


UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01153144 9

76 LIBRARY OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE. I

A

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,

FROM

THE EARLIEST AGES

TO

THE REFORMATION.

108 c

*PUBLISHED UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE SOCIETY FOR
THE DIFFUSION OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.*

VOLUME THE FIRST.

LONDON:

BALDWIN AND CRADOCK, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

MDCCCXXXI.



BR
162
W3

082429

COMMITTEE.

- Chairman*—The Right Hon. THE LORD CHANCELLOR.
Vice-Chairman—The Right Hon. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M.P.
Treasurer—WILLIAM TOOKE, Esq., F.R.S.
- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| W. Allen, Esq., F.R. & R.A.S.
Rt. Hon. Visc. Althorp, M.P.
Rt. Hon. Visc. Ashley, M.P., F.R.A.S.
Rt. Hon. Lord Auckland.
W. B. Baring, Esq.
Capt. F. Beaufort, R.N., F.R. & R.A.S.
The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chichester.
C. Bell, Esq. F.R.S., L. & E.
John Conolly, M.D.
William Coulson, Esq.
Wm. Crawford, Esq.
J. Fred. Daniell, Esq., F.R.S.
Sir T. Denman, M.P.
Rt. Hon. Lord Dover.
Lieutenant Drummond, R.E., F.R.A.S.
Viscount Ebrington, M.P.
John Elliotson, M.D., F.R.S.
T. F. Ellis, Esq., M.A., F.R.A.S.
How. Elphinstone, Esq., M.A.
Thomas Falconer, Esq. | I. L. Goldsmid, Esq., F.R. & R.A.S.
B. Gompertz, Esq., F.R. & R.A.S.
G. B. Greenough, Esq., F.R., and L.S.
H. Hallam, Esq., F.R.S., M.A.
M. D. Hill, Esq.
Rowland Hill, Esq., F.R.A.S.
Edwin Hill, Esq.
Sir J. Cam Hobhouse, Bt., M.P.
David Jardine, Esq., M.A.
Henry B. Ker, Esq., F.R.S.
J. G. S. Lefevre, Esq., F.R.S.
Edward Lloyd, Esq., M.A.
James Loch, Esq., M.P., F.G.S.
George Long, Esq., M.A.
J. W. Lubbock, Esq. F.R., R.A. & L.S.S.
Dr. Lushington, D.C.L., M.P.
Zachary Macaulay, Esq.
B. H. Malkin, Esq., M.A.
A. T. Malkin, Esq., M.A.
James Manning, Esq. | F. O. Martin, Esq.
John Herman Merivale, Esq. F.A.S.
James Mill, Esq.
James Morrison, Esq., M.P.
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Parnell, Bart., M.P.
Professor Pattison.
T. Spring Rice, Esq., M.P. F.A.S.
Dr. Roget, Sec. R.S., F.R.A.S.
Sir M. A. Shee, P.R.A., F.R.S.
J. Smith, Esq., M.P.
Wm. Sturch, Esq.
Dr. A. T. Thomson, F.L.S.
N. A. Vigors, Esq., F.R.S.
H. Warburton, Esq., M.P., F.R.S.
H. Waymouth, Esq.
J. Whishaw, Esq., M.A., F.R.S.
Mr. Serjeant Wilde, M.P.
John Wrottesley, Esq. M.A., Sec. R.A.S. |
|--|---|--|

LOCAL COMMITTEES OF THE SOCIETY.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Ashburton</i> —J. F. Kingston, Esq.
<i>Birmingham Local Association.</i>
Rev. John Corrie, F.R.S.
<i>Chairman.</i>
Paul Moon James, Esq.,
<i>Treasurer.</i>
Jos. Parkes, Esq. } <i>Hon.</i>
Wm. Redfern, Esq. } <i>Secs.</i>
<i>Bristol</i> —J. N. Sanders, Esq.,
<i>Chairman.</i>
J. Reynolds, Esq., <i>Treas.</i>
J. B. Estlin, Esq. F.L.S., <i>Sec.</i>
<i>Bury St. Edmunds</i> —B. Bevan,
Esq.
<i>Cambridge</i> —Rev. James Bowstead, M.A.
Rev. Prof. Henslow, M.A.,
F.L.S. & G. S.
Rev. Leonard Jenyns, M.A.,
F.L.S.
Rev. John Lodge, M.A.
Henry Malden, Esq., M.A.
Rev. Geo. Peacock, M.A.,
F.R.S. & G.S.
Marmaduke Ramsay, Esq.,
M.A., F.L.S.
R. W. Rothman, Esq.
Rev. Prof. Sedgwick, M.A.,
F.R.S. & G.S.
Professor Smyth, M.A.
Rev. Connop Thirlwall,
M.A.
<i>Canton</i> —J. F. Davis, Esq., F.R.S.
<i>Chichester</i> —Dr. Forbes, F.R.S.
Dr. Sanden, M.D.
C. C. Dendy, Esq.
<i>Corfu</i> —Prof. Thistlethwaite.
<i>Derby</i> —Joseph Strutt, Esq.
William Strutt, Esq.
<i>Devonport</i> —Major J. Hamilton
Smith, F.R. & L.S.
<i>Dublin</i> —Hon. Thos. Vesey | <i>Edinburgh</i> —The Right Hon. the Lord Chief Baron.
R. Greville, L.L.D.
D. Ellis, Esq., F.R.S.
Fras. Jeffrey, Esq., M.P.
Prof. Napier, F.R.S.E.
W. Thomson, Esq.
<i>Etruria</i> —Jos. Wedgwood, Esq.
<i>Exeter</i> —Rev. J. P. Jones.
J. Tyrrell, Esq.
<i>Glumorganshire</i> —Dr. Malkin,
Cowbridge.
Rev. R. B. Paul, Lantwit.
W. Williams, Esq. Aberpergwm.
<i>Glasgow</i> —K. Finlay, Esq.
D. Hamatye, Esq.
Rt. Grahame, Esq.
Professor Mylne.
Alexander McGregor, Esq.
C. Macintosh, Esq. F.R.S.
Mr. T. Atkinson, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>
<i>Hull</i> —Dan. Sykes, Esq., M.P.
<i>Keighley, Yorkshire</i> —Rev. Th. Drury, M.A.
<i>Lancceton</i> —Rev. J. Barfitt.
<i>Leamington Spa</i> —Dr. Loudon,
M.D.
<i>Leeds</i> —Benjamin Gott, Esq.
J. Marshall, Esq.
J. Marshall, Jun., Esq.
<i>Lemes</i> —J. W. Woollgar, Esq.
<i>Liverpool Local Association.</i>
Dr. Traill, <i>Chairman.</i>
J. Mulleneux, Esq., <i>Treas.</i>
Rev. W. Shepherd.
J. Ashton Yates, Esq.
<i>Maidenhead</i> —R. Golden, Esq.,
F.L.S.
<i>Manchester Local Association.</i>
G. W. Wood, Esq., <i>Chairman.</i>
B. Heywood, Esq. <i>Treas.</i> | <i>Manchester Local Association.</i>
T. W. Winstanley, Esq.
<i>Hon. Sec.</i>
Sir G. Phillips, Bart., M.P.
<i>Monmouth</i> —J. H. Moggridge,
Esq.
<i>Newcastle</i> —James Losh, Esq.
Rev. W. Turner.
<i>Newport</i> —Ab. Clarke, Esq.
T. Cooke, Jun., Esq.
R. G. Kirkpatrick, Esq.
<i>Newport Pagnell</i> —James Mil-
lar, Esq.
<i>Norwich</i> —Rt. Hon. Lord Suf-
field.
Rich. Bacon, Esq.
<i>Plymouth</i> —Geo. Harvey, Esq.
F.R.S.
<i>Portsmouth</i> —E. Carter, Esq.
G. Grant, Esq.
D. Howard, Esq.
Rev. Dr. Inman, Nav. Col.
<i>Sheffield</i> —J. H. Abraham, Esq.
<i>Shrewsbury</i> —R. A. Slaney, Esq.,
M.P.
<i>South Petherton</i> —J. Nicholetts,
Esq.
<i>Tavistock</i> —Rev. W. Evans.
John Rundle, Esq.
<i>Truro</i> —Wm. Peter, Esq.
<i>Warrick</i> —The Rev. W. Field,
(<i>Leam</i>)
<i>Waterford</i> —Sir John Newport,
Bart., M.P.
<i>Wolverhampton</i> —J. Pearson, Esq.
<i>Worcester</i> —Dr. Corbet, M.D.
Dr. Hastings, M.D.
C. H. Hebb, Esq.
<i>Yarmouth</i> —C. E. Rumbold,
Esq., M.P.
<i>York</i> —Rev. J. Kenrick, M. A.
John Wood, Esq., M.P. |
|--|--|--|

THOMAS COATES, *Secretary*, No. 59, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME THE FIRST.

Introduction	Page 1
------------------------	-----------

PART I.

CHAPTER I.—From the times of the Apostles to the accession of Constantine	5
CHAPTER II.—On the numbers, discipline, doctrine, and morality of the primitive Church	17
CHAPTER III.—The progress of Christianity from the year 200 A.D., till the accession of Constantine, A.D. 313	31
CHAPTER IV.—Persecutions of several Roman Emperors	41
CHAPTER V.—On the Heresies of the three first Centuries	58

PART II.

CHAPTER VI.—Constantine the Great	75
CHAPTER VII.—The Arian Controversy	88
CHAPTER VIII.—The decline and fall of Paganism	105
CHAPTER IX.—From the fall of Paganism to the death of Justinian (348—567)	119
CHAPTER X.—From the death of Justinian to that of Charlemagne (567—814)	142
CHAPTER XI.—On the Dissensions of the Church from the age of Constantine to that of Charlemagne	166
CHAPTER XII.—On the Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches	193
CHAPTER XIII.—Review of the Ante-Nicene Church	199

PART III.

CHAPTER XIV.—On the Government and Projects of the Church during the ninth and tenth Centuries	237
CHAPTER XV.—On the Opinions, Literature, and external Fortunes of the Church	255
CHAPTER XVI.—The Life of Gregory VII.	271

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

INTRODUCTION.

AN attempt to compress into a few of these numbers the ecclesiastical history of fifteen centuries, requires some previous explanation, lest any should imagine that this undertaking has been entered upon rashly, and without due consideration of its difficulty. This is not the case; I am not blind to the various and even opposite dangers which beset it; and least of all am I insensible to the peculiar and most solemn importance of the subject. But I approach it with deliberation as well as reverence, willing to consecrate to God's service the fruits of an insufficient, but not careless diligence, and also trusting, by His divine aid, to preserve the straight path which leads through truth unto wisdom.

