Stephen III and Hadrian, as we know them in the *Liber Pontificalis,* are enough to show the fragment is really authentic". Were it so, it would, of course, afford a strong confirmation of what we have already said with regard to the extent of Charlemagne's donation.

But no great weight can be attached to a document concerning which there are *cons* not a few, and which is regarded as spurious by many distinguished scholars. In the first place, the *Fragment,* which is drawn up as though it proceeded from Pippin, is addressed to Pope Gregory! "*Pippinus ... Gregorio apostolica sublimitate fulgenti*". But both before and after that expression there is always question of Pope *Stephen,* so that the introduction of 'Gregory' cannot be said to tell seriously against the authenticity of the document. Then Stephen is represented as asking, not Constantine Copronymus, who was the emperor during his reign, but Leo (IV) to allow him to turn to the Franks for aid against the Lombards. Here again there is an answer. It is pointed out that, as early as the year 751, Leo was associated with his father in the Empire. And if, as is supposed by various authors, the *fragment* was composed during the sole reign of Leo IV (775-780), there is obvious reason why his was the name selected for mention. The greatest difficulty in the way of allowing the genuineness of the document seems to be that the emperor of Constantinople is represented as authorizing the appeal of the Pope to the Franks for their support and patronage against the Lombards. But even this seems far from an insuperable objection. To play off one foe against another was a very common policy of the rulers of Constantinople, especially from the days of Justinian; and, it may well have been thought at this time in the capital of the Empire, that, if the Franks broke the power of the Lombards and gave most of their territory to the popes, the latter would prove a foe which could be much more easily overcome by the imperial troops than the fierce Lombard. Hence their ready consent to the Pope's request. As nothing depends upon the authenticity of this document of Fantuzzi, we may be pardoned for referring the reader elsewhere for further information with regard to it.

It would be neither possible nor desirable to discuss here all the different theories that have, on more or less strong grounds, been broached in connection with this donation. But in concluding our remarks on this subject, it may be useful to call attention to the truth that the dominion of a sovereign prince over a country does not necessarily imply his personal ownership of it, nor, *vice versa,* does ownership of a district imply supreme rule over it, but that in practice the overlord will probably possess more or less of the land of which he is the suzerain. And so it would not result, as a matter of course, that the popes were the supreme rulers of the districts where the 'patrimonies' of the Roman Church were situated; nor, on the other hand, because we find patrimonies in certain regions being given to them, would it follow that they were or were not already supreme rulers of those regions. The patrimonies were, so to speak, the State property, the "crown lands" of the Roman Church and the popes. They were the private property of the Roman See, and were situated both where the said See had supreme dominion and where it had not Charlemagne then, it would seem, to all practical purposes *increased* both the private property of the Church, *i.e.,* its patrimonies at least, by restoring in various districts its 'rights', which the Lombards had usurped, and its dominion, by rendering real a control which in some localities had, up to this date, existed only in a sealed parchment.

After he left Rome, Charlemagne returned to Pavia, which was forced to surrender unconditionally (June 774). Desiderius and his wife were taken by Charlemagne with him into France, where Desiderius is said to have died a holy death in the monastery of Corbie. And thus, in the words of an ancient writer: "Here was finished the kingdom of

the Langobardi, and began the kingdom of Italy, by the most glorious Charles, king of the Franks, who, as helper and defender of lord Peter, the prince of the Apostles, had gone to demand justice for him from Italy. For no desire of gain caused him to wander". After he had, as king of the Lombards, received the homage of the chief men of the conquered country, and placed garrisons in Pavia and a few of the frontier cities, Charlemagne returned to France.

Except that he had an overlord of a different nationality, the Lombard was left by Charlemagne well-nigh as free as he found him. But, after an inglorious existence of over two hundred years, inglorious in peace, for it produced no great man, and in war, for it never subdued all Italy, the kingdom of the Lombard now passed away for ever from before the eyes of the popes—another of the many kingdoms which the undying line of the Roman pontiffs has seen born and die! In the South of Italy, however, the dukes of Beneventum, who from this time forth assumed the title of prince, and whose territory comprised perhaps most of what was afterwards the kingdom of Naples, preserved more or less of independence for their Lombard countrymen.

No sooner had Charlemagne left Italy than Hadrian was beset by political difficulties of all kinds. Difficulties incidental to the establishment of a new order of things; difficulties from within and difficulties from without. Hadrian's first trouble after the departure of Charlemagne was from those "of his own household". We have seen Leo of Ravenna acting independently of the Pope in the affair of Paul Afiarta. Power must have proved sweet to him. No sooner had Charlemagne crossed the Alps than the archbishop seized various cities of Emilia, expelled the papal officials and appointed his own, and tempted the loyalty of the citizens of the Pentapolis. But these latter remained firm in their allegiance to Hadrian, as they had done to Stephen (II) III, "to whom", writes the Pope to Charlemagne, "your father and yourself gave the exarchate... And so the enemies of both of us are now striving to take away from us the power we exercised even in Lombard times". To gain over the Frank monarch to his side, Leo betook himself to Francia. He, however, obtained no satisfaction from Charlemagne, who assured the Pope that he would see that his donation was carried into effect. But, convinced that the Frankish king was too occupied with the Saxons (against whom Charlemagne had to be in arms off and on from 773-804) to be able to interfere with him, Leo, on his return from *Francia*, gave out that the cities of Imola and Bologna had been given to him and not to the Pope, and continued to act as before.

So that, for instance, when the Pope sent his treasurer Gregory to the aforesaid cities to bring thence to him their magistrates, and to receive the oaths of fidelity from all the people, Leo would not suffer the Pope's functionary to approach the cities. In like manner, when, by a formal official document, Hadrian had appointed a certain Dominicus count of the little city of Gabellum, the rebellious archbishop sent a body of troops to seize the new count. This they did, and at the time (November 775) when the Pope wrote the letter which furnishes us with all these particulars, Dominicus was a prisoner at Ravenna,

Disloyal to the Pope, Leo, not unnaturally, seems to have been disloyal to Charlemagne also. He doubtless realized that when the Frankish king had a free hand he would have to render him an account of his rebellious conduct towards the Pope.

Accordingly he seems to have lent his support to those who were desirous of ousting the Franks from Italy. At any rate this is the conclusion that, in common with Hadrian, we draw from the action of Leo, narrated by the Pope to Charlemagne in a letter 1 of October 27, 775. Hadrian had received a most important letter from John, the patriarch of Grado—so important that neither Hadrian himself nor his secretary ate or drank till they had sent it off to Charlemagne along with a letter from the Pope. This document of John, which, with great probability, has been supposed to have had reference to the rebellion of Rodgausus (Hrodgaud) of Friuli, which broke out a month or two after this, had been confiscated on its way through Ravenna by Leo. The archbishop broke the seals, made himself acquainted with the contents of the letter, and only then sent it on to Hadrian. Fully warranted by the circumstances seems the conclusion of the Pope—that Leo communicated the intelligence he had acquired by his arbitrary conduct "to Arichis, Duke of Beneventum, and to the rest of our and your enemies".

How many troubles would have been spared the popes if they could have made up their minds centuries earlier than they did to govern their dominions in a less paternal but more practical manner. If the people of our own century and country even require sometimes to be *kept* in order, how much more did the still semi-barbarian races which were in possession of Europe in the eighth century.

However, as after this Hadrian never again alludes to any difficulties with Leo, we may conclude that Charlemagne's ambassadors, whom the Pope was then expecting, restored his rule in the exarchate and Emilia.

These same ambassadors, Bishop Possessor and Abbot Radigaud, caused Hadrian no little anxiety, not merely because they did not arrive when he expected them, but because, "when they reached Perugia, instead of continuing their journey hither, as your Excellency (Charlemagne) had ordered them, and as we gathered they would from your letters, setting us at naught, they directed their steps to Duke Hildeprand at Spoleto, and sent word to us by our missi that when they had had some converse with Hildeprand they would, according to their orders, join them (Hadrian's envoys) at our palace". Then, what was worse, despite the Pope's urgent request that they would come to him at least before they went to Beneventum, they again made no account of his wishes but went immediately from Spoleto to Beneventum, thereby, as Hadrian imagined, disgracing him and unduly elating the Spoletans. His apprehensions were, however, entirely groundless. The king's *missi* had not been unfaithful to their sovereign's directions: still less had Charles himself been unmindful of the Pope's interests. This Hadrian discovered when the *missi*, at the close of the year (775), had at length presented themselves to him : "We beg to inform your Excellency concerning your most faithful *missi,* that (as we had already discovered and had by letter notified your royal power), when they had been presented to us, we found them true to your patron, St. Peter, as well as to us and to you. Hence we beg you receive them well".

Next year (776) Hadrian had to ask Charlemagne to remove from Tuscany Reginald, Duke of Clusium (Chiusi), for invading *our city* Castellum Felicitatis, which is generally supposed to be the same as the ancient Tifernum, destroyed by Totila, and the modern Citta di Castello, close to the left bank of the Tiber near its sources.

In the early part of this same year (776) Hadrian was brought face to face with a serious danger. Arichis, duke or prince of Beneventum, naturally full of Lombard sympathies, put himself at the head of a movement, the aim of which was to restore the Lombard supremacy in Italy. A conspiracy was formed between himself, Hildeprand, Duke of Spoleto (who was anxious to escape from any real subjection to Pope or Frank), Rodgausus (Hrodgaud), Duke of Friuli, and Reginald of Clusium, to combine in the March of 776 or 777 with Adalgis or Athalgisis, the son of Desiderius, who was expected then to land in Italy with a Greek force from Constantinople (whither he had fled on the fall of the Lombard kingdom), and to restore the said kingdom. For the time being, the marvelous activity of Charlemagne dealt the conspiracy a serious blow. He swooped down upon Friuli, and Rodgausus had lost both his duchy and his life before the Easter of this very year (776).

Throughout the greater portion of his reign Hadrian had ever to be on the watch against the intrigues of the Lombards. As long as Arichis remained unsubdued, it was only to be expected that the Lombards would rally round him and strive to regain their supremacy inItaly. But in Hadrian they met their match. His untiring watchfulness frustrated their plans. Charlemagne was kept well informed of their doings, and before they were completely matured they were invariably crushed by that equally unwearied and strong sovereign. Again, another powerful combination was formed in Italy. What made these designs all the more formidable was the fact that they had the support of Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, who, like Arichis, had married a daughter of Desiderius. The Beneventans formed an alliance with the Greeks of Terracina and Gaeta, where the patrician of Sicily was then residing, with the immediate object of subjecting certain of the papal cities of Campania to the Patricius (777). But a force sent by Hadrian checked their plots by the capture of Terracina. The effect of this was to make the Greeks at first wishful for peace; but, backed up by Arichis, who was daily expecting Adalgis from Constantinople with a Greek army, and aided by the Neapolitans, they recovered Terracina (780). In informing Charlemagne of these occurrences, Hadrian assures him that he asks his aid not on account of the loss of Terracina, but lest the Beneventans should succeed in throwing off the Frankish yoke altogether. Convinced of the magnitude of the danger, Charlemagne again set out for Rome, taking with him his wife and two of his sons. One of these, Carloman, the Pope baptized, giving him the name of Pippin. Both of them he anointed as kings. Pippin was named king of Italy, and Louis, king of Aquitaine. By the joint exertions of ambassadors from the Pope and Charlemagne, Tassilo submitted. The difficulty with the Greeks seemed to be put in a fair way to being finally settled, as, in consequence of a request from Irene, who was now ruling in the East, Charlemagne's daughter was espoused to the empress's young son (781). Trusting that a peace of permanent duration had now been secured, Charlemagne again set out for France, after having put the Pope in actual possession of the Sabine territory—*viz*., the territory about Rieti.

Apart from the letters between Hadrian and Charlemagne regarding the Sabine territory, very little of their correspondence between the years 781-6 has come down to us. A curious fragment, however, of the king's instructions to his *missi,* as to how they should behave towards the Pope, has escaped the destroying hand of time, and belongs to this interval.

The ambassadors are told to begin by offering to the Pope the respects of his son King Charles, of his daughter Fastrada, "our queen", of all his family, and the whole nation of the Franks. The Pope is to be thanked for informing the king of his health. For the king is happy when he hears of the safety of the Pope or of "your people". Hadrian is also to be thanked for his holy prayers, for which the king would be glad to make a suitable return. Through these same prayers and the mercy of God, the king and all his are well.

When the king's letter is presented to the Pope, the *missi* are to ask his gracious reception of it, and of the presents—such as Charlemagne could get in Saxony—which they are to show to Hadrian at his good pleasure. More valuable presents will be sent as soon as procurable.

For some years, indeed, there was peace in S. Italy, but in 786 the restless Arichis, for some cause or other at war with the Greeks, received a defeat from the Neapolitans when attacking one of their cities (Amalfi). But mutual dread and dislike of Charlemagne once more united these enemies. The unfaithful Tassilo was again induced to join against the common foe, and he in turn endeavored to secure the aid of the barbarian hordes on his frontier. The breaking off of the engagement between Rotruda and the young Constantine was followed by a hearty cooperation of the ambitious Irene in the alliance against the Frank monarch (787).

But, as before, Charlemagne was at Rome in the very center of his enemies before their schemes were ripe. After careful deliberation with the Pope and with the Frank leaders, it was decided to commence operations by crushing Arichis. When the duke heard that the dreaded Frank was already at Capua, he sent to offer his submission; and, as evidence of it, his sons as hostages, and money. Charlemagne, "having more regard for what was for the welfare of the people than for the man's obstinacy, granted his request, accepted the hostages he had sent; and for a large sum of money excused him from personal attendance. Only the younger son (Grimwald) was detained as a hostage. The elder (Romuald) was sent back to his father".

Charlemagne next turned his attention to Tassilo. That faithless prince, to gain time, sent ambassadors to induce the Pope to act as mediator between his offended suzerain and himself. Hadrian had no difficulty in soothing Charlemagne's anger against Tassilo. But when the Pope discovered that he was simply being made a tool of, he sent to let the Bavarian know that he would excommunicate him if, after all the promises he (Tassilo) had made, he did not submit; and that he would throw on him all the guilt of the spilling of Christian blood which obstinate perseverance in rebellion on his part would cause. This further introduction of excommunication as a factor in politics is noteworthy. Tassilo, a Catholic prince, had been guilty of perjury and calling in to his aid pagan barbarians, a course of action most inimical to the welfare of Christendom. As the recognized Head of the Church, which all Christendom then believed that they were bound to 'hear', Hadrian had a right to judge of the public crimes of Christian princes. "Excommunication" was the natural punishment to be inflicted on Catholics obstinately guilty of grave offences against the Church. But since, as yet, by the public law of Christendom, no tangible temporal penalties were attached to excommunication, the threat of it would have fallen to no purpose on the ears of

Tassilo, had they not soon after heard the clang of the approach of Charlemagne's army. Then, again, he was all submission. And once again, on his giving hostages, was he pardoned by the magnanimous Frank (October 787).

Kindness was, however, thrown away on both Arichis and Tassilo. Both were soon again plotting against the rule of their generous enemy. The rapidity of Charlemagne's movements in 787 had anticipated the arrival of any assistance for them from Constantinople. But Adalgis had never ceased laboring to get a Greek force with which to make an attempt to recover his father's throne. At length word was sent to the allies that he had obtained his end and was setting sail with a considerable force from Constantinople (788). He landed in Calabria, as the *toe* of Italy was then called, to find that Arichis (787) and his eldest son, Romuald, were dead. At the request of the Beneventans, but against the advice of Hadrian, whose advice was justified not by the immediate acts of Grimwald but by his later, Charlemagne had sent back Grimwald to be the new duke of Beneventum. To begin with, Grimwald was faithful and cooperated with Charlemagne's generals. For on this occasion, though he struck in again before his opponents were ready, Charlemagne himself did not go into Italy, but turned his attention to the more formidable danger and summoned Tassilo to him. Not powerful enough to disobey, Tassilo came, was condemned, and confined to a monastery. His dukedom was divided among various Frank counts (788).

In Italy, supported by the dukes of Beneventum and Spoleto, Charlemagne's troops were completely victorious over the Greeks about the middle of 788; and Adalgis is said by some to have died on the field of battle. "Legend has enshrined the memory of this champion of Lombard independence". This conflict practically put an end to Hadrian's troubles and fears from Lombard intrigue, and enabled him to pass the remainder of his days in comparative quiet.

However, before leaving the subject of Italian intrigues, for the purpose of showing more at large into what details of Italian politics the letters of Hadrian give us view, it may be worthwhile to draw out from that source account therein given of the negotiations connected with the surrender of Capua to the popes. That the story will be incomplete will only prove that it depends upon the Caroline Code.

Towards the close of the year 787 Charlemagne sent two embassies into Italy to arrange about the succession to the duchy of Beneventum (owing to the death of its duke Arichis and his eldest son in the summer) and the surrender to Hadrian of certain cities in the Beneventan territory. The deacon Atto, and Goteramnus, 'the magnificent Gate-keeper', belonged to the first embassy. The second was composed of Maginarius, abbot of St. Denis, Joseph, a deacon, and Count Liuderic—both embassies thus exemplifying the king's general custom of combining clerical and lay officials as his *missi*.

The second son of Arichis, viz., Grimwald, was in the hands of Charlemagne, and Hadrian used every effort to keep him there. "Know for certain", wrote the Pope to the Frankish monarch, "that if you send Grimwald to Beneventum, you will never be able to keep Italy free from disturbances". It was equally the aim, on the contrary, of the widowed Adelperga and the Beneventans to secure the succession of Grimwald to their dukedom.

Before his death Arichis had endeavored to strengthen his position by forming an alliance with Constantine (V) VI and Adalgis (Adelchis), who was at his court. To arrange the terms of the alliance, two imperial envoys landed in Lucania and proceeded to Salerno, where they had an interview with Adelperga (January 20, 788), finding, of course, that Arichis was no more. As their negotiations for the return of Grimwald were still pending, the Beneventans advised the imperial agents to betake themselves in the interim to Naples. This they did, and were received with all honors—with banners and images —by the Neapolitans.

Not all the Beneventans, however, were anxious for the rule of Grimwald. A strong party in Capua were desirous of being governed by Hadrian, and a deputation had early in January waited upon the Pope to make their wishes known to him. Hadrian at once wrote to Charlemagne's *missi*, who had left Rome for the Beneventan territory, to know what steps he had better take. He pointed out to the king's messengers that at least one benefit would result if he acceded to the wishes of the deputation, and that would be that two parties would in this way be formed among the Capuans. Thus divided, they would the easier be brought to fall in with his views and those of the king. Acting on the strength of this sound conclusion, he had caused the members of the deputation to swear fealty in the "confession" of St. Peter "to that apostle, to us, and to the king of the Franks".

Meanwhile the *missi* of Charlemagne had experienced a variety of adventures after their departure from Rome for Beneventum about new-year's day (788). The lateness of the arrival of Count Liuderic caused the two embassies to get separated, though Hadrian had expressed his wish to them that they should keep together, Atto and Goteramnus, passing through Valva, in the duchy of Spoleto (Castro Valve, some ten miles east of Lago di Fucino), arrived at Beneventum a few days before Maginarius and his party, who were by arrangement following the course of the river Sangro. Of this embassy there is extant the report which Maginarius sent to his master, and which we have cited before. On account of its interest we will let the report speak for itself.

"When we *(i.e.,* Maginarius and his two colleagues) learnt that the men of Beneventum were not disposed (towards you) as they ought to have been, we notified this to the other embassy, and asked them, if they judged it best, not to go on to Salerno before we arrived at Beneventum.

"When we reached the borders of the Beneventan duchy we found there was no sort of loyalty towards your Excellency. Accordingly we dispatched a second letter to Atto and party to await us at Beneventum, that, as the Apostolic lord (Hadrian) had advised, we might act together; and if on our arrival at Beneventum we were all convinced of the loyalty of its people, we might proceed to Salerno. But if not, we might there together discuss the Pope's interests and yours, as you had ordered.

"We had been informed that they (Atto, etc.) would await our coming ... But when, after journeying through a disloyal population—against whom may God be opposed—we reached Beneventum, we found that they had left for Salerno the day before.

"This distressed us very much, both because we had not our companions with us, and because those faithful to you assured us that, if we proceeded on our journey, the

men of Salerno would detain us until they knew what you intended doing with Grimwald and their envoys. They, moreover, added that unless we could assure them at Salerno that you would let Grimwald be their duke, and give back to them the cities you had granted to St. Peter and the Pope, they would not fulfill your orders, but would keep us prisoners...

"Thereupon I, Maginarius, feigned to be ill, and said that I could not possibly go on to Salerno. Then, with a view of getting our friends back, I wrote to Adelperga and others of the Beneventan nobility, to the effect that I wished to send on Joseph and Liuderic to them, but that they were unwilling to go without me. Hence that it would be well for them to send Atto and Goteramnus back to us, with twelve or so of the Beneventan nobility, to whom we might unfold our commission. And then, if my health permitted, I would go on to Salerno with the others; and if not, that my four companions at least would make their way thither.

"Adelperga would, however, only send back Goteramnus. And though, when we had discussed the disloyalty of the Beneventans, he wished to return to Salerno on account of Atto, we decided it was better for one to be kept a prisoner than two. And then, at cock-crow, we fled secretly, and with difficulty reached the territory of Spoleto (at Valva)".

To the information contained in this mutilated letter of Maginarius, further particulars may be added from the letters of Hadrian. The story went, says the Pope, that Atto, hearing of the flight of his companions, betook himself to a church for sanctuary. But the Beneventans soothed his fears and sent him off to you (Charlemagne), continues the Pope, with a feigned offer of submission. Hadrian also assured the Frankish king that he had it on the authority of the priest Gregory, who was one of the leaders of the party that wished for the surrender of Capua to the Pope, that his ambassadors were the more anxious to escape from the city of Beneventum, because it had come to their ears that they were to be treacherously murdered if they returned to Salerno.

Whether there was any solid foundation for this assertion of Gregory, the whole history of this embassy shows how weak was the hold of Charlemagne on the duchy of Beneventum. It may have been consciousness of this weakness which induced Charlemagne to yield to the violence of the Beneventans, and to let them have Grimwald to rule them, to the great chagrin of the Pope and the ultimate disadvantage of the Frankish supremacy.

About Gregory and his party at Capua, the extant documents of the time say no more. From the donation of Louis the Pious, however, it may be safely concluded that a slice, at any rate, of the duchy of Beneventum was made over to Hadrian, inclusive of Capua.