The principles by which I have been guided require no preface; they will readily develop themselves, as they are the simplest in human nature. But, respecting the general plan which has been followed in the conduct of this work, a few words appear to be necessary. In the first place I have abandoned the method of division by centuries, which has too long perplexed ecclesiastical history, and have endeavoured to regulate the partition by the dependence of connected events, and the momentous revolutions which have arisen from it. It is one advantage in this plan, that it has very frequently enabled me to collect under one head, to digest by a single effort, and present, in one uninterrupted view, materials bearing in reality upon the same point, but which, by the more usual method, are separated and distracted. It is impossible to ascertain the proportions or to estimate the real weight of any single subject amidst the events which surround it—it is impossible to draw from it those sober and applicable conclusions which alone distinguish history from romance, unless we bring the corresponding portions into contact, in spite of the interval which time may have thrown between them: for time has scattered his lessons over the records of humanity with a profuse but careless hand, and both the diligence and the judgment of man must be exercised to collect and arrange them, so as to extract from their combined qualities the true odour of wisdom.

It is another advantage in the method which I have adopted, that it affords greater facility to bring into relief and illustrate matters which are really important and have had lasting effects; since it is chiefly by fixing attention and awakening reflexion on those great phenomena which have not only stamped a character on the age to which they belong, but have influenced the conduct and happiness of after ages, that history asserts her prerogative above a journal or an index, not permitting thought to be dispersed nor memory wasted upon a minute narration of detached incidents and transient and inconsequential details. And, in this matter, I admit that my judgment has been very freely exercised in proportioning the degree of notice to the permanent weight and magnitude of events.

As regards the treatment of particular branches of this subject, all readers are aware how zealously the *facts* of ecclesiastical history have been disputed, and how frequently those differences have been occasioned or widened by the peculiar *opinions* of the disputants. Respecting the former, it is sufficient to say that the limits of this work obviously prevent the author from pursuing and unfolding all the intricate perplexities of critical controversy. I have, therefore, generally contented myself, in questions of ordinary moment, with following, sometimes even without comment, what has appeared to me to be the more *probable* conclusion, and of signifying it as probable only. Respecting the latter, I have found it the most difficult, as it is certainly among the weightiest of my duties, to trace the opinions which have divided Christians in every age regarding matters of high import both in doctrine and discipline. But it seems needless to say that I have scarcely, in any case, entered into the arguments by which those opinions have been contested. It is no easy task, through hostile misrepresentation, and the more dangerous distortions of friendly enthusiasm, to penetrate their real character, and delineate their true history. For the demonstration of their reasonableness or absurdity I must refer to the voluminous writings consecrated to their explanation.

This history, extending to the beginning of the Reformation, will be divided into five Parts or Periods. The *first* will terminate with the accession of Constantine. It will trace the propagation of Christianity; it will comprehend the persecutions which afflicted, the heresies which disturbed, the abuses which stained the early Church, and describe its final triumph over external hostility. The *second* will carry us through the age of Charlemagne. We shall watch the fall of the Polytheistic system of Greece and Rome; we shall examine with painful interest the controversies which distracted the Church, and which were not suspended even while the scourge from Arabia was hanging over it, and that especially by which the East was finally alienated from Rome. In the West, we shall observe the influx of the Northern barbarians, and the gradual conquest accomplished by our religion over a second form of Paganism. We shall notice the influence of feudal institutions on the character of that Church, the commencement of its temporal authority, and its increasing corruption. Our *third* period will conduct us to the death of Gregory VII. And here I must observe, that, from the eighth century downwards, our attention will, for the most part, be occupied by the Church of Rome, and follow the fluctuations of its history. About 270 years compose this period—the most curious, though by no means the most celebrated, in the papal annals. From the foundations established by Charlemagne, the amazing pretensions of that See gradually grew up; in despite of the crimes and disasters of the tenth century, they made progress during those gloomy ages, and finally received development and consistency from the extraordinary genius of Gregory. Charlemagne left behind him the rudiments of the system, without any foresight of the strange character which it was destined to assume; Gregory grasped the materials which he found lying before him, and put them together with a giant's hand, and bequeathed the mighty spiritual edifice, to be enlarged and defended by his successors. The *fourth* part will describe the conduct of those successors, as far as the death of Boniface VIII., and the removal of the seat of government to Avignon. This is the era of papal extravagance and exultation. It was during this space (of about 220 years) that all the energies of the system were in full action, and exhibited the extent of good and of evil of which it was capable. It was then especially that the spirit of Monachism

burst its ancient boundaries, and threatened to quench the reviving sparks of knowledge, and to repel the advancing tide of reason. The concussion was indeed fearful; the face of the Church was again darkened by the blood of her martyrs, and the rage of bigotry was found to be more destructive than the malice of Paganism. The *last* division will follow the decline of papal power, and the general decay of papal principles; and in this more grateful office, it will be my most diligent, perhaps most profitable, task, to examine the various attempts which were made by the Roman Church to reform and regenerate itself, and to observe the perverse infatuation by which they were thwarted; until the motives and habits which attached men to their ancestral superstitions at length gave way, and the banners of reason were openly unfurled in holy allegiance to the Gospel of Christ.

There is a sober disposition to religious moderation and warm but dispassionate piety, with which the book of Ecclesiastical History must ever inspire the minds of those who approach it without prejudice, and meditate on it calmly and thoughtfully. May some portion of that spirit be communicated to the readers of the following pages! May they learn to distinguish the substance of Christianity from its corruptions—to perceive that the religion is not contaminated by the errors or crimes of its professors and ministers, and that all the evils which have ever been inflicted upon the world in the name of Christ, have invariably proceeded from its abuse! The vain appendages which man has superadded to the truth of God, as they are human so are they perishable; some have fallen, and all will gradually fall, by their own weight and weakness. This reflexion will serve, perhaps, to allay certain apprehensions. From the multitude of others which suggest themselves, I shall select one only. The readers of this work will observe, from the experience of every age of Christianity, that, through the failings and variety of our nature, diversity in religious opinion is inseparable from religious belief; they will observe the fruitlessness of every forcible attempt to repress it; and they will also remark, that it has seldom proved dangerous to the happiness of society, unless when civil authority has interfered to restrain it. The moral effect of this great historical lesson can be one only—uncontentious, unlimited moderation—a temperate zeal to soften the diversities which we cannot possibly prevent—a fervent disposition to conciliate the passions where we fail to convince the reason; to exercise that forbearance which we surely require ourselves, and constantly to bear in mind that in our common pursuit of the same eternal object, we are alike impeded by the same human and irremediable imperfections.

GEORGE WADDINGTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

PART I.

FROM THE TIMES OF THE APOSTLES TO THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE.

CHAPTER I.—*The Propagation of Christianity.*

Method of treating the subject. (1.) Church of Jerusalem—Its earliest members—Death of St. James—Succession of Symeon—Destruction of the city by Titus—Succession to Pella—Bishops of the Circumcision—Destruction of the city by Adrian—Ælia Capitolina—Second succession of Bishops—Conclusion. (2.) Church of Antioch—Its foundation and progress—Ignatius—Theophilus—Mesopotamia—Pretended correspondence between the Saviour and Abgarus, Prince of Edessa. (3.) Church of Ephesus—The Seven Churches of Asia—The latest years of St. John—Piety and progress of the Church of Ephesus—Polycrates—His opposition to Rome. (4.) Church of Smyrna—Polycarp—His Martyrdom—Sardis—Melito—Hierapolis—Papias—Apollinaris—Bithynia—Testimony of the younger Pliny. (5.) Church of Athens—Character of the people—Quadratus—Aristides—Athenagoras—Their apologies—Other Grecian Churches. (6.) Church of Corinth—Character of the people—Nature of their dissensions—Clemens Romanus—His Epistle—Form of Government—Dionysius of Corinth—Seven general Epistles—Remarks. (7.) Church of Rome—The persecution of Nero described by Tacitus—Martyrdom of St. Paul and St. Peter—Probable effect of this persecution—Extent of Romish superiority over other Churches—Controversy respecting Easter—Conduct of Victor, Bishop of Rome—Irenæus—France—Church of Lyons. (8.) Church of Alexandria—St. Marc—Its increase and importance—Epistle of Hadrian—Remarks on it—Education of the first Christians—Pantæus—Clemens Alexandrinus—The Church of Carthage.

CHAPTER II.—*On the Numbers, Discipline, Doctrine, and Morality of the Primitive Church.*

(1.) General view of the extent of the Church—Facility of intercourse favourable to Christianity—Other circumstances—Miraculous claims of the Church—To what limits they ought to be confined. (2.) Government of the Primitive Church—During the time of the Apostles—After their Death—Deacons—Distinction of Clergy and Laity—Earliest form of Episcopal Government—Independence of the first Churches—Institution of Synods—Their character and uses—The evil supposed to have arisen from them—Metropolitans—Excommunication—Supposed community of property—Ceremonies of religion—Feasts and fasts—Schools. (3.) Creeds—The Apostles' Creed—Baptism—The Eucharist—The Agapæ. (4.) Morality of the first Christians—Testimonies of St. Clement—Pliny—Bardeanes—Chastity—Exposure of infants—Charity—The earliest converts among the lower orders—The progress of the faith was upwards—Testimony of Lucian in history of Peregrinus—Suffering courage.

CHAPTER III.—*The progress of Christianity from the year 200 A. D. till the Accession of Constantine, A. D. 313.*

Incipient corruption of the Church—Reasons for it—Its extent—External progress of religion in Asia and in Europe—Claims, character, and prosperity of the Church of Rome—That of Alexandria—Origen—his character—Industry—Success—Defect—The Church of Carthage—Tertullian—His character—Heresy—Merits.—Cyprian.—Government of the Church—Increase of episcopal power, or, rather, influence—Degeneracy of the Ministers of Religion exaggerated—Institution of inferior orders—Division of the people into Faithful and Catechumens—Corruption of the sacrament of Baptism—Effect of this—The Eucharist—Demons—Exorcism—Alliance with philosophy—Its consequences.—Pious frauds—Their origin—Excuses for such corruptions—Eclectic philosophy—Ammonius Saccas—Plotinus—Porphyry—Compromise with certain philosophers—The Millennium—The writings of the early Fathers—Apologies.