Hence it may be noted that, before his death, Hadrian was the ruler not only of the exarchate and the Pentapolis, but of the duchy of Rome, which we must now think of as stretching from Grosseto (Rosellse) on the Ombrone to Capua on the Vulturno, and including Sora, Arpino, Arce, on the left bank of the Garigliano (Liris), and Aquino, Teano, Capua, which lay between the Vulturno and the Garigliano, and of the territories of Amelia, Todi and Perugia, which connected his Roman dominions with those on the

Adriatic. Whether or not he had given up claims to them, he certainly was not the ruler of the duchies of Spoleto or Beneventum, of Venetia or Istria.

The Adoptionist heresy

Even whilst engaged in these political struggles, Hadrian had also to cope with religious difficulties of no mean order. He had to deal with a new heresy, or, rather, with a new phase of an old one, *viz.*, Adoptionism, and with one which had for some sixty years been disturbing the peace of the Church, especially in the East, *i.e.*, Iconoclasm.

The beginnings of Adoptionism are wrapped in some obscurity; but they are thought to have sprung from some controversies with the little-known doctrines of a certain Migetius. Among other rather wild doctrines, he taught that in the Blessed Trinity were three *corporeal* persons, that David was God the Father incarnate; Our Lord, born of the Blessed Virgin, was the second person, and that St. Paul was the third person of the Blessed Trinity. His errors were condemned in a council at Seville (782), and by the Pope. The heresy of Migetius would not demand our attention were it not the occasion of Adoptionism. The principal opponent in Spain of the doctrines of Migetius was Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo. In arguing against his errors on the subject of the 'corporeal persons' of the Blessed Trinity, Elipandus went to the other extreme, and denied that the second person of the Blessed Trinity had a real human nature at all. He held that the human nature of God the Son was only an 'adopted' nature; and hence that Jesus Christ was not the true Son of God, but only His 'adopted' son. He thus practically revived the heresy of Nestorius. For the inference from the teaching of Nestorius, that was so fatal to that heresiarch in the eyes of the people of Ephesus, viz., that Our Lady was not the Mother of God, was equally applicable to the doctrine of Elipandus. It was further maintained, by at least some of the followers of Elipandus, that the second person 'adopted' the man Christ at the time of the baptism in the Jordan, and that consequently from that moment Jesus Christ was the Son of God by 'adoption'.

One of the first and ablest of the supporters of Elipandus was Felix, Bishop of Urgel in the Spanish March, *i.e.*, in that part of the north-east of Spain which was under the power of Charlemagne. By the year 785 controversy on the subject ran high; and Spaniards in the far Asturias wrote in opposition to Elipandus. Speedily informed of what was going on, Hadrian wrote a long letter "to all the orthodox bishops of Spain" this same year (785). He reminds them that the Roman Church is the head of the Churches throughout the world, and that whoever severs himself from that Church is out of the Christian religion; and says he has heard that certain bishops in Spain, setting at naught the doctrine of the Apostolic See, have introduced various new heresies. They, however, must strive to keep intact the doctrine which their predecessors received from "our holy Catholic and Apostolic See"; and hence must not allow to creep in among them the poisonous doctrines of Elipandus and his followers, "who do not blush to affirm that the Son of God is an adopted son, a blasphemy which no other heretic has dared to enunciate, except Nestorius, who made out that the Son of God was a mere man". The Pope next establishes the orthodox faith by proofs drawn from the New Testament and from the Fathers.

This letter produced no effect. The heresy continued to spread. By the command of Charlemagne a synod was assembled at Ratisbon in 792. Here the doctrine of the Adoptionists was condemned. Felix retracted and was sent to Rome to Pope Hadrian. In St. Peter's, in presence of the Pope, Felix again abjured his heresy. He solemnly placed one written profession of faith on the Sacred Species, and another on the tomb of St. Peter; and engaged on oath to believe and to teach that Jesus Christ was the true Son of God and not His adopted son.

Returned to Spain, he returned to his errors; and, that he might be free to propagate his views, he withdrew into a part of Spain that was under the sway of the Moors. Charlemagne now began to take energetic measures to combat the advances made by the new heresy. His first step was to recall his trusty counselor, Alcuin, from England: "Heresy is spreading in our lands; make haste thou to help us". Finding, however, all his efforts to move Felix, to whom he was personally attached, quite unavailing, Alcuin advised Charlemagne to summon another council to discuss the affair. The Frankish king, who had been asked by certain of the Spanish bishops, quite in the usual style of heretics who always appeal to the civil power, to decide the controversy himself, sent their communications to the Pope, begged his advice, and assembled a council at Frankfort in the beginning of the summer of 794, "by apostolic authority". Bishops, how many is not exactly known, came from all parts of Charlemagne's dominions. Two came to represent the Pope. Adoptionism was again condemned. Two refutations of it were drawn up and approved by the council. Among the decreesdrawn up by this council, as we shall have occasion to mention more in detail presently, there was one (the second) which condemned the Seventh General Council of Nice for teachings in reference to holy images, which were never enunciated by that Council. Hadrian also condemned the Adoptionist documents, which Charlemagne had sent him, in a letter addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Spain. "As it is a question of the faith", writes the Pope, "we have been obliged to reply to the letter of the Spaniards in writing and with the authority of the Apostolic See". This letter of the Pope, and the two refutations of Adoptionism, drawn up by the Italian and Frankish bishops respectively, were sent by Charlemagne to Elipandus and the other bishops of Spain, along with a letter from himself. The king of the Franks opens his letter with ardent words in praise of the blessings of unity. His warrior nature displays itself in the comparisons he uses. "As the ordered array of an army and the united bravery of the soldiers strikes terror into the enemy"—doubtless Charlemagne was thinking of the effect his disciplined forces produced on the unorganized courage of the Saxons —"so the peaceful union of the sons of our holy Mother the Church within the wall of the Catholic faith is terrible to the powers of darkness". He exhorts them to humbly search after the truth: "for it is better to be a learner of the truth than a teacher of falsehood ... The faith of all Christians must be one ... That the Spaniards are under the yoke of the infidel is pitiful, but that they should fall under the sway of unbelief or schism would be more so" ... To bring them back to the unity of the faith, he had summoned a council, and "on this new invention had three or four times sent embassies to the most blessed pontiff of the Apostolic See, to learn what answer to these questions would be given by the Holy Roman Church, taught as it was by the traditions of the Apostles". As for himself, he unites himself to the great numbers and authority of the fathers of the council, to the Apostolic See, and to the ancient Catholic traditions that have come

down from the early Church, rather than to the small number of Spaniards who have put forth a new doctrine. He entreats the Spaniards to do likewise, to remain with him firmly attached to the profession of the one Catholic faith, and not to consider themselves wiser than the Universal Church; and he reminds them that if they will not heed the apostolic authority and the unanimous voice of the synod, they must be accounted heretics, with whom he must not be in communion. Charlemagne concludes this letter, so full of the truest Catholic spirit, with a profession of faith drawn from the Nicene and Athanasian creeds.

This action on the part of the Frankish monarch did not, unfortunately, put an end to the heresy it was directed against. Even after the death of Hadrian, controversy on the subject was still brisk. Fresh apologies for his doctrine poured from the pen of Felix. These Charlemagne sent to Rome, and in response to the wishes of the king, Leo III held a council of 157 bishops in St Peter's (799). Here the doctrines of the Adoptionists were once more condemned. More effective than this, however, in putting an end to the Adoptionist heresy, was a mission which Charlemagne sent into the province of Urgel, to explain the true faith to the people. Besides bringing back thousands to the faith, they induced Felix again to present himself before a council. In the autumn of 799, at a council convened by Charlemagne, overcome by the logic of Alcuin, Felix once again renounced his errors. A second mission sent by Charlemagne to Urgel, the death of Elipandus—and Adoptionism died the death.

Whilst combating a new heresy in the West, Hadrian was helping to deal a severe blow at another in the East. The life of one hundred and twenty years of the Iconoclast controversy may be conveniently divided into three periods. In the first, from the publication of Leo III's first decree against the images (726) to the death of his grandson Leo IV (780), the Iconoclasts were masters of the situation. From that event (780) to the accession of Leo V the Armenian (813), especially whilst power was in the hands of the Athenian Irene, the orthodox party were in the ascendant; but under Leo V, Michael II and Theophilus, Iconoclasm was again rampant, till it was finally suppressed under Theodore (842). In 755 died miserably the tyrant Constantine Copronymus, crying out, according to Theophanes, that he was already tasting of the fire which is never to be extinguished. His son Leo IV, whose attention was fully occupied by the Saracens, and whose reign was but short (775-780), only began to prove himself a persecutor a few months before his death (October 780). The supreme power now fell into the hands of Leo's wife, the beautiful but ambitious Irene, as regent for her young son Constantine VI Porphyrogenitus. Under Irene the 'worship' of images was tolerated at once. And in compliance with the exhortations of Pope Hadrian, she decided to take measures for the restoration of the images and of communion with the West. Wars with the Saracens and Slavs prevented any active steps being taken for a few years, but at length matters were brought to a head, after a cessation of those wars, by the resignation of the patriarch Paul (August 784). On leaving his See he expressed his regret to the empress and her son that he had ever "sat in the sacerdotal throne of Constantinople, inasmuch as that Church was tyrannized over, and cut off by the other thrones from communion with them". And to the nobles he added: "Unless you assemble a general council and put an end to your errors, there is no hope of salvation for you". By the empress and people Tarasius, a layman and imperial secretary, was selected to succeed

Paul. Tarasius, however, after pointing out that the Church of Constantinople was anathematized as well by the other Churches of the East as by the West, and that there was need in the Church of one faith, one baptism, and concord and agreement in other ecclesiastical matters, declared that he would only accept their choice of him if the rulers would bring about a general council. After some demur on the part of the partisans of Iconoclasm, the condition was agreed to, and Tarasius was consecrated on Christmas Day, 784. He at once wrote to the Oriental patriarchs and to the Pope, requesting them to send delegates to assist at a General Council. Irene also wrote to Hadrian a letter which is found prefixed to the Acts of the Seventh General Council (August 785), in the different collections of the *Councils.* Saluting Hadrian as "the most holy head", who had received from Our Lord the highest dignity among the priests, as he has given us (viz., Constantine and Irene) the chief power in the State, she says that, with the advice of her priests and people, she has decreed the holding of an ecumenical council; and begs the Pope to come in person to it "as the true first priest and the one who presides in the place and See of St Peter's". If the Pope cannot come in person, he is entreated to send venerable and learned men with letters from him to represent him.

In his reply to the empress (October 785), which was read in the second session of the Seventh General Council, Hadrian rejoices in her intention to restore the orthodox faith by the restoration of the images, "Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, left to his successors, who were for ever to sit in his Sacred See, the chief power of the Apostolate, just as he had himself received it from Our Saviour. And it is by their tradition that we venerate the images of Our Lord, His Blessed Mother and the Saints". The Pope then at some length defends a rational use of images from the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers, and bewails the folly of those who would forbid the honoring of images, "in which are contained the histories of Our Lord and the Saints". If an ecumenical council had to be held, the pseudo-synod (of 753 or 754), held without the sanction of the Apostolic See, must be anathematized, and a safe conduct for the Pope's legates and a declaration of impartiality must be tendered by the rulers. Hadrian also asked for the restoration of the 'patrimonies' and his patriarchal rights, which had been taken away by Leo the Isaurian, and expressed his astonishment that the "title of universal patriarch" had in her letter been given to Tarasius by the empress. The title ought not to be employed, as it would seem to imply that the patriarch of Constantinople had the primacy which had been given by Our Lord to the Roman Church through Peter. Had it not been for his orthodoxy, the Pope could not have consented to the uncanonical election of Tarasius. To Tarasius himself, quite in the same strain, the Pope wrote another letter, which was also read in the second session of the Council.

No direct answer to the letter of Tarasius came from the Oriental patriarchs themselves, for the simple reason that, owing to the hostility of the Saracens, it never reached them. An answer, however, came from certain 'archiereis of the East', as they style themselves, *i.e.,* as is clear from the context and the present use of the word among the Greeks, superiors of monasteries. By the advice of these men, the messengers of Tarasius did not proceed on their journey to the Oriental patriarchs, for fear of stirring up the Mohammedans against the whole body of Christians under their rule. But they (the messengers) returned with John and Thomas, syncelli, or chaplains, of the

patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria respectively, who were commissioned to testify to 'the apostolic tradition of the East', which they knew well. "Should you wish to hold a synod", the letter continues, "be not concerned at the absence of the three patriarchs and of the bishops under them; for this is due to the threats of their temporal rulers (the Saracens), and not to their own wish". Their absence did not interfere with the authority of the Sixth General Council, especially as the Pope of Rome gave his assent to it ... "To give weight to our letter, we send the synodical letter which Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, once sent to the patriarchs Cosmas of Alexandria and Theodore of Antioch; and which called forth responsive letters from them to him".

An attempt to hold the council in Constantinople (August 786) failed owing to the violence of the imperial bodyguard, a band of men full, of course, of the views of Constantine and Leo. Next year, however, after Irene had disbanded the old bodyguard and formed a new one, the bishops again met, to the number of some 350, at Nicaea, and held their first session in September, 787. Though Tarasius directed the work of the synod, the Pope's legates held the first place in the assembly, as the acts, which they always sign first, show. The enemies of the holy images were anathematized, and the Council, at the end of the seventh session, decreed that "images of Our Lord, of our immaculate Mother, and of the Saints in any material might be placed anywhere. The oftener one looked on these representations, the more would the onlooker be stirred to the remembrance of the originals, to imitate them, and to offer his greeting and his *reverence* to them, not the actual worship of 'latria', which belonged to the Godhead alone; but that he should offer, as to the figure of the cross, the books of the holy Gospels, and to the other sacred things, incense and lights in their honor, as this had been the sacred custom 'with the ancients; for the honor which is shown to the figure passes over to the original, and whoever does reverence to an image does reverence to the person represented by it".

At an eighth session, held in Constantinople, the decree was signed by Irene and Constantine. It is interesting to note that "the scene is represented in a Greek MS., now in the Vatican, and the young emperor (the empress is omitted) is the most conspicuous personage. In the foreground is a prostrate figure, which seems to represent the spirit of Iconoclasm that was now overthrown". On the termination of the Council, Tarasius wrote to the Pope (788), whom he speaks of as adorned with the high priesthood and as hastening to destroy error with the sword of the Spirit, to inform him of what had been done at the Council, how they had all embraced the confession of the truth which the Pope had sent; and how the emperors had re-erected the images both in the Churches and in the palaces. The Pope's legates returned with letters from Irene and with the Acts of the Council in Greek, bearing the autograph signatures of the empress and her son. Thus, for a time at least, the image question was at rest in the East.

But in the West it was quite the reverse. Where there had been peace on the image question there was now war. Though Hadrian did not send a formal confirmation of the Council to Irene, because his just demands, in connection with the restoration of the patrimonies and of his jurisdiction in the diocese of Illyricum, had not been attended to, he nevertheless received the Council, and ordered its acts to be translated into Latin. His orders were obeyed indeed; but so bad a translation was made that Anastasius, the librarian, who again translated the acts, assured Pope John VIII that the first interpreters

had employed such a slavish word for word translation that the sense of the original could scarcely ever be discovered. Up to this the Franks entertained the same rational views with regard to the use of images as was entertained then in the other countries of the West, and as is entertained now in the Catholic Church. Even to this day the use of images is not so great in the West as in the East. Reflecting on this fact, and that Charlemagne was annoyed at Irene for breaking off the engagement between her son and his daughter, it need cause no great surprise that the arrival, among the Franks, of a bad translation of the Acts of the Seventh General Council caused considerable disturbances in their country. And in combating what they supposed to be the blasphemous idolatry of the Greeks, they, at least to some extent, left the 'via media' in which they had previously been, and denied that any, even relative, honor was, in practice at any rate, to be paid to the sacred images.

The Caroline Books

In 790 appeared the famous *Caroline Books,* which, issued under the name of Charlemagne, are often groundlessly attributed to Alcuin. These books (four in number) condemned alike the Council of Constantinople (753 or 754) for ordering the destruction of images, which the books consider useful, and the Council of Nice for ordering their *adoration.* Throughout, the *Caroline Books,* ignoring the plain distinction between adoring images *absolutely,* and *adoring them relatively,* a distinction which the Council of Nice had made clear by the use of the words 'latria' on the one hand and 'proskunesis' on the other, speak as though the Seventh General Council had placed the 'adoration' or worship to be offered to the Blessed Trinity and to images on the same level. Hence, at the close of the preface of the first book, its authors say that "they hold to the orthodox doctrine, according to which images must serve only to ornament the churches and to recall past events, while God alone must be adored, and His saints only honored with the veneration which is their due; and hence they neither break the images with the one synod, nor adore them with the other". Throughout these books also there is displayed a great want of accuracy, and the animus of their authors against the Eastern rulers is displayed by the absurd points which they endeavor to make against them—*e.g.,* their arrogance in giving to their letters the name of 'Divalia'. Other matters not at all to the point are discussed in these 'books', such as the 'procession' of the Holy Ghost in the beginning of the third book; and some of the arguments for the worship of images, which had been adduced by some of the more simple Fathers of the Nicene Council, are crushed with pitiless logic. But in some cases the authors of the Caroline books, either in bad faith, or misled by the wretched translation that had fallen into their hands, erected men of straw for themselves, and then triumphantly demolished them. Smartly do they attack the Nicene bishops for putting images and the Blessed Eucharist on the same level. The Council of Nice, however, so far from doing anything of the sort, would not even have the 'unbloody sacrifice' called the 'image of Christ'; for, of course, it was in their eyes Christ Himself, and not an image of any kind. Again, the Caroline books find no difficulty in annihilating the Seventh Council for *approving* of the language of Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, who had the courage to

give voice to what the rest of the council thought, and to say boldly that he paid the same homage to images as he paid to the Blessed Trinity. Constantine, as a matter of fact, had said: "I embrace with honor the holy and venerable images, but true adoration I offer to the Holy Trinity alone". There is no doubt that the *supposed* utterance of Constantine was what most put the Franks on the wrong tack in their estimation of the work of the Seventh General Council. And so, as we shall see presently, they were the very words singled out for condemnation by the Council of Frankfort. With glorious inconsistency, too, the *Libri* assert "Whilst in the matter of images we despise nothing except the 'adoration' of them, they (the Fathers of the Council) place all their faith in them; though we venerate the saints in their *bodies,* or rather in the *relics* of their bodies, and in their *vestments,* according to the tradition of the ancient Fathers!"

Of one thing in their reckless attack on the seventh synod the authors of the *Libri* were careful; and that was to show their loyalty to the Holy See. Anxious lest, whilst attacking a council presided over by the Pope's legates, they might be thought wanting in respect to the See of Rome, they take an early opportunity of setting forth "how much the Roman Church has been raised by Our Lord above the other churches, and how it must be consulted by the faithful". Only those texts of Scripture are to be recognized which are taken from the books acknowledged by her to be canonical, and only those Fathers are to be considered as authorities who have been acknowledged by the Roman pontiffs. As the apostles were above the other disciples, and Peter preeminent over the apostles, so the apostolic Sees are above the other Sees, and the Roman See above the other apostolic Sees ... After Christ, to obtain help to strengthen their faith, all must turn to her, who has no spot or blemish, who crushes heresy and strengthens the faithful in their faith". Hence, with that Church, the authors of the *Libri* would be one even in matters not of faith, as in modes of worship and singing.

Whether the *Caroline Books* were presented to the Fathers of the Council of Frankfort or not, it is certain that the question of the decision of the Second Council of Nice was discussed by them. For among the fifty-six chapterswhich they drew up, the second declared that the Greek synod, held at Constantinople (the last session of the Second Council of Nice was held in the imperial city), had condemned those who would not render to images the 'adoration' they rendered to the Blessed Trinity. All the bishops here present have refused to give 'adoration' to images, and have rejected the synod. It is quite plain that the bishops at Frankfort were under a completely wrong impression as to what the Seventh General Council had really decided.

Either in 792 or 794 the *Caroline Books* were sent to the Pope; or, rather, probably some abridgment of them. At any rate, it is quite certain from Hadrian's reply to them, that they were not sent to him in the form in which we now have them. The objectionable propositions were sent to the Pope, "to be corrected in accordance with his judgment". A very lengthy reply was sent by the Pope either in 794 or 795. Hadrian reminds Charlemagne that the care of the Church was given by Our Lord to St. Peter and his successors, and says that in replying to the king's communication, point by point, he will hold to the tradition of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. Hadrian then proceeds to reply to a great number of points which are by no means exactly those of the Caroline books, as we have them today. In unfolding the tradition of the Roman Church, Hadrian declares that time would fail him were he to attempt to

enumerate the churches his predecessors have built and adorned with statues and paintings, and to set forth the veneration they have paid them. The Seventh Council, he said, decided, in accordance with the teaching of St. Gregory I and his own, that honor was to be given to holy images, but true worshiponly to the Divine nature. Hence he concludes: "We accept the council. For if we did not, and men returned to the vomit of their error, who would be responsible on the great accounting day for the loss of so many thousand Christian souls but we ourselves? … We are more concerned for the salvation of souls and the preservation of the true faith than for the possession of the world". This was said by Hadrian in reference to the claim he had made to the Greek emperor for the restoration of the confiscated patrimonies.

With this, the image-difficulty was for the time settled among the Franks. The images remained in their churches; they still continued to *honor* the cross, the book of the Gospels, etc., and, beyond all doubt, the images themselves, though perhaps with less demonstration than the cross, relics and the rest. Up to this day has image-worship been practiced in France through the long-succession of the centuries. And as the traveler makes his way from village to village, and from town to town, throughout the length and breadth of sunny France, his mind is constantly raised to the thought of higher things by the frequently-recurring sight of the sign of our redemption or of the image of Our Lady or some Saint. Material objects indeed are they; but none so calculated to make us less material.

Before, however, leaving this question, we may be permitted to quote here a letter to the Pope from our countryman Alcuin, which many think was called forth by this image controversy. The letter is assigned to the July or August of 794. Alcuin opens his letter by imploring the prayers of that "venerable man, who was illustrious throughout the whole world for his goodness", and who was "the heir of that wondrous power" of binding and losing in heaven and on earth. He confesses himself a miserable sinner (for opposing the Pope at the Council of Frankfort on the matter of the images), and prays Hadrian to absolve him from his sins. He begs God long to preserve the life "of such a pastor".