CHAPTER IV.—*On the Persecutions of several Roman Emperors.*

Claims of Roman Paganism to the character of tolerance examined—Theory of pure Polytheism—Roman policy—Various laws of the Republic—continued under the emperors—Mecænas—Remarks—The ten persecutions—how many general—That of Nero—its character—Of Domitian—The grandsons of St. Jude—the epistle of Pliny to Trajan—His answer—Real object of Trajan—Letter of Serenius Granianus to Hadrian—Antoninus Pius.—Marcus Antoninus—Gibbon's partiality—Real character of this persecution compared with those preceding it—His principles and knowledge, and superstition—His talents and virtues—Connection of his philosophy and his intolerance—Commodus—Decius—His persecution—accounted for—its nature—Valerian—Martyrdom of Cyprian—Persecution of Diocletian—Its origin and motives—Influence of Pagan priesthood—Progress of the persecution—Its mitigation by Constantius, and final cessation at the accession of Constantine. General remarks—Unpopularity of the Christians—accounted for—Calumnies by which they suffered—Their contempt of all false gods—Change in the character of their adversaries—Philosophy—Excuses advanced for the persecutors—their futility—General character of persecuting emperors—Absurd opinions on this subject—Effect of the persecutions—upon the whole favourable—For what reasons.

CHAPTER V.—*On the Heresies of the three first Centuries.*

Meaning of the word Heresy—Charges of immorality brought against Heretics—Their treatment by early Church—Number of early Heresies—Moderation of the primitive Church—Three classes of Heretics. (1.) Two kinds of Philosophy—Gnosticism—Origin and nature of that doctrine—its association with Christianity—Moral practice of the Gnostics—Their martyrs—Various forms of Gnosticism—Basiliides.—Carpocrates—Valentinus—Cerdo and Marcion—Tatian and the Encratites. (2.) The Ebionites—Eusebius's account of them—Conclusions from it—The Heresy of Artemon—revived by Paul of Samosata—his sentence and expulsion—how finally enforced—Heresy of Præseas—Doctrines of the Church stated by Tertullian—Sabellius—his opinions—Patripassians. (3.) Simon Magus—Montanus—his preaching and success—Controversy on the Baptism of Heretics—The Novatians—their schism and opinions—Conclusions respecting the general character of the early Heresies, and the manner of opposing them—On the Fathers of the primitive Church—Real importance of their writings—Shepherd of Hermas—Epistle of St. Barnabas—Ignatius—Polycarp—Clement of Rome—Respecting their doctrine—Irenæus.

PART I.

FROM THE TIMES OF THE APOSTLES TO THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE

CHAPTER I.—*The Propagation of Christianity.*

It is our object in this chapter to state what is material in the early history of such of the Churches of Christ, whether founded by the apostles themselves, or their companions, or their immediate successors, as were permitted to attain importance and stability during the first two centuries. For this purpose we have not thought it necessary to describe the circumstances which are detailed in the sacred writings, and are familiar to all our readers. The Churches which seem to claim our principal attention are eight in number, and shall be treated in the following order:—Jerusalem and Antioch, Ephesus and Smyrna, Athens and Corinth, Rome and Alexandria; but our notice will be extended to some others, according to their connexion with these, their consequence, or local situation. It is thus that we shall gain our clearest view of the progress made by infant Christianity, and the limits within which it was restrained.

(1.) The converts of Jerusalem naturally formed the earliest Christian society, and for a short period probably the most numerous; but the Mosaic jealousy which repelled the communion of the Gentile world, and thus occasioned some internal dissensions, as well as the increasing hostility of the Jewish people and government, no doubt impeded their subsequent increase. The same causes operated, though not to the same extent, on the Churches established in other parts of Palestine, as in Galilee and Cæsarea, and even on those of Tyre, Ptolemais, and Cæsarea. About the year 60 A.D., James, surnamed the Just, brother of the Saviour, who was the first President or Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, perished by a violent death*; and when its members† subsequently assembled for the purpose of electing his successor, their choice fell on Symeon, who is also said to have been a kinsman of Jesus. Shortly after the death of St. James an insurrection of the Jews broke out, which was followed by the invasion of the Roman armies, and was not finally suppressed until the year 70, when the city was overwhelmed by Titus, and utterly destroyed. During the continuance of this war, as well as through the events which concluded it, the Holy Land was subjected to a variety and intensity of suffering, to which no parallel can be found in the records of any people‡.

* Le Clerc, H. E. (vol. i. p. 415) ad ann. 62, in which year he places the death of St. James, and affirms that nothing is known respecting its manner. The state of the question is this: Eusebius (lib. ii. cap. 23), on the authority of Hegesippus (a Jewish convert who wrote under the Antonines) gives a very long and circumstantial narration of the Bishop's martyrdom; of the circumstances many are clearly fabulous, and all may be suspected; but the leading fact, that St. James was killed in a tumult of the Jews, it would not be safe to reject. His violent end, with some variation in particulars, is confirmed by Josephus, Antiq. b. xx. chap. 9.

† Eusebius (lib. iv. cap. 11) places the election of Symeon (ὡς λόγος κατέχει) after the destruction of Jerusalem, which he makes immediately subsequent to St. James's martyrdom; the Jewish rebellion probably was so. In the same book (cap. 32) he relates the martyrdom of Symeon during the reign of Trajan, at the age of 120—again on the authority of Hegesippus. This author wrote five books of ecclesiastical history. Such a work by a judicious writer of that age would have been invaluable, but the fragments preserved to us by Eusebius persuade us that Hegesippus was not so.

‡ It is sufficient to refer to the history of Josephus.

A short time before the Roman invasion, we are informed * that the Christian Church seceded from a spot which prophecy had taught to hold devoted, and retired to Pella, beyond the Jordan. From this circumstance it becomes at least probable, that the Christians did not sustain their full share of the calamities of their country; but though their proportion to the whole population may thus have been increased, their actual numbers could not fail to be somewhat diminished, since they could not wholly withdraw themselves from a tempest directed indiscriminately against the whole nation.

During the next sixty years we read little respecting the Church of Jerusalem, except the names of fifteen successive presidents, called 'Bishops of the Circumcision;' fourteen of these only belong to the period in question, since they begin with James; and they appear to end at the second destruction of the city by the emperor Adrian†. But the times of these successions are extremely uncertain, as the first Christians had little thought of posterity‡, nor were any tabularies preserved in their Churches, nor any public acts or monuments of their proceedings. The Church over which they presided seems to have perished with them; but there is still reason to believe that it was not numerous, and we may attribute its weakness partly to the continued action of the two causes abovementioned, and partly to the absolute depopulation of the country. Yet it would appear from Scripture that some sort of authority was at first exercised by the Mother Church over her Gentile children; and that 'the decrees ordained by the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem §' found obedience even among distant converts.

On the summit of the sacred hill, out of the ruins which deformed it, Adrian erected a new city, to which he gave the new and Roman title of *Ælia Capitolina*||, thinking perhaps that he should erase from all future history the hateful name of Jerusalem, or that a city with a more civilized appellation would be inhabited by less rebellious subjects, or that the contumacy of the Jews was associated with the *name* of their capital. A new Church was then established, composed no longer of Jews, but of Gentiles only, and was governed by a new succession of bishops, as obscure and as rapid as that which we have mentioned. Their names are also transmitted to us by the diligence of Eusebius¶, but none with any distinction except Narcissus, the fifteenth in order, who flourished about the year 180, and of whom some traditionary miracles ** are recorded.

* Euseb. lib. iv. c. 5. Le Clerc places this secession in the year 66. Semler (sect. 1) fixes the beginning of the Jewish war in 64. The Christians probably retired, as the war became more obstinate, and advanced nearer to Jerusalem.

† Euseb. lib. iv. c. 5.

‡ This is the complaint of Le Clerc, ad ann. 135. And in fact the two most prominent features in the histories of Christians, during the three first centuries, are their divisions and their persecutions. These subjects we shall examine in separate chapters, and all that can be confidently asserted on other points we are contented to glean from Eusebius and some writers of ambiguous authority who are quoted by him, from the apologies, epistles, and treatises of the early fathers, and from a few fragments of profane antiquity.

§ Acts xvi. 4.

|| Ecclesiastical writers differ about the date of this event. Semler (cent. ii.) places it in the year 119. Fleury (liv. iii. sect. 24.) mentions *Ælia Capitolina* as existing previous to the rebellion of Barcochabas, but still as the work of Adrian. Le Clerc (ad ann. 119) seems to waver—(ad ann. 134) decidedly fixes the foundation for that year, and attributes the commotions of the Jews to that cause. Those commotions certainly broke out in 132, and were soon quelled; but both Mosheim and Basnage (Ann. Polit. Eccles. AD. 132, vol. ii. p. 72) consider the foundation of the new city to have been immediately subsequent to the rebellion. Probably Le Clerc is right, as he admits too that the city was finally established in 174, after the insurrection (ad ann. 174).—See Euseb. H. E. lib. vi. c. 6.

¶ H. E. lib. v. c. 12.

** Euseb. H. E. lib. vi. c. 9.

Such are the imperfect accounts which remain to us respecting the early history of the Church in Palestine; but, imperfect as they are, we are enabled to collect from them that the progress of Christianity in that stubborn soil was slow, and its condition uncertain and fluctuating. And this conclusion is confirmed by the direct assertion of Justin Martyr, a Samaritan proselyte of the second century, our best authority for that age and country, who expressly assures us that the converts in Judæa and Samaria were inferior, both in number and fidelity, to those of the Gentiles. 'We behold the desolation of Judæa, and some from every race of men who believe the teaching of Christ's Apostles, and have abandoned their ancient customs in which they fell astray. We behold ourselves, too, and we perceive that the Christians among the Gentiles are more numerous and more faithful than among the Jews and Samaritans.' He then proceeds to account for the fact, 'that none of these have believed excepting some few,' by appeal to the prophetic writers*.

(2.) From the spectacle of the infidelity and devastation of Palestine, foretold by so many prophecies, and truly designated by Jortin as an 'event on which the fate and credit of Christianity depended,' we turn to the more grateful office of tracing its advance, and celebrating its success. We may consider the neighbouring Church of *Antioch* to have been founded about 40 A. D.† by St. Paul and St. Barnabas. It was there that the converts first assumed the name of Christian, and the first act which is recorded respecting them was one of charity to their suffering brethren in Judæa. In a mixed population of Greeks, and natives unfettered by the prejudices of Judaism, our holy faith made a rapid and steady progress. In the residence of the Prefect of Syria, under the very eye of the civil government, it is probable that the infant society was protected against the active hatred of the Jews; and there can be no doubt that its early prosperity was greatly promoted by the zeal of its second bishop, Ignatius. This ardent supporter of the faith, the contemporary, and, as we are informed, the friend of some of the Apostles, presided over the Church of Antioch for above thirty years, and at length was led away to Rome, and perished there, a willing and exulting martyr. He fell in the persecution of Trajan, in the year 107‡. During his journey through Asia to Rome he addressed epistles to some of the Christian Churches, in which we may still discover the animated piety of the author, through the interpolations with which the party zealots of after times have disfigured them.

The fourth bishop in succession from Ignatius was Theophilus, a learned convert from paganism, more justly celebrated for his books to Autolycus in defence of Christianity, than for his attack on the heresies of Marcion and Hermogenes. Under such guidance the Church of Antioch became numerous and respectable; and from the ordinary course of events we may reasonably infer, that the religion which was popular in the capital of Syria obtained an easy and general reception throughout the province§.