In view especially of certain utterly baseless theories that many are endeavoring to have accepted in this country, the account of Hadrian's dealings with England will doubtless be more interesting to Englishmen than the Iconoclast controversy. In 773 the Pope granted the pallium to Ethelbert of York and in 780 we read in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that King Alfwold sent to him for the pallium for Eanbald, the successor of Ethelbert. A little later (786), understanding that things were not as they should be in England, Hadrian sent over to this country two special legates, George, Bishop of Ostia, and Theophylact, Bishop of Todi, "to renew the faith and peace which St Gregory had sent us by Augustine, the bishop, and they were worshipfully received and sent away in peace". There also came along with the bishops one Wighod, an ambassador from Charlemagne. What the legates did we can best learn from the letter of George to the Pope. He says that by the aid of the Pope's prayers, they at length reached England, and at once proceeded to the palace of Offa, king of the Mercians. "Owing to his reverence for Blessed Peter and your apostleship, he received with great joy both us and the sacred letters we had brought from the supreme See". They then went into Northumbria, where they found matters in a bad state, "as they were the first Roman priests who had been

sent there since the time of Blessed Austin". In a council (probably at Corbridge-on-Tyne), in presence of King Alfwold, the Pope's letters to the Northumbrians were read, and various canons (some twenty in number) were proposed to the king and his prelates and nobles for their acceptance. These canons had reference to the frequent holding of synods; the careful teaching of the faith "as it had been handed down to them by the Holy Roman Church"; the election of kings; the respecting of privileges granted to churches by Rome; the abstaining from violence on the part of all such as would keep "in communion with the Holy Roman Church and St. Peter"; the abolition of the practice of tattooing, of cruelty to horses, and eating their flesh, etc. All engaged to keep these decrees, with the aid of divine grace, to the best of their ability, and the leading men confirmed the decrees by placing their hands in the hands of the legates, as representatives of the Pope, and making the sign of the cross on the copy of the canons.

The letter then goes on to relate that the legates afterwards returned to Mercia; and, at a council at Calcuith (which Lingard supposes to be Chelsey), before Offa and Jaenbyret (Lambert), Archbishop of Canterbury, read, both in Latin and Teutonic that all might understand them, the decrees that had been approved of by the council in Northumberland. "All with one accord, grateful for the admonitions of your apostleship", promised to stand by the canons. In this synod King Offa, partly from hostility to the men of Kent and to their archbishop, and partly from motives of pride, tried to obtain from the council the recognition of Lichfield as a metropolitan See. As might have been expected, there was a stormy discussion. But Offa was determined, and he gained the bishops to his views. Lichfield was acknowledged as the archiepiscopal See of the country between the Thames and the Humber, Jaenbyret's possessions within the borders of Mercia were seized by the king. Offa even managed to obtain the consent of Pope Hadrian to his wishes. "From Pope Hadrian", says William of Malmesbury, "whom he had wearied with plausible assertions for a long time, as many things not to be granted may be gradually drawn and artfully wrested from minds intent on other occupations, he obtained (788) that there should be a bishopric of the Mercians at Lichfield". The Pope is even said, but wrongly, to have sent the pallium to the successor of the new archbishop, Higebert. It is interesting also to note that at this council Offa gave into the hands of the legates a deed by which he engaged that he and his successors should each year give to St Peter's at Rome 365 mancuses (a mancus = 30 pennies) to supply oil for the lamps and for the support of poor pilgrims.

Pope Hadrian was also called upon to adjudicate—with what result history does not inform us—between Offa and some of his political opponents, who had fled to the court of Charlemagne. In response to the repeated request of Offa to have them delivered up to him, Charlemagne sent them to Rome to have them tried before the Pope and "your archbishop". "For what", wrote the Frank to Offa, "can be more satisfactory than that the apostolic authority should decide cases in which there is difference of opinion?" What bloodshed would be avoided if this conduct of Charlemagne were imitated by the great ones of today! And the Frankish monarch had every reason to believe that such a course could not be unacceptable to Offa, as Hadrian had assured him that Offa's predecessors "had ever been subject in obedience and faithful love to the Pope's holy predecessors".

Other passages in the letter just quoted are not without interest as showing that the idea of having a Pope of Frankish origin, and so presumably subservient to their king, came into the fertile imaginations of the Gauls before the days of Philip the Fair or Napoleon I. “You write”, says the Pope, “that it has been reported to you that we have been informed that Offa has written to suggest to you that you should drive us from Our See and install therein one of your own nation. You have further written”, continues Hadrian, “to assure me that no such suggestion was ever made by Offa, whose only wish is that my paternity should be spared to govern the Church of God to the advantage of all Christians”. However, the Pope goes on to assure Charlemagne, he has not heard any such reports about Offa, who could not, had he been a pagan, have conceived such ideas; and, moreover, had he heard them, he would not have believed them. And in any case: “The Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me” (Ps. CXVII. 6).

It will not be out of place here to dwell at some little length on some other of the relations between Hadrian and Charlemagne.

The Case of Abbot Potho

About a ‘thousand paces' from the source of the Vulturno the traveler may behold the ruins of one of the most famous monasteries in Italy during the Middle Ages. Famous even in the eighth century, the monastery of St. Vincent, on the Vulturno, was at the time of which we are now writing in a most flourishing condition. Founded in the midst of what was then a most wild country, by the advice of that pious hermit, Thomas of Morienna (who had been the originator of the equally famous abbey of Farfa), and destined to be plundered over and over again by the Saracens in the following century, it was in the reign of Hadrian full of monks. We can easily understand how, in their hours of recreation, the monks must have discussed the great changes which were taking place in the government of Italy. A letter of Hadrian, which tells us of a commotion in this abbey, is in many ways the most interesting document of his age, as it lets us see what men were thinking and saying with regard to what was going on around them. A charge of treason against the abbot of St. Vincent's (one Potho) had been brought to the notice of Charlemagne. However, in accordance with the requirements of the canons, as the case concerned an ecclesiastic, the king referred the matter to Hadrian. The parties were duly summoned before a court at Rome, at which, with the Pope, there sat as assessors, archbishop Possessor the *missus* of Charlemagne, the abbot of Farfa, and three other abbots, Hildeprand, Duke of Spoleto, and various officials of the papal court*),* such as the librarian Theophylactus, Stephen the treasurer, Duke Theodore, the Pope’s nephew, and many others. One of the monks, Rodicausus (Rothgaud), stepped forward and said : “My lord, when we had finished Sext, and, according to custom, were singing the psalm—‘Save me, O God, by Thy name’—for the king and his family, the abbot suddenly stood up and refused to sing. On another occasion, when we were walking together, the abbot asked me: ‘What is your opinion of our cause? I have been expecting a sign in connection with it and have been disappointed. If it were not for the monastery and its Beneventan lands, I would count

him (Charlemagne) as a dog ... Would that there were no more Franks left than I could carry on my shoulder". To all this Potho indignantly retorted : "Our congregation always prays for the king's Excellency and for his children. And on the occasion referred to, I rose, suddenly indeed, but merely to attend to some business concerning the monastery. As for what was said during our walk, it was simply this: If it would not seem like desertion of the monastery and its interests, I would go to some place where I should not have to look after anybody. Finally, with regard to the Franks, I said nothing of what he alleges against me". Rodicausus could not bring forward any confirmatory evidence of his allegations, and his charges were further discounted when it was shown that he had been anything but an exemplary character. After a most careful investigation, the abbot was at length acquitted on his own oath, and that of ten 'compurgators (five Franks by birth and five Lombards), that he had never been "unfaithful' to the king".

The words of Rodicausus, if unjustly placed by him in the mouth of Potho, are an index of the independent spirit that was abroad at this period in the Samnite duchy, which was evidently too little in the power of Charlemagne for him to have handed it over to the Pope in its entirety, however much he may have wished to do so. It was, in practice, as much distinguished from the kingdom of Italy as the duchy of Rome and the Pentapolis.

As we have already seen, Charlemagne not only confirmed the Pope's supreme dominion over various parts of Italy, but also restored to him the various patrimonies which belonged to the Holy See, and had been seized by the Lombards, But it was one thing for Charlemagne to decree that these estates should be given back to the popes, and another for the popes to be able to get them back from those who were in possession of them. Hence Hadrian had a great deal of writing to do before he could come into his rights in connection with some of them. In five letters of the Caroline Code do we find negotiations between the Pope and the Frank king relative to the full restoration of the Sabine patrimony. Sometimes perverse and wicked men prevented even the envoys of Charlemagne from being able to carry out their sovereign's orders. Three years elapsed before the restoration of that patrimony was completely effected. There are also extant, at least, three letters that treat of the full restoration of the patrimonies of Rosellae, near the modern Grosseto, and Populonium, a maritime city, on the Aurelian Way, which had belonged 'of old' to the Holy See. For thus trying to regain his just rights, the charge of avarice has often been glibly thrown at Hadrian. But there is an avarice which is no avarice. It is idle to accuse of avarice a man who looks well after his own. And, as we shall see, no man ever made a better use of the money that came to him from the possessions of the Church than Hadrian, On one occasion we find him indignantly denying that he acted "from any avaricious desire of acquiring even the cities which Charlemagne had given to Blessed Peter and to him".

Other writers, again, accuse Hadrian of appealing to the "donation of Constantine" in order to substantiate his claims to dominion and patrimonies. This document may be found in the principal collections of the councils. It was received into the collection of the 'False Decretals', made by one calling himself Isidore, which appeared in France about the middle of the ninth century. In it we read that Constantine made over to the Pope not only the city of Rome and the whole of Italy, but all the

provinces of the West, and gave to the Roman clergy a great many privileges of honor. It is, of course, now admitted on all hands that the donation document is a forgery. But who was the author of the forgery, or when exactly it first saw the light, are questions which, if the truth be told, cannot be completely answered. Those who are not well disposed towards the popes give as early a date as possible to the composition of the donation, to insinuate, at least, that it was by producing a forgery to the Frank monarchs that the Roman pontiffs acquired their temporal power. This action of writers hostile to the popes causes authors who are attached to them to be desirous of putting the date as late as possible. However, of one thing we feel sure; no one who has attentively followed the history of the growth of the temporal power of the popes can believe that the so-called 'donation', produced, at the earliest, in the second half of the eighth century, had anything to do with the acquisition of sovereign power by the popes in that century. The donation of Constantine no more gave a rood of territory to the popes than the False Decretals gave them a title of spiritual power or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In theory or on paper the donation gave the Pope temporal authority enough; but in point of fact it certainly cannot be shown that it was the means of adding anything to the practical jurisdiction of the popes. What gave the popes their temporal sway in the eighth century was the previous march of great events over which they had no control, and not a trumpery piece of forged parchment And, as a matter of fact, when the popes' already existing temporal authority was extended by Pippin or confirmed by Charlemagne, where do we find any mention of the donation? It is indeed said that Pope Hadrian himself appeals to it. That the reader may judge for himself whether Hadrian did or did not cite the donation, we will translate the whole passage which is supposed to contain the allusion. Hadrian, after asking Charlemagne to see to the fulfillment of all that he had promised to the Church, continues as follows : "And as, in the times of Blessed Sylvester, the Roman pontiff, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church of God was exalted by the most pious emperor of blessed memory, Constantine the Great, and *power was given to it in these Western parts,* so in your and our most happy times may the Holy Church of God, *i.e.,* of Blessed Peter the Apostle, exult ... because a new most Christian emperor Constantine has arisen in these times, through whom God has deigned to bestow everything on his Holy Church of Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. Moreover, may there be restored in your day *all the other things* which have been granted to Blessed Peter and the Roman Church by divers emperors, patricians and other God-fearing men for the good of their souls and the pardon of their sins, in Tuscany, Spoleto, Beneventum, Corsica and the Sabine patrimony, and which have been in the course of time filched away by the unspeakable Lombards. We have sent, for the satisfaction of your Most Christian Majesty many of the *donations* which we have in our archives in the Lateran". In this passage, misled either by the so-called 'Acts of Pope Sylvester', or, perchance, too highly estimating the elevated position in the Western world which the recognition of Christianity by Constantine must have given to the See of Peter, Hadrianmay have exaggerated what Constantine effected for the Holy See. But there cannot have been question here of the donation of Constantine. There would have been no need, with such a donation (even if we limit it to Italy), to send to Charlemagne 'donations' of 'other emperors' of patrimonies in Tuscany, Spoleto, etc. It is plain that throughout this whole letter Hadrian is speaking of donations of money,

landed property and the like, *i.e.,* of the *patrimonies* of the Roman See and not of its newly-acquired regal sway over certain territories.