* Apol. i., ch. 53.

† Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. t. i., p. 347 (ann. 40). Semler places the foundation of the Church in 39. In spite of Scripture (Acts xi. 21, 22, &c.) Baronius claims the honour for St. Peter, and is confuted by Basnage, vol. i., p. 502. (ad ann. 40).

‡ Le Clerc (Sæc. Sec. ann. 116) fixes this event after the earthquake in 116, which destroyed a great part of the city, and was attributed by the heathen priesthood to the 'impiety' of the Christians. Pearson, Pagi, and Fabricius are of the same opinion. But that of Tillemont, Du Pin and Cave, which we follow, is more probable, and is confirmed by Lardner (p. ii., c. v.) But Basnage, after all, is right, when he candidly places 'the year of Ignatius's death among the obscurities of chronology.'—Hist. Polit. Eccl., ann. 107, sect. 6.

§ Even before his journey to Macedonia we read that 'Paul went through Syria, and Cilicia, confirming the churches.'—Acts xv. 41.

A correspondence between our Saviour himself and Abgarus, a prince of Edessa in Mesopotamia, is delivered to us at the end of the first book of Eusebius, as copied from the public records of the city. The genuineness of the correspondence has long ceased to find any advocate, and this is probably among the earliest of the many pious frauds which have disgraced the history of our Church; but the existence of the forged record in the archives of Edessa has never been disputed; and, as it is clearly the work of a Christian intending to do honour to the founder of his religion, it proves at least how early was the introduction of that religion into the province of Mesopotamia.

(3.) The seven Churches of Asia mentioned in the Revelation are, Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea. Of Pergamus and Thyatira little subsequent mention is made in history; the other five, and especially the two first, are distinguished among the most fruitful of the primitive communities. The Church of *Ephesus*, which was founded by St. Paul and governed by Timothy, was blessed by the presence of St. John during the latest years of his long life. Of him it is related, on sufficient authority, that when his infirmities no longer allowed him to perform the offices of religion, he continued ever to dismiss the society with the parting benediction, 'My children, love one another!' and there is nothing in the early history of this Church to persuade us that the exhortation was in vain. In fact, Ignatius, during his residence at Smyrna, addressed an Epistle to the Ephesians, bearing testimony to their evangelical purity, and to the virtues of their bishop Onesimus. And it is important to add, that two other Epistles addressed at the same period to churches at Magnesia and Tralles (or Trallium), of more recent foundation, prove the continued progress of our faith in those regions, even after the last of the apostles had been removed from it. At the end of the second century we find that Ephesus still remained at the head of the Asiatic churches, and we observe its bishop, Polycrates, conducting them in firm but temperate opposition to the first aggression of the Church of Rome.

(4.) It would appear from the Epistle of Ignatius to the *Smyrnæans*, that some in that communion were tainted with heresies, which appeared unpardonable to that zealous bishop, and which perhaps might be attended with some danger to an infant society. But when he designates those schismatics as 'beasts in the shape of men*,' we may doubt whether his exertions in this matter were calculated to restore the union of the Church. A pious bishop named Polycarp at that time presided over the Church of Smyrna: he had been appointed to his office by St. John, and continued faithfully to discharge it until his aged limbs were affixed to the stake by the brutality of Marcus Antoninus. 'Eighty and six years have I served Christ, and he hath never wronged me,' was his reply to the inquisitorial interrogations of the Roman proconsul; and it will not be out of place here to transcribe his last beautiful prayer, which has reached us from the pen of those who witnessed his martyrdom†.

'Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have knowledge of thee; God of angels and powers and of all creation, and of the whole family of the just who live in thy presence! I thank thee that thou hast thought me worthy of this day and this hour, that I may take part in the number of the martyrs in the cup of Christ for the resurrection of eternal life, soul and body, in the incorruptibility of the

* Ignat. Epist. Smyrn. sect. 4.

† Epistle of the Church of Smyrna to that of Philomelium. Euseb. iv. 15.

Holy Spirit—among whom may I be received in thy presence to-day in full and acceptable sacrifice, as thou hast prepared, foreshown, and fulfilled, the faithful and true God. For this, and for everything, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, through the eternal High Priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son.’ The martyrdom of Polycarp took place about 166 A.D.*

The Church of Sardis, whose imperfect faith is rebuked by St. John, may have profited by the reproaches of its founder, for about the year 177 A.D., we again discover it under the government of a learned and eloquent bishop, named Melito. To this writer we are indebted for the first catalogue of the books of the Old Testament compiled by any Christian author†, and it may be useful as well as curious to quote from Eusebius the titles of some of his works:—‘Two Books concerning Easter—Rules of Life of the Prophets—A Discourse of the Lord’s Day—Of the Nature of Man—Of the Obedience of the Senses to Faith—Of Baptism—Of Truth and of Faith, and the Generation of Jesus Christ—Of Prophecy—Of Hospitality—Of the Devil—Of the Revelation of St. John.’ And least of all should we omit to mention the ‘Apology for Christianity ‡,’ which he addressed to M. Antoninus.

Before we take leave of the Asiatic Churches, we must remark that the early establishment of Christianity was not confined to the shore of the Ægean§, or to places little removed from it. Hierapolis, an important city of Phrygia, contained a Christian society, over which Papias presided in the beginning of the second century. Papias was an industrious collector of all reported acts and sayings of the Apostles, and has been justly designated the Father of Traditions; he may have been a feeble and credulous man, but it is enough that his mere existence as Bishop of Hierapolis proves the very early progress of our religion towards the interior of Asia. Claudius Apollinaris was bishop of the same church, in the reign of M. Antoninus, ‘a man of great reputation,’ as says Eusebius, and celebrated for his ‘Apology for Christianity ||,’ and his ‘Books against Jews and Pagans.’

The province of Bithynia was situated at the south-western extremity of the Euxine Sea. We have no record of any Apostolical Church here founded; but we are accidentally furnished with proof that, in the very beginning of the second century, a great portion of the population were Christians—proof which has never been disputed, because it is derived from the annals of Pagan history.

Pliny the younger, a humane and accomplished Roman, was governor of Pontus and Bithynia for about eighteen months, during the persecution

* This is the opinion of Du Pin, Tillemont, Archbishop Usher, Lardner (p. ii. 1. 6.) and others. Eusebius and Jerome also place the event in the time of M. Antoninus. Bishop Pearson (Op. Post. Diss. 2. c. 15, 16, 17) however, argues that it took place under Antoninus Pius in 148. Le Clerc advocates as late a year as 169, vol. i. p. 724—730.

† Fleury, lib. iv. sect. 3, xi. Melito was, by many ancient Christians, accounted a prophet—in the sense, no doubt, of an inspired teacher. See Jortin. Rem. Eccl. Hist. book ii. part i. end.

‡ Fragments of this are preserved by Eusebius. H. E. lib. iv. c. 26. He boldly censured the Emperor’s decree against the Christians, as one ‘which ought not to have been promulgated even against barbarous enemies.’ And, therefore, he expressed a loyal doubt whether it really proceeded from the councils of the Emperor. Le Clerc supposes the Apology to have been published in 169; Fleury (l. iv. 1.), in 170.

§ ‘We know from certain documents that the Christian religion was firmly established among the Arabs’ in the second century. Semler, sect. ii. c. ii.

|| Fleury, H. E. l. iv. sect. 4.

of Trajan; and on that subject, in the year 107*, A.D., he addressed to the Emperor his celebrated Epistle. This being justly considered as the most important document remaining to us in early Christian history, we shall here transcribe some portion of it, the more willingly as we shall have occasion hereafter to refer to it.

After mentioning the difficulty of his own situation, and his perplexity in what manner to proceed against men charged with no other crime than the name of Christian, the writer proceeds as follows:—‘Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves Christians, and afterwards denied it; the rest said they had been Christians, but had left them, some three years ago, some longer, and one or more above twenty years. They all worshipped your image, and the statues of the gods; these also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this—that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ, as to God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies.

‘After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid servants, which were called ministers; but I have discovered nothing beside a bad and excessive superstition. Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice, for it has appeared to me matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering, for many of all ages, and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country; nevertheless, it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples which were almost forsaken begin to be more frequented; and the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission, are revived. Victims likewise are everywhere bought up, whereas for a time there were few purchasers. Whence it is easy to imagine what numbers of men might be reclaimed if pardon were granted to those who repent.’

So few† and uncertain are the records left to guide our inquiries through the obscure period which immediately followed the conclusion of the labours of the Apostles, that the above testimony to the numbers and virtues of our forefathers in faith becomes indeed invaluable. No history of our Church can be perfect without it; and its clear and unsuspected voice will be listened to by every candid inquirer in every age of truth and history. At present our only concern is with the concluding paragraphs, which show us how extensively our religion was disseminated within seventy-five years from the death of its founder, in a province very distant from its birthplace, and where no apostle had ever penetrated; and certainly it is not unfair to infer that in other provinces more favour-

* Lardner, Test. of Anc. Heathen.

† Ecclesiastical history discovers to us no important event between the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, and that of St. John, excepting the rise of the Gnostic heresy, which Le Clerc places in the year 76.

ably situated, and more industriously cultivated, as rich a harvest may have grown up of faith and piety, though unnoticed by the pen of the Roman officers, whose mere duty required nothing more from them than its extirpation.

(5.) From the churches of Asia we proceed to the description of those of Greece, and among these our first notice shall be directed to *Athens*. A vain, and light, and learned city, the theatre of lively wit and loose and careless ridicule, the school of intellectual subtlety and disputatiousness, the very Pantheon of Polytheism, where the utmost efforts of human genius had been exhausted to celebrate a baseless and gaudy superstition—such, assuredly, was not a place where the homeliness of the Gospel could hope to find favour. More curious in the pursuit of theories than in the investigation of facts, the Athenian philosopher (of whatever sect) would not readily embrace a faith which required him to believe so much and allowed him to speculate so little; and, we may add, that he would bring to the inquiry a mind either hardened by previous habits of universal scepticism, or fraught with some sort of theistical notions inconsistent with the truths he was called upon to receive. For these, and similar reasons, Christianity made, for some years, very trifling progress at Athens. We read, indeed, of a succession of bishops, beginning with Dionysius the Areopagite, the convert of St. Paul. But it appears that Quadratus, on his accession in Adrian's time, found the church in a state verging on apostacy*, and to him, perhaps, may belong the honour of restoring, if we should not rather say, of establishing it. After that period we find it more flourishing; and we have the authority of Origen, in his second book against Celsus, for believing that, about the middle of the second century, the Christians of Athens were eminent for their piety; and their industry, if not learning, is attested by the publication of three apologies for their faith. Two were written by Quadratus † and a contemporary philosopher named Aristides, and were presented or dedicated to Adrian. The third was published several years afterwards, by another philosopher, named Athenagoras, and is still extant.

To the Philippians an epistle was addressed by Polycarp, about 108, A.D., attesting, at least, the permanency of that apostolical Church; and that that of Thessalonica had also been perpetuated, and another subsequently established at Larissa, is proved by the circumstance that Antoninus Pius addressed copies of his 'Order of Toleration' to the governors of those cities.

(6.) Tracing the footsteps of the apostle of the Gentiles from Athens, we proceed to *Corinth*. We still find ourselves surrounded by graceful temples and statues, consecrated to the deities of Paganism. We observe the same elegance of opulence, the same abandonment to fastidious luxury, but there is this difference, that the character of the people, with less renown for wit, vanity, and ambitious pretension, is even more distinguished for immorality. Not so warmly attached to the keen and fruitless contests of the schools, the Corinthians rather sought their happiness in

* Dionys. apud Euseb. iv. 23. The age of Quadratus is well discussed by Le Clerc, H. E. ad ann. 124.

† These Apologies, certainly that of Aristides, were extant in the time of Eusebius (l. iv. c. 3) and St. Jerome (Catal. Script. Eccles.).—See Fleury, lib. iii. sect. 22. Athenagoras dedicated his Apology to M. Aurelius and L. Verus, in the year 166, calling it an 'Embassy for the Christians.' See Le Clerc, ad ann. 166 (vol. i. p. 702—710), and Fleury, lib. iii. sect. 47. Bayle (vie Athenag.) mentions with surprise that that writer was unknown to Eusebius, Jerome, and most of the ancient fathers. He appears to have held some erroneous opinions, and is noticed by Epiphanius, Adv. Hær. num. 64, p. 544, t. 1.

the vulgar excitements of sensuality. It is easier to remove many moral imperfections, than to convince the self-sufficiency of wit. And this may have been one of the reasons which decided St. Paul to select Corinth as his principal residence in Greece. The early years of this Church are not free from reproach; but we observe that they are distinguished rather by the spirit of dissension and contumacy than by that of immorality—it retained the vices* of the Greek character after it had thrown off those of the Corinthian. Cephass and Apollon divided the very converts of the apostle, and, about fifty years afterwards, the disunion had so far increased as to call for the friendly interference of the Church of Rome. About 95, A.D.†, St. Clement, the bishop, addressed to them his first and genuine Epistle, which has fortunately been preserved to us, and is probably the most ancient of uninspired Christian writings‡. The author is related to be the same Clement whom St. Paul mentions as one ‘of his fellow-labourers whose names are in the Book of Life §.’ The dissensions of the Corinthians seem to have entirely regarded the discipline, not the doctrine of the Church; they had dismissed from the ministry certain presbyters, as St. Clement asserts, undeservedly, and much confusion was thus introduced. For the purpose of composing it, five deputies were sent from Rome, the bearers of the Epistle.

We should here observe, that the epistle is written in the name of ‘the Church sojourning at Rome,’ not in that of the Roman bishop; that its character is of exhortation, not of authority; and that it is an answer to a communication originally made by the Church of Corinth. The episcopal form of government was clearly not yet here established, probably as being adverse to the republican spirit of Greece. This spirit, naturally extending from political to religious affairs, may have acted most strongly in the most numerous society; and to its influence, so dangerous to the concord of an infant community, we may, perhaps, attribute the evils of which we have spoken. At what precise moment the converts of Corinth had the wisdom to discover that their unity in love would be better secured by a stricter form of Church government, we are not informed, but, about seventy years after these dissensions, we find them flourishing under the direction of a pious and learned bishop, Dionysius. This venerable person is chiefly celebrated for his seven Epistles called, by Eusebius||, Catholic,—two of these were addressed to the Churches of Rome and Athens, two other to those in Pontus and Bithynia, two to those of Gortyna and Gnosso in Crete, and one to that at Lacedæmon. It is thus, incidentally, that we are furnished with our best evidence of the gradual growth of Christianity. From Athens we proceed to Corinth, from Corinth to Lacedæmon; established in the capital, we advance into the towns and villages; and we doubt not that, at that early period, the wild mountaineers of Taygetus received that faith which they have through so many centuries so devotedly preserved, and which is, at length, confirmed to them for ever.

(7.) In the Annals of the historian Tacitus (xv. 44), after the descrip-

* They are thus enumerated by St. Clement, c. 35, ἀδικία, ἀνομία, πλεονεξία, ἱερεῖς, κακοήθειαι τε καὶ δόλοι, ψιθυρισμοὶ καὶ κατατάλαι, θεοστυγία, ὑπερηφανία, ἀλαζονεία καὶ κεινοδοξία.

† There are very wide differences among historians respecting this date. Lardner (part i. ch. 2.) appears to us to have selected the most probable opinion.

‡ Perhaps we should except the Epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas.

§ ‘Ancient writers, without any doubt or scruple,’ assert this. Lard. Cred. G. H. p. ii. 1. 2.

|| H. E. l. iv. c. 23.

tion of a terrible fire at Rome, we read with sorrow and indignation the following passage:—"To suppress the common rumour, that he had himself set fire to the city, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishments upon those people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. They had their denomination from Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was put to death as a criminal by the procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread not only over Judæa, the source of this evil, but reached the city also, whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first those only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards a vast multitude was discovered by them, all of whom were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; and others having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burnt to death. Nero made use of his own gardens as the theatre upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the Circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer, at others driving a chariot himself, till at length these men, though really criminal and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated, as people who were destroyed, not out of regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man.' This passage, which will scarcely be deemed creditable to the philosophy of its author even by those who most extol it, and which is most deeply disgraceful to his historical accuracy, to his political knowledge, and to his common humanity, was written at the end of the first century, about thirty-six years after the persecution* which it so vividly describes. It was in the midst of this awful scene, that St. Peter and St. Paul† are believed to have suffered. We shall not pause to investigate very deeply the truth of this opinion, but rather confine our attention to the testimony here afforded as to the number of Christians existing at Rome even at that very early period. 'A vast multitude was discovered' by the eye of persecution, and the compassion excited by their sufferings would naturally awaken an attention, which had never before been directed before to them. The assault of Nero was furious and probably transient; and such is precisely the method of aggression, which fails not in the end to multiply its objects; and if it be thus probable that, before the end of the first century, the Church of Rome surpassed every other in power and consideration, we may rest assured that these were rather augmented than diminished during the century following. To this

* That event is placed in the year 64, by a general consent of Christian antiquity. It is also commonly agreed, that St. Peter, as well as St. Paul, suffered martyrdom under Nero. (Euseb. l. ii. c. 25, on the authority of Caius an Ecclesiastic, and Dionys. Epist. to Romaus.) But there are differences as to the exact time of that suffering. Le Clerc (vol. i. p. 447, A.D. 68) places it at the end of Nero's reign in the year 68; but the general opinion refers it to the persecution. The doubt as to fact rests rather on the martyrdom of St. Peter than of St. Paul, but the authority appears to us sufficient historically to establish the violent end of both.

† Eusebius asserts that these two apostles were *joint* founders of the church of Rome, and thus the order of their three immediate successors has been most warmly disputed. The difficulty is not removed by the supposition that the Church was originally divided,—one apostle (or bishop) presiding over the Jewish, the other over the Gentile converts, According to this distribution, St. Peter, of course, had the charge of the former.

belief we are persuaded, partly by the greater facility of conversion offered by the size of the city, and the number of the inhabitants; partly by consideration that the force of opinion would naturally lead the feeble Christian societies throughout the empire to look for counsel and protection to the capital, as we know the church of Corinth to have done; and partly by the fact, that frequent pecuniary contributions were transmitted by the faithful at Rome, to their less fortunate brethren in the provinces*. In this, then, consisted the original superiority of Rome; in numbers, in opinion, in wealth: to these limits it was entirely confined, and it was not until quite the conclusion of the second century that we hear of any claim to authority.

The circumstances of that claim arose from a very early difference in the Church respecting the celebration of Easter. It was shortly this: the Christians of Lesser Asia observed the feast at which the Paschal lamb was distributed, in memory of the Last Supper, at the same time at which the Jews celebrated their passover; that is, on the 14th day of the first Jewish month; and three days afterwards they commemorated the resurrection, without regard to the day of the week. The western churches confined the anniversary of the resurrection to the first day of the week, and kept their Paschal feast on the night preceding it. Hence arose some inconveniences; and we find that Polycarp had visited Rome about 100, A.D. for the purpose of arranging the controversy†. He was not permanently successful; and about ninety years afterwards (A.D. 196, Fleury, l. iv. c. 44), Victor, Bishop of Rome, addressed to the Asiatics an express order to conform to the practice of Rome. They convoked a numerous synod, whose feelings of independence, and disdain of the assumed authority of the Roman, were temperately expressed in the answer of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus‡. The insolence of Victor was irritated by the refusal, and he published an edict of excommunication against the churches of Asia. This was the first aggression of a Roman bishop on the tranquillity of the Church of Christ; and we may reasonably believe that it was disapproved by the best Christians of the West, since we know that it provoked the remonstrance of Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons. The churches of Palestine and Alexandria§ appear to have united with those of Asia in an affair so highly inflamed by the arrogance of Victor, that it advanced from a controversy to a schism, which was not finally healed till the Council of Nice in 325.

Our earliest knowledge of the existence of Christianity in France is derived from its calamities. During the persecution of Marcus Antoni-

* Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, thus addresses the Roman Church, about the year 156:—‘This is your custom from the beginning to confer benefits on all brethren, and to send relief to various churches in every city. By which means, while you assist the indigent, and sustain the brethren who are in the mines, and while you continually persist in such donations, you preserve the national custom of Romans—that which your excellent Bishop Soter has even carried further than usual by making generous donations to the Saints, and edifying by excellent discourse (as a loving father his children) the brethren, who visit him from abroad.’—Euseb. lib. iv., c. 23.

† Euseb. H. E. lib. v., c. 23. See Tillem. vol. iii., p. 102, &c.

‡ It contains these words:—‘I, my brethren, who have lived five and sixty years in the Lord, who have conversed with my brethren dispersed over the whole world, who had read through the whole Scriptures, am nothing moved by the terrors (of excommunication) which are held over us. For I know that it has been said by those who are far my superiors, that it is better to obey God than man.’—See Le Clerc, vol. i. p. 800.