The donation, then, was not cited by a Pope before the year 1054, when Leo IX quoted it in writing to the patriarch Michael Cerularius. And we may say with Fleury, and others, that the first writer who cites it was Aeneas, Bishop of Paris, in a treatise that he composed against the Greeks, apparently about the year 867. Hincmar of Rheims, and his contemporary Ado of Vienne, are the next authors who mention the 'donation'. From this time forth, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages to the fifteenth century, it was regarded as authentic by both Greeks and Latins. Looking now at facts only, it appears, in the first place, that most of the MSS. of the 'donation' are of Gallic origin, as also are the most ancient of them. Fresh examination of the MSS. has apparently proved that the oldest copy of the deed, which is in the *Bibliothéque Nationale* of France, was written in the ninth century, and in the monastery of St. Denis. Further, though it would have been very useful to such popes as Nicholas I and Hadrian II in their controversies with Photius, it was not cited by the Roman pontiffs till after the middle of the eleventh century. But it was quoted by Gallic authors of the ninth century. Why, then, should we not conclude that it was forged among the Franks? A Frank would forge it as a means of defending the institution of the Frankish Empire against the diatribes of the Greeks. If Constantine made Pope Sylvester supreme in the West, then the popes could make over their rights to Charlemagne and his descendants.

Whoever was the author of the donation (very likely, as Grauert conjectures, a monk of St. Denis, near Paris, in the first half of the ninth century), it may perhaps be said that there is no convincing reason for believing that it saw the light before the ninth century, or anywhere else than in *France.* We may allow, however, with many modern critics, that it may have been forged about the year 774 in the Lateran itself, and that it may have proved useful in later times to the popes by furnishing them with a ready and handy weapon for defending their rights to power they had previously acquired. Still it assuredly cannot be shown that they were ever able to add by its means to the territory they already had—a remark equally applicable to the False Decretals in the domain of the spiritual power of the popes. As a matter of fact, too, the false donation was a document not much used by the popes; and it certainly cannot be shown that it affected public opinion either in Rome or elsewhere in the eighth century.

But not only in his temporal difficulties did Hadrian confidently turn to Charlemagne for help. It had come to the Pope's knowledge that various Lombard bishops were in the habit of interfering with one another's jurisdiction, and that certain monks and nuns among the Lombards had thrown off their monastic habits and contracted illicit marriages. He therefore wrote to Charlemagne to beg him to cooperate with him, that such disorders "might be canonically corrected in our and your times, among the whole Christian people committed by God to our (the Pope's) care". In a word, then, it may be said that these two master minds of their age, Hadrian and Charlemagne, always worked together in harmony.

This view, founded, it was believed, on a careful study of the extant documents, from which it was possible to judge of the intercourse of the Frankish king and the Roman pope, had been written down long before the publication of Dr. Hodgkin's last

volume of his most interesting *Italy and her Invaders.* When, however, the author of this view read therein: "The history of Italy during the quarter of a century before us (the last quarter of the eighth) is almost entirely the history of the strained relations between the two men, Charles and Hadrian, who had sworn eternal friendship over the corpse of St. Peter"—when he read this, he not unnaturally wondered whether prejudice had been at work and quite distorted his vision. He is content, however, to stand by his opinion, as he finds that Mr. Davis, the latest student in this country of the career of Charlemagne, has no hesitation in writing that the estrangements between the monarch and the Pope were but "temporary .... were ripples on the surface; they did not affect the broad stream of Frankish policy". For in Hadrian's own words, "it is my practice to try to oblige you, as it is yours to endeavor to gratify me"; and in Charlemagne's", your interests are ours, and ours are yours".

Of course it is only to be expected that for their own ends some would endeavor to disturb this harmony, and that during their long intercourse some slight differences of opinion or disagreements might arise between the Pope and his powerful protector. The letters of the Caroline Code prove that all this did really take place.

Two powerful officialsof Ravenna, who had perpetrated divers excesses, and in consequence were in dread of the Pope's resentment, fled secretly to Charlemagne trusting to make good their case by endeavoring to breed distrust between the Pope and the king. Hadrian, however, writing to Charlemagne and assuring him that he does not think that anyone can sever their close friendship, asks him not to show favor to these two wicked men, but to send them to him in disgrace, that they may be tried and punished, and so that the offering, *i.e.,* the donation, "made by your father Pippin and confirmed by yourself, may remain intact".

On another occasion, when a similar course had been pursued by others of his Ravennese subjects, Hadrian found it necessary to write in very plain terms to Charlemagne. After pointing out that if honor is due to the king's patriciate so is it also due to 'that of St Peter'—a form of speech used on this occasion only by the Pope, Hadrian affirms that the 'donation' of Pippin, which he here calls a holocaust, must be rigidly observed. And if Charlemagne does not object to 'his men', bishops, counts or others, coming to the Pope, either to obey the Pope's orders or from their own free will; so neither does the Pope object to his men going to the king, either to pay him their respects or to seek justice. But as the king's men do not come "to the threshold of the apostles" without the king's permission, the Pope's men ought not to be suffered to approach the king without the Pope's permission. And he begs the king to exhort those of the Pope's men who come to him to remain subject to the Pope, as he (the Pope) always exhorts those who come to him from the king to remain steadfast in their loyalty to their sovereign.

Strongly, too, had the Pope to protest against the detention of one of his legates (a certain Anastasius, the Pop's chamberlain) by Charlemagne. The legate had made use of some languagewhich the king could not brook, and had in consequence been thrown into prison. Hadrian pointed out that the Lombards were boasting that such conduct on the part of Charlemagne showed that the friendship between the king and the Pope was

at an end, that such action was indeed wholly unheard of, and that the legate ought to be sent back at once to the Pope, to be punished by him according to his deserts.

On the death of Gratiosus, Archbishop of Ravenna (778), ambassadors of Charlemagne were present at the election of his successor. Against this Hadrian protested as an uncanonical proceeding.

But, in general, as we have already insisted, there was complete harmony of action and unbroken friendship between the Pope and the king. At the request of the latter, we find Hadrian ordering the archbishop of Ravenna to expel all Venetian traders from the Pope's territories in those parts; granting him marbles and mosaics from the exarch's old palace at Ravenna, for his church at Aix-la-Chapelle, and sending him a copy of the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, mathematical and other masters, and cantors to teach the Roman chant.

These books and masters were wanted by Charlemagne as aids for the furtherance of that literary Renaissance, which, with the assistance of the practical Northumbrian Alcuin, who showed himself a skilled organizer, the enlightened monarch was much more anxious to promote among his subjects than he was to extend his regal sway over kingdoms. Feeling deeply, and complaining in his capitularies that the neglect of his predecessors had well-nigh resulted in the extinction of learning, he made every effort to revive it. He realized that there could be no civilization without religion and learning. In all this the Church, the Pope, went before and along with the King. Charlemagne proclaimed to the worldthat his first capitulary was issued at the instigation of the Pope. Of his legislative enactments, even those "dealing with commerce, education, the administration of justice, seem to be inspired by contact with Rome", says his latest English biographer. "Each visit to Italy was followed by important reforms in Church or State. Sometimes the king returns with artists, teachers, theologians in his train; more often we discern that the general sense of responsibility as the custodian of a great Christian society is quickened in him, by the lofty ideas which Hadrian, greater in his words than in his acts, communicated to the patrician of the Holy See".

If what the Frankish monarch accomplished in advancing the cause of learning were to be estimated by any modern standard of actual results, it might be thought he effected but little. But if it be measured, as it should be, by what his labors afterwards made possible, then the debt which European learning owes to him can scarcely be overrated. He revived sound principles and ideas on the subject of learning. It was again placed by him on a pedestal, as something to be admired and imitated. He proclaimed it the star by which men who would rise to eminence in Church or State must be guided.

And if the learning which Charlemagne encouraged was a culture which had reference for the most part directly to the service of religion, it was at the time none the less important. Nay, it was then on that very account but the more important. The Teutonic rulers of Europe, at that time still rather wildly independent, had an instinctive reverence indeed—as the Germans markedly have to this day—for religion and its ministers, but for little else besides. Civilization and learning they could be only got to esteem, in so far as it was connected with religion. However, it is no part of our plan to go into the general question of the Carolingian Renaissance. Still less is it our business to enter into details on the subject. But as the Annals of Lorsch and John the Deacon,

the biographer of Gregory the Great, give us very lively details on the subject of the Roman Cantors taken to Francia by Charlemagne, one is the less prepared to pass them over in silence, as they show in what light the Frankish ruler regarded Rome.

On the occasion of Charlemagne's third visit to Rome (787), the services at Easter time brought out the proverbial jealousy of musicians. The Franksdeclared that their singing was more tuneful than that of the Romans. The latter retorted that they rendered with great exactness the Gregorian chants, which the Franks simply murdered. When the dispute was brought before Charlemagne it grew hot. "Relying on the presence of their sovereign, the Franks loudly jeered the Romans, who, trusting to their superior knowledge, promptly dubbed their opponents fools and asses, and reckoned that the teaching of St. Gregory was a rather better guide than Gallic stupidity. To bring this sort of aimless bickering to a point, Charlemagne asked his cantors which was better and purer, the fountain-head or the streams which flow at a distance from it. The fountain-head, was the unanimous answer. Do you return then to the fount of St. Gregory, for you have clearly corrupted the music of the Church", was the order of their king. Accordingly when he returned to Frankland, he took with him two Roman cantors as well as two Gregorian antiphonaries, which had been presented to him by the Pope. Although, on account of what John, the deacon, calls 'Gallic levity', it took some time to reform the chant of the Franks, it was at length accomplished through the zeal of the Roman tutors (who also taught the Franks the organ), and through the capitularies of the Frankish king. But, at the same time, if the national prejudice of the Roman deacon could be trusted, the result of these combined efforts cannot have been very gratifying,if the 'beery throats' of the Franks were only made capable of producing noises "like the sound of wagons rumbling over the stones"

Also at Charlemagne's request we find the Pope bestowing the pallium on Ermenbert, Bishop of Bourges, and on Tilpin, Archbishop of Rheims; and ordering a three-days' prayer of thanksgivingfor the conversion of the Saxons throughout his dominions. And in return we find Charlemagne constantly doing favors for the Pope and sending him presents of all kinds—crosses, horses, strong and shapely; wood and metal for the church repairs that Hadrian was carrying on, and money.