§ Euseb. v., 23 and 25. The church of Alexandria agreed with that of Rome on the rights of the question, but opposed the overbearing insolence with which they were asserted.

nus, the churches of Vienne and Lyons sent a relation of their sufferings to those of Asia and Phrygia, which is by some ascribed to the pen of Irænaeus. It is written with simplicity and beauty, and is one of the most affecting passages in the ancient history of Christianity. Pothinus, the bishop, with several others, underwent the last affliction; still we have not reason to believe that the religion was at that time (A.D. 177)* widely diffused in the country; probably, indeed, the same Pothinus first introduced it from the East†. Irænaeus, the learned and zealous combatant of heresy, succeeded to the dangerous eminence of Pothinus, and under his prolonged and vigilant protection Christianity took deep root, and finally fixed itself in the soil of France. According to the best authorities, he died in the year 202 †.

(8.) It was an early belief that St. Mark first preached his gospel at *Alexandria*, and founded churches there; and he is expressly mentioned by Eusebius§, as the first bishop of that city. The same writer asserts that a multitude of converts, both men and women, listened to his instructions, from their very first delivery. The evidence which he brings for this fact is not quite conclusive, but other circumstances render it highly probable. The population of Alexandria was very numerous, and composed of every variety of race and superstition—so that no general prejudice against the introduction of a new religion could exist there; it was commercial, and therefore enlightened; and it was also remarkable for the ardour with which it cultivated every branch of literature||, the facility with which it admitted and reconciled philosophical tenets the most dissimilar, and the freedom which it indulged to every novelty of truth or speculation. Again, through the number of Jews originally established there at the foundation of the city, and continually increased by their domestic calamities; through the moderation¶ and even liberality of those Jews, as compared to their brethren in other countries, and especially through the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, which was there chiefly circulated, and studied by the learned of every sect, the knowledge of the true God was more generally diffused in Alexandria than in any other Gentile city, and the minds of men in some degree prepared to receive the second Covenant. We do not pretend to assert that they received it in entire purity, or with a perfect comprehension of its true character and inestimable advantages; but we doubt not that a vast number believed and were baptized, and constituted, under the holy guidance of the Evangelist and his successors, a respectable and powerful community. St. Mark was succeeded by Anianus, and the Latin names of many of the following bishops persuade us that the same

* Le Clerc places that event seven years earlier.

† Dupin, H. E., vol. i. p. 32.

‡ That he died a martyr is the common belief; but as the fact is not mentioned either by Tertullian or Eusebius, we may be allowed to suspect it, though asserted by Tillemont vol. iii. p. 94.

§ H. E. l. ii. c. 16 and 24. St. Luke is also believed to have visited this city, and the Acts of the Apostles to have been written and thence diffused over the Christian world. Semler, c. i. ch. 5.

|| Le Clerc (H. E. ann. 129) thinks it possible that Adrian was deceived by informers, who mistook the Gnostics, many sects of whom were then found at Alexandria, for the Orthodox Christians. But this supposition is not necessary; the very style of the passage argues inaccuracy and exaggeration, if not indifference. The Emperor erected a number of temples, *without statues*, which he intended, no doubt, to be consecrated to himself. Hence, some afterwards imagined that they were built for the Christians, but with little reason. Lampridius, Vit. Alex. Ser. ch. xliii. Eusebius, however, (Prep. lib. iv. c. 17.) assures us that it was particularly in the reign of Adrian that Revelation made progress.

¶ See note *, p. 17.

alliance and continued intercourse subsisted between the ecclesiastical, as between the civil, governments of Rome and Alexandria.

Vopiscus, an historian who flourished about 300, A.D., has preserved a letter, written by the Emperor Adrian in the year 134, immediately after his visit to Alexandria. Its contents are nearly as follows:—‘I have found Egypt in every quarter fickle and inconstant—the worshippers of Serapis are Christians, and those are devoted to Serapis who call themselves Christian Bishops. There is no ruler of the synagogue, no Samaritan, no presbyter of the Christians, no mathematician, no soothsayer, no anointer; even the patriarch himself, should he come into Egypt, is compelled by some to worship Serapis, by others Christ—a most seditious and turbulent sort of men. However, the city is rich and populous. . . . They have one God: him the Christians, him the Jews, him all the Gentile people worship.’ We need not be surprised or offended by the insolent levity with which the profligate imperial philosopher places the religion of Serapis on a level with that of Christ, while, through the numerous misrepresentations so obvious in these sentences, one important truth may be descried. They manifestly prove, that, within a hundred years from the resurrection of Christ, his worshippers formed at least an important part of the inhabitants of the second city of the empire; and, perhaps, it is not unfair from this record to conclude, that they were as numerous as those who remained attached to the indigenous superstitions.

There is another circumstance which increases the importance we should attach to the early prosperity of the Alexandrian Church. Before the birth of Christ, a very great proportion of the learning of the Eastern world had been transferred from the schools of Greece to those of Alexandria. Not that Athens was entirely abandoned by disputants, or even by philosophers; but the uncertain renown which it still maintained was surpassed by the splendid institutions of a city, whose literary triumph was preceded, and perhaps occasioned, by its commercial superiority. The early Christians felt the necessity of education, though they differed as to its proper limits and object. We are told that St. John erected a school at Ephesus, and Polycarp at Smyrna, and even that St. Mark originally established the Catechetical School at Alexandria*. There can be no doubt that these schools, by whomsoever established, were useful in the propagation of religion; but it was long before any of them produced any persons of great literary merit. Pantænus a convert from stoicism, who flourished about 180, A.D., directed and adorned for several years that of Alexandria. He resigned his office in 190, in order more effectually to serve his religion as a missionary. His exertions were directed, with what success we know not, to the higher regions of the Nile†. He was succeeded by Clemens, commonly called the Alexandrian, and Clemens by the celebrated Origen, whose fame, however, belongs to the third century. It is only necessary here to observe, that these learned Christians being tinctured with certain philosophical notions which they were desirous to reconcile with the Gospel, and influenced by the society of those pro-

* Schmidius de Schol. Catech. Alex. Jerom. de Vir. illust. c. 36.

† From Euseb. H. E. l. v. c. 10, and Orig. Epist. l. vi. c. 19, Le Clerc infers that Pantænus resumed his scholastic office after his return from Ethiopia (India), vol. i. p. 757 (ad ann. 179). Lardner fixes the earliest date of his return in 192. (p. ii. c. 21.) St. Jerome (de Vir. Ill. c. 36) relates that Pantænus found, ‘that the Apostle Bartholomew had already preached in those regions the coming of Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel of St. Matthew, which he brought back to Alexandria, written in Hebrew.’

fessing them, have very frequently distorted and discoloured the features of their religion.

At the end of the second century, the Church of Carthage was already growing into eminence; but we shall not at present do more than notice its existence.

CHAPTER II.

On the Numbers, Discipline, Doctrine, and Morality of the Primitive Church.

(1.) General view of the extent of the Church—Facility of intercourse favourable to Christianity—Other circumstances—Miraculous claims of the Church—To what limits they ought to be confined. (2.) Government of the Primitive Church—During the time of the Apostles—After their Death—Deacons—Distinction of Clergy and Laity—Earliest form of Episcopal Government—Independence of the first Churches—Institution of Synods—Their character and uses—The evil supposed to have arisen from them—Metropolitans—Excommunication—Supposed community of property—Ceremonies of religion—Feasts and fasts—Schools. (3.) Creeds—The Apostles' Creed—Baptism—The Eucharist—The Agapæ. (4.) Morality of the first Christians—Testimonies of St. Clement—Pliny—Bardesanes—Chastity—Exposure of infants—Charity—The earliest converts among the lower orders—The progress of the faith was upwards—Testimony of Lucian in history of Peregrinus—Suffering courage.

(1.) FROM a review of the preceding chapter, we find that before the year 200, A.D., the religion of Christ had penetrated into most of the provinces of the Roman empire, and was very widely diffused in many. By one of those dispositions in the scheme of Divine Providence, which it is not given us perfectly to comprehend, the people to which the faith was immediately addressed, was that which was most reluctant to receive it; indeed, its earliest and bitterest enemies*, wherever it presented itself, were Jews†; but heaven protected its weakness, and proved its legitimacy, and avenged its sufferings, by executing on its first persecutor the severest chastisement ever inflicted on any nation.

During the few first years of Christianity, the most flourishing Church was, undoubtedly, that of Antioch; until, in the wider progress of the Gospel, it was surpassed by the superior populousness of Rome and Alexandria.

From Syria to the shores of the Black Sea, throughout the rich provinces of Asia Minor, Cilicia, Phrygia, Galatia, Pontus, Bithynia, and along the whole coast of the Ægean Sea, a considerable proportion of the inhabitants were Christians, and we find their establishment in all the leading cities of Greece. From the cities, in each instance, the religion was silently derived and distributed among the surrounding towns and villages and hamlets, purifying morality, and infusing hope and happiness; and thus every Church was surrounded by a little circle of believers, which gradually enlarged, according to the zeal and wisdom which animated the centre.

The earliest converts were to be found chiefly among the middling and lower classes, which will account as well for their numbers as for their

* Less so, however, at Alexandria than in Greece and Asia, which we may attribute, not so much to any general disposition in that people to engraft foreign superstitions on their national worship (See Dr. Burton, Bamp. Lect. iii.), as to the fact, that the Alexandrian Jews were much more enlightened by Greek literature and Platonic philosophy than the rest of their race. It was also another and principal cause of their greater moderation, that they had been allowed to build for themselves a temple at Leontopolis, near Alexandria, which tended to disconnect them from Jerusalem, and thus to soften their prejudices.

† Mosh. Gen. Hist. cent. i. p. i. ch. 5.

obscurity, and the little mention that is made of them by contemporary writers.

We shall not enter into any elaborate consideration of the various human causes which may have facilitated the progress of our religion*, nor of the many impediments which have been opposed to it. Instances of both will frequently present themselves in the course of this history, and some of the former in the present chapter. It would neither be wise nor consistent to deny their existence, or to assert that Providence, which condescends to effect its other earthly purposes by the agency of man, has wholly neglected such means in effecting its great purpose, the propagation of Christianity.

A very general facility of intercourse, rendered still easier by the diffusion of the Greek language through the Eastern provinces, and by the knowledge of the Latin, which was universal in the West, prevailed throughout the Roman Empire; for the conquerors well knew that without great rapidity of communication by sea and by land, so vast a compound of discordant materials could not long be held together in one mass. This was the most beneficial result of their political speculations; and hence proceeded their great diligence in the formation of roads and the construction of bridges. The means which were intended to advance the progress of armies, and perpetuate the duration of slavery, were also converted to the more honourable purposes of commerce and civilization; and more than that, they were made serviceable to an end which was least of all contemplated by their authors, when they became instrumental in the dissemination of Christianity. But they speedily became so; and it was thus that the weak were enabled to obtain support from the more powerful, the poor from the more wealthy, the ignorant from the more enlightened brethren; that the churches in distant provinces could maintain an easy and rapid intercourse; that the East could send missionaries to the West; and the more recent converts hold fearless correspondence with the establishments of the Apostles †. The devoted zeal of the primitive missionaries, the pure and austere morals of their converts, and the union and discipline of the Church, are universally admitted. By these and similar considerations we are led to believe, that, at least throughout the Eastern provinces of the empire, in Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece, a respectable proportion of the people were Christians, even before the end of the second century ‡; and there is strong reason for supposing our religion to have been already so firmly rooted in those parts, that its extirpation by any domestic persecutor would even then have been wholly impossible. This, at least, is our opinion; if true, it is an important service to have established it from the fair examination of such imperfect records as remain to us; for infidel writers are fond of insinuating that Christianity emanated from the court of Constantine, and had nowhere assumed any permanent

* Le Clerc (ad ann. 102-3) ascribes the rapid propagation of Christianity during the second century to four causes: (1.) some remaining miracles performed by the last disciples of the Apostles; (2.) open confutation of heathenism by Christian apologists; (3.) the constancy of the martyrs; (4.) the morals of the Christians. Others might be added, but these were unquestionably among the principal.

† As in the case of the Church of Lyons, which seems to have been established by a Greek missionary, Pothinus, and continued in correspondence with the Churches of Asia.

‡ The great number of councils assembled about the years 195 and 196, on the controversy about Easter, proves, as Tillmont (vol. iii. p. 114) observes, the tranquillity of the Church: it proves also its prosperity; and the authority of Tertullian has persuaded that historian that the Christians formed at that time almost the majority of the inhabitants.

or consistent form until its character was fixed and its stability decided by the policy of an emperor.

In order to rest on ground which will not be disputed, we have been contented to seek our proofs of the early strength and security of Christianity in the ordinary records of history, made probable by natural circumstances and human operation. *Miraculous claims.* But we should treat the subject imperfectly if we were to make no mention of those higher powers which have been so generally claimed for the primitive Church, not merely through the interposition of Divine Providence at such moments as seemed fit to His omniscience, but as a gift confided by the Most High to the uncertain discretion of his ministers on earth, and placed through a succession of ages, at their uncontrolled disposition. The chain of historical evidence on which this claim rests is continued from the days of St. Irenæus to those of St. Bernard (and even much later) with much uniformity of confident assertion and glaring improbability; it is interwoven in inseparable folds throughout the whole mass of ecclesiastical records, and the links which compose it so strongly resemble each other both in material and manufacture, that it appears absolutely impossible to break the succession, or to distinguish which of the portions were fabricated by the wisdom of God, which by the impiety of man*. Various writers have assigned various periods to the cessation of supernatural aids; but they appear for the most part to have been rather guided by their own views of probability, than by critical examination of evidence; which would have led them equally to receive or equally to reject the claims of every age, excepting the first. The powers which were undoubtedly communicated by the Apostles to some of their immediate successors probably continued to enlighten and distinguish those holy persons to the end of their ministry, and were eminently serviceable in the foundation of the faith†; but it is a reasonable opinion‡,

* The performance of a pretended miracle for the purpose of delusion is the highest imaginable impiety, and the deliberate propagation of accounts of such performances, with knowledge of their character, is not far short of it. But we do not intend to impute this guilt to all the ancient Christian retailers of miraculous stories,—far from it;—credulity is the weakness of some minds, as mendacity is the vice of others; and the former of these qualities, perhaps even more than the latter, has characterised some Eastern nations in every age. And we should recollect that to them we are indebted for the fabrication of most of the tales which stain ecclesiastical history, and for the example which led to them all.

† Mosh. Hist. Gen. c. i. p. i. ch. 4.

‡ On such a question as this it is vain to appeal to authorities; and unhappily we have here no space for full developement of our reasons. We must be contented, then, to say, that the *argument* by which we are principally moved is this: miracles become improbable in proportion as they seem to be not absolutely necessary; and we consider that through the wonders wrought by the Apostles, and those, their contemporaries, to whom similar power was vouchsafed, some of whom may have survived them forty or fifty years, the foundation of the Christian Church was so firmly established as to remove the *necessity* of the further continuance of that power to it. The *facts* which have chiefly decided us are the following:—In the writings of the Apostolical Fathers and those immediately succeeding, we read nothing respecting apostles, prophets, interpreters, or other inspired and extraordinarily gifted ministers: we have no record of the perpetuation of any *office* in the ministry which in its nature and name included the certainty of inspiration and miraculous powers. Again, the fathers who succeeded them, those of the second and third centuries, when they speak of the existence of such powers, confine themselves to the use of general language; they seldom specify an instance of their application; and when they do so, it may usually be classed in that description of miracles which is most liable to misrepresentation or mistake; such as the healing of diseases, or the expulsion of demons. Add to these and similar considerations that which we do not hesitate to call the *historical impossibility* of assigning *any* period for the cessation of such gifts in the Church, if we once exceed the barrier which the infallibility of the inspired writers

that after their departure the possession of miraculous aids was no longer vouchsafed to the Church as a community, or to any individuals *as its ministers*. All miracles which are related to have taken place after that period must be separately subjected to the usual tests*, and must stand or fall on their own merits, according to the degrees of evidence and probability. On the other hand, we are far from intending to assert that Providence, at the same time, withheld His *occasional* assistance from His faithful and afflicted servants; and, perhaps, we may observe generally, that the accounts of His interposition which we should receive with the least suspicion are those which describe the supernatural support afforded to missionaries in the prosecution of their holy labours.

(2.) We must now proceed to examine the discipline and government of the primitive Church, and, in this inquiry, we shall discover no marks of a loose and passing superstition, but, on the contrary, the surest prognostics of vigour and immortality. There are many reasons which make it necessary, in the treatment of this subject, to distinguish clearly between what is historically known and what is plausibly conjectured; for it is from the confusion of facts with probabilities that most of the difficulties of this question have arisen. In the first place it is certain, that, from the moment in which the early Churches attained a definite shape and consistency, and assumed a permanent form of discipline; as soon as the death of the last of the Apostles had deprived them of the more immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, and left them, under God's especial care and providence, to the uninspired direction of mere men; so soon had every Church, respecting which we possess any distinct information, adopted the Episcopal form of government. The probable nature of that government we shall describe presently; but here it is sufficient to mention the undisputed fact, that the religious communities of the Christian world universally admitted the superintendence of ministers, called bishops, before the conclusion of the first century†. In the next place it is equally true, that neither our Saviour nor his Apostles have left any express and positive ordinances for the administration of the Church ‡; desiring, perhaps, that *that* which was intended for every age and condition of man, to be the associate and guardian of every form of civil government, should have the means of accommodating its external and earthly shape to the various modifications of human polity. It is also true that in the earliest government of the first Christian society, that of Jerusalem, not the elders only, but the 'whole Church'§ were associated

has, in our opinion, clearly marked out.—See Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, xcvi. 102. In the meantime there is one most important consideration which we should always bear in mind—that the truth of Christianity is not at all interested in the decision of this question.

* Thus, when fairly tried by these tests, the once popular miracle of the Thundering Legion appears at length to have fallen into universal discredit. One or two others will be discussed in the course of this work.—Mosh. Gen. Hist. c. ii. p. i., ch. 1.

† To save the space which would be occupied by an accumulation of authorities, it will be sufficient, perhaps, to remind our readers, that this fact is admitted by Gibbon in his 15th chapter.

‡ See Mosh. Gen. Hist., c. i. p. ii. ch. 2. and the translator's impartial note. Also Disnage, tom. i. liv. i. c. 8. Principles are given, but no specific rules (Hinds' Early Church, vol. ii. p. 100). After all, no form of Church government now exists, or could exist, accurately framed on the model of the earliest, since *that* was regulated by an inspired ministry, and enlightened by extraordinary gifts. The government which immediately followed that earliest was episcopal.

§ Acts xv. 2, 4, 22, 23, &c.—still, of course, with some degree of subjection to apostolical authority. This, according to Mosheim (c. i. p. i. ch. 2.), was the model of all the primitive churches.

with the Apostles: and it is even certain that the terms bishop and elder or presbyter were, in the first instance, and for a short period, sometimes used synonymously*, and indiscriminately applied to the same order in the ministry. From the comparison of these facts it seems natural to draw the following conclusions,—that during the lifetime of the apostles they were themselves the directors, or at least the presidents of the Church; that, as long as they remained on earth, it was not necessary, in all cases, to subject the infant societies to the delegated authority of a single superintendent, though the instances of Titus and Timothy clearly prove that it was sometimes done; and that, as they were severally removed from the world, some distinguished brother was in each instance appointed to succeed, not indeed to the name and inspiration, but to the ecclesiastical duties of the blessed Teacher who had founded the Church. The concurrence of ancient records confirms this last conclusion; the earliest Church historians † enumerate the first bishops of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Smyrna, Alexandria and Rome, and trace them in each case from the Apostles. And thus it came to pass that, for more than twenty years before the death of St. John, most of the considerable Churches had gradually fallen under the presidency of a single person entitled Bishop; and that, after that event, there were certainly none which did not speedily follow the same name and system of administration.

Again, for the first thirty years, perhaps somewhat longer, after the ascension of Christ, the labours of the apostles were aided by certain ministers entitled Prophets‡, who were gifted with occasional inspiration, and taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit. This order of teachers was withdrawn from the Church when their office became no longer necessary for its advancement, and it

* Theodoret (Com. on 1 Tim. iii. 1.), a Father of the fourth century, admits and explains that circumstance as follows:—‘The same persons were anciently called both bishops and presbyters, while those which are now called bishops were called *apostles*; but, shortly afterwards, the name of apostles was appropriated to those who were apostles indeed, and then the name bishop was given to those before called apostles.’ (See also a passage from St. Ambrose, cited by Amalarius and Bingham.) Whatever value we may attach to this explanation, it is quite certain that bishops began very early to assume the title of ‘successors of the apostles,’ which we find to have been done by Firmilian, Cyprian, and other bishops of Carthage. See Bingham’s *Church Antiq.*, b. ii. c. 2. Le Clerc, ad ann. 44. (vol. i. p. 358), and ann. 47 (vol. i. p. 449), places the general institution of elders in the year 47. Bingham (b. ii. c. 19.) and others, admitting the confusion of names, would still persuade us that there was no identity of office. Bishop Pearson (*Vindic. Ignatianæ*) is of opinion that, in some churches, there were bishops and not presbyters; in others, presbyters and not bishops—a plausible opinion, strongly confirmed by the assertions of Clemens and Epiphanius, that in some churches there were bishops and deacons, in others only presbyters and deacons; but that the larger communities had all the three orders. Mosheim, however, considers ‘the two terms as undoubtedly applied to the same order of men,’ (c. i. p. i. ch. 2.); and such is the plain interpretation of the Scripture passages.—See Hinds’ *Early Prog. Christ.*, vol. i. p. 349, &c.