Their friendship for one another was further shown by that especial sign of mutual esteem—the frequent interchange of verses of their own composition. Some of those of Hadrian to Charlemagne have already been quoted. Among those of Charlemagne to Hadrian mention may be made of the dedicatory lines accompanying a present of a copy of the Psalter in golden letters, which Charlemagne had had prepared for the Pope. The king begs the Pope's acceptance of his present, for it contains the sweet songs of David. He gives it to him that he may think of him when he touches it, and pray for him. In turn he prays that the Pope may live long to rule the Church by his dogmatic skill.

Hoc vobis ideo munus pie dado sacerdos,

Filius ut mentem Patris adire queam.

Ac memorare mei precibus sanctisque piisque,

Hoc donum exiguum saepe tenendo manu.

Et quamquam modico niteat splendore libellus,
Davidis placeat celsa camaena tibi.
Rivulus iste meus teneatur flumine vestro,
Floriferumque nemus floscula nostra petant.
Incolumis vigeas, rector, per tempera longa
Ecclesiamque Dei dogmatis arte regas.

There is no need to pause to observe that this interchange of poetical presents, besides being an indication of the mutual friendship of Pope and king, is a sign of no little value of the expanding literary aspirations of the times.

Charlemagne's love for the Pope came out in strong light on the death of the latter (December 25 or 26, 795). "He wept for him", says his biographer, Eginhard, "as if he had lost the son or brother that was dearest to him. And after he had ceased his mourning for him, he begged prayers to be offered for him, and many times sent alms to other countries for his benefit", adds an old monastic chronicle. Of this holy thought of Charlemagne we have an interesting example in a letter which he wrote to our King Offa. In it he says that he has sent presents to various episcopal Sees of England "as an almsgiving on account of our apostolic lord Hadrian, earnestly begging that you would order him to be prayed for; not as doubting that his blessed soul is at rest, but to show our esteem and regard for our dearest friend". Just before Hadrian died, Charlemagne was preparing to send him a large share of the spoils he had taken from the last stronghold of the robber Avars. He was going to send it, as he toldPope Leo, to whom it was afterwards sent, that "the greatness of the gift might show the strength of his love for Hadrian, and that the steadfastness of their sweet familiar intercourse might be made manifest to the eyes of many". He also, perhaps with the aid of Alcuin, wrote the Pope's epitaph, which he caused to be inscribed in letters of gold on black marble, and sent to Rome, where it may still be read. The epitaph begins: "Here the Father of the Church, the glory of Rome, the illustrious author, Hadrian, the blessed Pope, has his rest ... Born of noble parents, he was nobler by his virtues ... The Church he enriched with his gifts, the people with his holy teaching ... Rome, chief city of the world, he re-erected thy walls ... You were my dear love, you do I now mourn. I join our names together, Hadrian and Charles. I, the King; you, the Father ... With the Saints of God may your dear soul rejoice".

The prosperity and the long peace which Hadrian enjoyed enabled him to turn his attention to the needs of his city itself. And to judge from the long list, given in the Book of the Popes, of what he accomplished in that direction it was evidently well that he did take up the work, or the city would have fallen into ruin. In what he accomplished as a builder he was quite a rival of the fame of his great namesake, the Roman emperor.

He began first, it would seem, on the walls, which he completely renovated. As he left them, they were of even greater extent than the walls of the emperor Aurelian. For the accomplishment of the work, the Pope brought together men from the whole

patrimony of the Church, from Tuscany, Campania and the districts around Rome. These, with the Romans themselves, encircled the city with a strong wall defended by some four hundred towers. This work costed the Pope a hundred pounds weight of gold.

We have not space here to relate all that Hadrian, Churches, whom his biographer calls "a lover of the Churches", did in the way of rebuilding, repairing, redecorating and refurnishing churches and cemeteries. The curious in this matter will find the detailed account in the *Book of the Popes,* or copious particulars in Miley or Gregorovius. Among the many offerings which Hadrian made to various churches for their decoration, we may instance as illustrative of much that has gone before, a crown which he hung (774) before the tomb of St. Peter. He caused it to be inscribed with some dozen verses, which set forth that Our Lord, in His care for Church and State, gave His sheep to Peter to tend, and he in turn handed them over to Hadrian. The Roman patriciate He gave to His faithful servants—to Charlemagne, who received it from the bounty of Peter. It was for the king's prosperity that this crown was offered.

To carry out his works, Hadrian spared no expense. As the portico to St. Peter's running along the river from the gate of the same name was too narrow for the convenience of the people, the Pope resolved to build a new one. Over twelve thousand blocks of travertine were laid as a foundation in the bed of the river for the new colonnade. Similar colonnades were constructed by the Pope between the gates and the Churches of St. Lawrence and St. Paul, both outside the walls. "Very great indeed", is said by his biographer, "to have been the number of workmen employed by the Pope".

But of all the things most useful for the inhabitants of a large city, there is nothing to equal abundant supply of pure water. The Lombards, however, when they besieged Rome in 756, under Aistulf, had done their best to deprive the Romans of that priceless boon. The aqueducts were in ruins. One of the first works undertaken by the Pope, after the fall of the Lombard kingdom, was to repair (776) the *Trajana* aqueduct, known in Hadrian's time as the *Sabatina* from the fact that it conveyed the water of the Sabatine Lake (Lago di Bracciano) to the Janiculum. The words of the Pope's biographer tell his work in the matter of this aqueduct with some detail. "For some twenty years (from the siege of 756) the aqueduct—known as the Sabatina—and the leaden duct *(centenarium)* that conveyed its waters to the atrium of St. Peter's, and to the baths close by (where our brethren, the poor of Christ, come to receive alms and to be washed at Paschal time), and by which the mills on the Janiculum hill were worked, had been in ruins. And as a hundred arches, and those of great height, had been destroyed, there seemed to be no hope of the repair of the aqueduct. The Pope, however, gathering together a great many men, undertook the repair of the aqueduct; and such care did he expend upon it, and the renewing of the leaden duct, that by the blessing of God the water again flowed abundantly as it had done of old". Under the name of the *Acqua Paola,* this aqueduct still supplies water to the same mills and to the famous fountain of Paul V. The aqueduct, which bore the name of *Jobia,* and which had also been destroyed at the same time as the Sabatina, was in like manner renovated by the Pope. His vigorous hands also restored the *Claudia,* which supplied the Lateran basilica, among other places, with its water. With the aid of a great host of men from Campania, the *Claudia,* the ruins of which still form one of the most striking features of the Campagna near Rome, again refreshed the city with its waters. Nor did the good Pope relax his efforts till, by the

restoration of the *Aqua Virgo*, still in use, "he had supplied almost the whole city with water by means of that aqueduct".

In every age the popes and the Catholic Church have ever gone on with courage, ever fresh, erecting buildings to the honor and glory of God, and for the benefit of mankind. And if a country is dotted throughout its length and breadth with ruins of such buildings, they have certainly not been destroyed by Pope or priest.

Another effort made by the Pope for ameliorating the condition of the people consisted in an attempt to improve the cultivation of the Campagna. He continued the work begun by Pope Zachary in founding "domus cultae" or farm colonies. The *Liber Pontificalis* gives us the history of the foundation of six such institutions. The one of them in which the Pope took the greatest interest was called "Capracorum". It was situated apparently in the old territory of Veii, and was some fifteen miles from Rome. The Pope had there inherited an estate; and, after he had added to it very considerably by purchasing various properties adjoining it, he formed the whole into a farm colony. An extant inscription shows that its people took part in the building of the walls of the Leonine City under Leo IV. Broken up in the eleventh century, its name still survives in Monte di Capricoro and in the plain of Crepacore, near the river Treia and the village of Campagnano. Its produce the Pope assigned under pain of anathema to the perpetual use of "our brethren the poor of Christ". For the use of the farm people, he built and "dedicated to God his Maker, under the name of St. Peter", a Church, to which, with the greatest ceremony, attended by his court and by the Roman senate, he brought a great many relics of the saints. With the profits of this colony, the Pope ordained that at least one hundred poor persons should be fed in the portico of the Lateran, where were depicted on the walls various pictures illustrative of alms given to the poor. Each person received a loaf of bread, two glasses of wine, and polenta.

The last of the six colonies was that of St. Leucius, which Mastalus, the primicerius, left to the Pope for the poor out of his hereditary estates, "for the good of his soul". This colony was situated on the Flaminian road, about five miles from Rome.

The *Book of the Popes* also tells of various Deaconries for the relief of the poor which Hadrian founded and endowed or improved in various parts of the city. By his work in this direction, the number of these charitable institutions was brought up to eighteen. And as to the titular churches (in Hadrian's time twenty-two) there were already attached cardinal priests, so, later on (towards the close of the eleventh century), cardinal deacons were attached to the eighteen deaconries. We can have no difficulty in believing the Pope's biographer when he assures us that Hadrian "arranged everything usefully for the benefit of the poor".

Whatever conclusions are come to with regard to the alleged coining of money by popes Gregory III and Zachary, no one doubts that Hadrian I at any rate caused coins to be struck. Several specimens of his silver denarius of unquestioned authenticity are to be found in the Vatican collection and elsewhere. The series of papal silver money begins with Hadrian. The extant examples of his denarius show two types. The rarer type, may be said to correspond to the coins (?) of Gregory III and Zachary, even though its examples are round and of silver. For as with the *coin* of Gregory III, Hadrian's coin of the rarer type bears on the obverse a cross and the words *Hadrianus*

Papa, and on the reverse, divided by bars, the words *Sci Petri.* This striking similarity goes far to support the arguments for the genuineness of the *coins* of Hadrian's predecessors. The coins of the other style were evidently modeled on the type of money current in Italy at the time. On the obverse is a bust of the Pope, showing, according to some, the head uncovered, with a crown of hair *(i.e.,* the crown of the tonsure), but no beard. However, to the uninitiated, at least, it seems as if the head were surmounted by headgear of some sort. On either side of the bust there are the letters I B, of which no one apparently knows the meaning. The words D N Adrianus P P (Dominus noster Adrianus Papa) complete the one side of the coin. The centre of the reverse is taken up with a cross above two steps, and with the letters R M (Roma), one on each side of it. Round the edge are the words *Victoria D N N* (Domini Nostri), which refer to Our Lord Jesus Christ. Below the cross are the letters C O N O B, the meaning of which is so much disputed. The best signification, perhaps, which has been given to these letters is the following, taken from Cedrenus :— *Civitates Omnes Nostrae Obediunt Benerationi.*

These denarii are often spoken of as 'grossos' (said to be so called because they are equivalent in value to a number of smaller coins), and are worth five' bajocchi', or about threepence. They were the most valuable coins then in common circulation in Rome. They are of the size of our sixpence, but somewhat thinner.

Hadrian was buried in the Church he had done so much for—the basilica of St, Peter's—on the day after his death, *i.e.,* on December 26, 795,

After the eloquent facts we have narrated of the life of Hadrian, there will surely be no need of expending many words in setting forth in express terms the character of this pontiff, one of the greatest who have adorned the chair of Peter.