† Hegesippus and Eusebius. ‘It is highly probable,’ says Mosheim, (c. 1. p. ii. ch. 2.) ‘that the Church of Jerusalem, grown considerably numerous, and deprived of the ministers and the apostles, who were gone to instruct other nations, was the first which chose a president or bishop: and it is no less probable that the other churches followed, by degrees, such a respectable example.’ And it is certain that, in at least two instances, such presidents were appointed by an apostle. The Church of Corinth seems, indeed, to have been the only exception. Till the date of St. Clement’s Epistle (ch. 47.) its government had been clearly presbyterial, and we do not learn the exact moment of the change.—See Hinds’ *Early Church*, vol. ii. p. 163, and Bingham, b. ii. c. 1.

‡ St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 20, &c.; Ephes. iv. 11. Mosheim de Rebus Christ. ante Const. Sæc. 1. s. xl. and Gen. Hist. c. i. p. ii. ch. 2.

appears wholly to have ceased before the end of the century, at which period, as we have already observed, ecclesiastical government universally assumed that durable shape which has been perpetuated, and, with certain variations, generally adopted through every age of Christianity.

We have yet made no mention of the deacons, who were the third order in the Episcopal Church. The word *deacon* (*διάκονος*)

Deacons. means minister, and in that sense is sometimes applied to the office of the Apostles; but in a general sense only, since we are assured* that the diaconal order was distinct, and instituted for a specific purpose. However it seems certain that, in the very beginning, the office of the deacons was not confined to the mere ministry of the table, since we read that Stephen disputed publicly on the Christian truth with irresistible wisdom and spirit; and, moreover, that 'he did great wonders and miracles among the people.' It is equally clear that attendance on the poor was for several centuries attached to it; even after the office of treasurer was held by the bishop, the portion destined to charitable relief continued to pass through the hands of the deacon. It is not so easy to ascertain the extent of their spiritual duties in the earliest Church. Ignatius speaks of them with high respect, and, in one place †, calls them 'ministers of the mysteries of Christ.' Tertullian distinguishes them from the laity, together with bishops and presbyters. Cyprian asserts that the Apostles appointed them as 'ministers of their episcopacy and Church.' By the Nicene Council they are designated as servants (*ὑπηρέται*) of the bishop. It is certain that they were ordained by the bishop alone, without any imposition of hands by presbyters; that in some Churches they were admitted to read the gospel, and that they universally assisted in the distribution of the Eucharist, without any share in its consecration. Their early acknowledgment as members of the ministry is proved by their occasional presence in the original synods of the clergy ‡.

The origin of the distinction between the clergy and the laity has given rise to much controversy. Bingham § is of opinion that it was derived from the Jewish into the Christian Church in its earliest days. And Clemens Alexandrinus || has expressly declared, 'that St. John, after his return from Patmos, ordained bishops, and appointed such men for *clerical* ministers as were signified by the Holy Spirit.' If the persons here mentioned were actually set apart and consecrated to the ministry, the reality as well as the name of the distinction might with greater assurance plead apostolic authority; but this does not positively appear. On the other hand, the separation of the sacred order is so commonly mentioned by the early Fathers, not by Cyprian only, but by his predecessors ¶ Tertullian and Origen, and so invariably treated as a necessary part of the Christian system, that if its origin was not coeval with the foundation of the system,

* Acts vi.

† Ignat. Ep., ad Trale. Tertullian de Juge, c. 11. Cyprian Epist. 65. (ad Rogatian) Conc. Nic. c. 18.

‡ On this subject consult Bingham, Ch. Antiq., b. ii. ch. 20. The deaconesses, of whom we read in early Church History, may probably have been widows appointed, for the better preservation of the ministry from scandal and calumny, to superintend the charitable distribution made to the female portion of the poor.

§ Eccles. Antiq., b. i. ch. 5.

|| Ap. Euseb. H. E. lib. iii., c. 23. κληρῶνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαίνοντων.

¶ This writer goes so far as severely to censure certain heretics for following the contrary practice.

it was at least unrecorded and immemorial. The fairest supposition respecting this question appears to be, that the *first* converts, those who spread the earliest tidings of redemption before the Apostles themselves had quitted Judæa, were commissioned to preach the name, and diffuse the knowledge of Christ indiscriminately. But it seems equally certain, that this commission was of very short duration; and that as soon as in any place converts were found sufficient to form a society or church, a bishop or presbyter* was ordained for life to minister to them. The act of ordination established the distinction of which we are treating.

According to the earliest form of Episcopal government it would appear that the bishop possessed little, if any, power in matters of discipline, except with the consent of the council of presbyters; that the council possessed no sort of power except in conjunction with him †; and that, in affairs strictly spiritual, as the ordination ‡ of the inferior clergy and the administration of the sacraments, especially that of baptism §, he acted as some think with original, and certainly with independent authority. His office was for life, and the funds of the society were committed to his care and dispensation. Of most of the apostolical churches, the first bishops were appointed by the apostles; of those not apostolical, the first presidents were probably the missionaries who founded them; but, on their death, the choice of a successor devolved on the members of the society. In this election the people had an equal share with the presbyters and inferior clergy, without exception or distinction; and it is clear that their right in this matter was not barely testimonial, but judicial and elective||. This appointment was final, requiring no confirmation from the civil power or any superior prelate; and thus, in the management of its internal affairs, every church was essentially independent of every other.

The Churches, thus constituted and regulated, formed a sort of federative body of independent religious communities, dispersed through the

* See Epiphanius. *Hæres.* 75; *Ærian.* n. 5, as referred to by Bingham.

† We refer to the passages from the Councils of Laodicea, Arles, and Toledo, from Ignatius's Epistles and the Apostolical Canons, and the writings of Tertullian, Jerome, and Ambrose, collected by Bingham, b. ii. ch. 3.

‡ It appears probable (notwithstanding the silence of St. Paul on this subject in his commission to Titus, i. 5.) that, in the ceremony of ordination, even in the earliest church, the imposition of hands was performed by certain presbyters, in conjunction with the bishop; but the consecration to the ministry was the act of the bishop only, through the power derived in the first instance from the apostles, and at no time claimed by any inferior order in the church. When Jerome (*Dissert.* 85 ad *Evagr.*) and Chrysostom, in the fourth century (*Hom.* 2 in 1 *Tim.* iii. 8), are endeavouring to exalt presbyterial almost to the level of episcopal authority, they agree in considering the power of ordination as constituting the grand, and, as they assert, the only distinction. It has been argued that the power of preaching was originally confined to the bishops, and from them derived, and by their permission exercised, by the inferior clergy; the reasons adduced for this opinion are plausible, though not, perhaps, conclusive.—Bingham's *Church Antiq.*, b. ii. ch. 3.

§ *Mosh. Gen. Hist.* (c. i. p. ii. ch. 4. sec. 7 and 8.) When the bishop extended the rite of baptism to presbyters and suffragan bishops (*Chorepiscopi*), he still reserved to himself the exclusive power of *confirmation*.—Bingham's *Church Antiq.* c. ii. p. ii. ch. 4.

|| This is made very clear, from the comparison of much contradictory evidence, by Bingham, *Ch. Hist.*, b. iv. ch. 2. sec. 2, 3, 4, &c. There were some variations in the mode of election, according to times and circumstances, since no rule is laid down in Scripture on the subject; but there is a great concurrence of evidence to shew that no bishop was ever obtruded on an orthodox people without their consent. Mosheim (c. i. p. ii. ch. 2.) attributes a great extent of general power to the people, not only in the election of their teachers, but in the control of their conduct, and even extends it to decision on controverted points and excommunication of unworthy members. We are not aware on what authority he advances these assertions.

greater part of the empire, in continual communication, and in constant harmony with each other. It is towards the end of the second century that the first change is perhaps perceptible: as the numbers of the believers and the limits of the faith were extended, some diversities in doctrine or discipline would naturally grow up, which it was not found easy to reconcile except by some description of general assembly. Accordingly we find the first instances of such assemblies* (unless that which was summoned by the Apostles may be so called) at this period. They were composed, either of the bishops only, or of these associated with a party of the priesthood; those ministers presented themselves as the representatives of their respective societies; nor was any superiority claimed by any of them in virtue of the supposed pre-eminence of particular Churches. These councils were called by the Greek name Synods, and seem at first to have been provincial, following in some manner the political division of the empire. They had their origin in Greece—the land of public assemblies and popular institutions, of which the memory was fondly cherished there, after the reality had been lost in Roman despotism. Their character was essentially popular; the representatives of equal Churches, elected to their sacred offices by the whole body over which they presided, assembled to deliberate as equals; and we may reasonably indulge the belief, since the exertion of freedom in any one direction makes it more ready to act in every other, that the political emancipation of mankind was promoted, even thus early, by the free and advancing spirit of Christianity.

Such were the principles on which the affairs of the Churches were conducted for some time after the period mentioned by us; and none can be conceived more favourable to the progress of the faith. The government of a single person protected each society from internal dissension—the electiveness of that governor rendered probable his merit—the meeting together of the deputies of the Churches, in occasional assemblies, on equal terms, taught the scattered members of the faith that they were animated by one soul, and informed and dignified by one spirit. Some evil will be expected to arise out of much good; and evils of some importance have been attributed to the necessary frequency of synods. The first was an early addition to the orders and gradations of the hierarchy; for, as it was soon discovered that these provincial Councils required the control of a President, the Bishop of the capital of the province was usually appointed to that office, under the lofty title of the *Metropolitan*†; from an occasional office he presently assumed a permanent dignity, and his dignity was insufficient until it was attended by authority. Again, the ecclesiastics who composed them properly appeared there in no other character, than as the deputies of their Churches; but it may sometimes have happened, that on their return home they individually assumed some part of the *power* which they had possessed collectively; at least, it is certain that many notions respecting the exalted and irresistible nature of episcopal authority‡, were already floating about the Christian

* We believe the view of Mosheim upon this subject to be very nearly correct. C. 1. p. i. ch. 2.

† Mosh. Gen. Hist. c. ii. p. ii. ch. 2.

‡ The Epistles attributed to Ignatius are the earliest writings which countenance such claims; and they were afterwards more boldly advocated by Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. In fact, we should remark that Ignatius exalts the presbyterial with almost as much zeal as the episcopal order, and that his object was rather to increase the authority of the whole ministry than to elevate any branch of it.

world, and the Bishop was not likely to disclaim the homage which would occasionally be offered to him. But it was not until the habit of acting in bodies made them sensible of their common interest and real power, that they ventured to assert such claims, and assumed a loftier manner in the government of their dioceses; so that, though these synods were doubtless indispensable to the well-being of Christianity, they seem to have been the means of corrupting the