For does not, for instance, the plain declaration of his rights, whether spiritual or temporal, before prince or bishop, proclaim the calm courage of the man? No one will fail to have noted that he was not slow in standing out for his temporal rights as well with Charlemagne as with Constantine and Irene. In matters of spiritual jurisdiction, too, he was certainly no less firm. He would not have Charlemagne interfere in the election of the archbishops of Ravenna, and in set terms explained his position among the bishops of the world to the Frankish monarch. "There is no one but knows how great authority has been granted to Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to his most Holy See, so that it has the right of giving authoritative decisions in every case; and no one has any right to override its sentences. The See of Blessed Peter has the right of loosening whatever may be bound by the decisions of any bishops at all, through whom the care of the Universal Church is referred to the one See of Peter, and every member is kept joined to the Head". Mullinger, indeed, thinks this passage is an interpolation, as it is too papal in tone! No further notice will be taken of this groundless thought than to observe that such conjectures are equally competent to do away with the whole *Codex Carolinus,* and then to support the said passage by a second from another letter of Pope Hadrian published by Hampe. The letter is addressed to Maginarius, the abbot of St. Denis, to whom the Pope had granted some privilege (no doubt as a recognition of his services when acting as one of Charlemagne's *missi* to Rome), which had been attacked, among others, by the powerful bishops of Milan and Aquileia. "It is plain, from the tradition of the Fathers, that it (the Holy Roman Church) holds the chief place

(principatum) in the world. This position, obtained by the word of the Lord, the Blessed Apostle Peter has ever held and still holds, and it is acknowledged to be his by the Church *(ecclesia nihil hominus*— sic—*subsequente)*. If, then, the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch are subject to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church—the more that it was by the consent of the same Roman Church that the Church of Constantinople obtained the second rank, and that the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, which had previously been above the Church of Constantinople, did not presume to resist after the Roman Church, their head, had given its assent—what are those unhappy and wretched pseudo-bishops going to do, who, resisting the privileges of the Holy See, as your Holinesses have done, rob themselves?" Whether this letter seems papal in tone or not, its editor, Hampe, assures us that its authenticity has been demonstrated, and that, as his references show, its substance was, after all, proclaimed by Pope Gelasius I in 495.

What need to say Hadrian was charitable? His was a charity that would stand test. For he was not content with giving alms to the poor, which to a rich man may be no great sacrifice, but he gave his personal services, which to people in position costs a great deal more. Was the city of Rome devastated by an extraordinary flood of the Tiber (December 791)? The Pope was not content with praying for its cessation, prostrate on the ground, but he took provisions in boats to those who, by reason of the depth of the water, could not leave their homes. And when the flood had subsided, the Pope went to visit in their houses those who had suffered most, to console them. Did he hear of a fire in the city, he was there, though it were first thing in the morning, working away endeavoring to extinguish the flames. When we recall his prompt restoration of law and order in Rome on his accession, his successful struggle with the Lombards, and with heresy in the East and West, his gigantic works undertaken for the renovation of the city, his coining of money, and generally his labors in the direction of fixing the extent of papal rule in Italy and of settling its system of government in more or less newly-acquired territory, what necessity can there be to dilate on his vigor, energy and promptness of action? And his zeal was in accordance with both knowledge and prudence. His piety was of the solid kind that "prays as though everything depended on God, and works as though everything depended on oneself". His amiability was such that he was as much the friend of the great Frankish sovereign as of the poor of Rome. In an age when it is the fashion with many to consider that all in the Middle Ages were superstitious, it may be well to note that Hadrian writes to praise Charlemagne for holding of no account the visions of a certain monk of the name of John. "In talent and education" he was "the foremost man in Rome". To Charlemagne's poetical letters he "sometimes replied in verse; and specimens of these poetic effusions still remain. Written in acrostics, they are neither in expression nor metre below the level of their time".

The Popes of the eighth century

Looking back for a moment at the popes of the eighth century, we have to gladden our sight the lives not only eighth of good men, but even of men at once good and great.

Gregory II, "one of the brightest characters of modern history", Zachary, and Hadrian were men who stand out in beautiful relief in the history of the age in which they lived. The true greatness of Hadrian was not dimmed even by the glory of Charlemagne, perhaps the only really great lay sovereign of the age. The non-Catholic author last quoted says of the popes of this period that they "appear to have merited their elevation by their virtues; and, deserted by the feeble court of Constantinople, the Romans withdrew their respect and confidence from the emperors to repose their obedience on nearer protectors".

The last proposition of the preceding quotation naturally leads us to emphasize the acquisition of temporal power by the popes as the event of the most far-reaching consequence of their history. After two centuries of what we may describe as anarchy in Italy, the popes emerge as rulers of a very considerable part of it. The powerlessness and tyranny of the exarchs and the eastern emperors, and the lust of territory on the part of the savage Lombard, on the one hand, and the beneficent conduct of the popes on the other, were the true cause of the acquisition of sovereign power in temporals by the popes. And here we cannot refrain from quoting in this connection a few eloquent words from Diehl. In his *Justinien,* a work as attractive and instructive from the number and beauty of its carefully selected illustrations as valuable from the excellence of its matter and the grace of its style, he writes thus of the popes of the sixth century: "In everyday life it was the Church which, from the products of its rich and admirably-managed estates, supported the city: by the hospitals which it built, by the works of charity which it multiplied, by its daily and inexhaustible beneficence, it was the Church which reanimated and consoled the wretched; and so, in that Rome which it defended and kept alive, slowly did it prepare and legitimatize the authority it was one day to exercise therein. Under the rule of Justinian, indeed, it had cruel experience of the rigor of imperial despotism; but the day was to come when the Roman pontiff would (for ever) free himself from the grasp of the Caesaro-papism of Byzantium". Even before the close of the sixth century that day had already dawned. The first Pope of whom we have written, the great Gregory, was already practically independent of Constantinople Hadrian, with Charlemagne as his protector, was, in right and in fact, lord and master both at Rome and Ravenna. It was no longer Ravenna that sent to Rome its civil and military officials, its *judices, magistri militum,* and its dukes. But it was the Pope who set over Ravenna its archbishop as its ruler in temporal as in spiritual concerns, who sent thither his dukes and his counts, his *judices* and his *actores,* who there with authority settled all matters which came up for consideration. Equally absolute was the civil jurisdiction of Hadrian within the City of Rome, It is true that there were to be found therein the most notable of the institutions of antiquity. But it was rather that their names were heard on the lips of men than that their power and influence really survived. If the greatest of the Goths (Theodoric) infused new life and honor into the Senate, it was extinguished in the blood of the senatorial families by a revengeful successor, who felt that his nation was being crushed forever by the *Roman* general Narses. Hence have we already heard the great Gregory bewailing its disappearance. And if from time to time in this history we have come across *the senate,* it can only have been at most a kind of municipal council, and it was probably, during the two centuries of which we have written, only a name for the class of the nobles.

In the same way, during the pontificate of Gregory I, as during that of Hadrian, we encounter *the prefect of the City.* But before the days of Gregory, Boethius could lament that in his time the prefect was but an empty name. In the days of Hadrian his jurisdiction was limited by the ruling authorities among both the clergy and the military, by the primicerius, secundicerius and the others, soon to be known as the *judices de clero* or the palatine judges, on the one hand, and by the *magistri militum* and the dukes on the other; and was apparently confined to dealing with criminals who did not belong to either the clerical or military circles.

Though, then, for the time, the popes at the close of the eighth century were free from all external control, whether in the city or out of it, they were not free from trouble. It is with the popes as with us all, we get rid of one trouble only to be assailed by another. Their difficulties were henceforth for many ages to spring largely from within, from the aristocracy. Now that the popes had extensive temporal sovereignty, it was only natural that the great families of Rome should use every means to get the power of the Papacy into their own hands and to keep it there. And they did! The violent action of Duke Toto on the death of Paul I is only an earnest of much worse to come. Still, even with the certain assurance of bringing fresh difficulties upon themselves, it was only to be expected that the popes would not tamely endure the oppression of Pavia and Constantinople.

Submission to the Lombards was not to be thought of. If the Italians instinctively hated the Goths, "the most enlightened of the barbarians", they and the Romans especially abhorred and detested the Lombards. They were an altogether impossible nation for a people with ever so little civilization to live under. Up to the very end of their sway in Italy they waged war with as much barbarity as they did when they first descended upon the peninsula. The binding obligation of an oath they never understood. Such improvement as had taken place among them was, of course, due to the teachings of Christianity, which seems to have been adopted by the nation at large during this century. The Christian influence brought to bear by the popes on their legislation, and on that of other Western peoples, is an argument of the beneficent power of the Papacy, at once as striking and irrefragable as free from declamation. In reforming the marriage laws, Liutprand avers: "This ordinance have we made because, as God is our witness, the Pope of the city of Rome, who is the head of the Churches of God and of the priests in the whole world, has exhorted us by his epistles in nowise to allow such marriage (with a first cousin's widow) to take place".

It has been truly said that the temporal power of the popes is the only example in history of the acquisition of such power without arms, and of its preservation without violence. Well was it for the world that Rome was not overcome by the Lombards, and that it passed from under the sway of the tyrannical East to the paternal, often too paternal, rule of the popes. With the conquest of Rome by the Lombards, civilization and Christianity, in the West at least, would have been, if not quite destroyed, yet certainly retarded for many a decade of years. For if Italy and Rome, even in that age a source of light to the West, had been reduced to the direst extremity by the Gothic wars; if "to bend the rigid minds of the Goths" the wretched remnant of the Italian people had been brought to the verge of financial ruin, still, no doubt, even under a Greek exarch, matters would have gradually improved. For, on the close of the Gothic war, Justinian

not merely boasted that he had freed Italy from the tyranny, had restored to it perfect peace, and had taken all the needful steps to repair its disasters, but he erected such monuments in Ravenna and other places as to furnish models calculated to raise the standard of art. But to "the extraordinary decadence in all Art", which had begun during the Gothic campaigns, the Lombard conquest "immensely contributed". One result of the victories of Belisarius and Narses had been the introduction, along with Greek influences generally, of Byzantine Art. And with the distress caused by the Lombards, Italy and Rome had to be content with the poorest productions of that Art. For there was nothing there at this period to tempt the Greek artist to leave Constantinople; on the contrary, there was every reason to make him keep away from it, "because Italy was then a synonym for land accursed and desolate; Italians for miserable impoverished slaves, and their rulers for ignorant, avaricious, cruel barbarians, destructive of the very elements of civilization". The famous letter of Agatho to Constantine Pogonatus shows how much the popes regretted this decay in the arts and sciences of civilized life. All that men could do to arrest it, that they did. What is the *Book of the Popes* but a list of works undertaken by the popes in every department of art? From the days of Gregory to those of Hadrian I they sent forth books and masters to the whole West; and to Rome, in search of all that a zeal for increased civilization could make men desire, came monks and princes from the furthest bounds of what was then called "the parts of the Hesperiae". Civilization in the West would have been dealt a fatal blow had the Eternal City fallen beneath the sway of the ferocious Lombard.

And had Rome remained under the control of the despots of Constantinople, its patriarchs, the popes, the great upholders of liberty of conscience, would have been as much ecclesiastical puppets as the patriarchs of Constantinople. And, humanly speaking, there would, moreover, have been in the Chair of Peter, as there were in the See of Constantinople, patriarchs as ready, at the will of a proud or ignorant emperor, to do all that lay in their power to play fast and loose with the sacred doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, as to smash images. But, by the decrees of God, Who watches over His Church, "the snares were broken" and the popes were freed. Freed as well from the Lombard as from the tyrants at Constantinople.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME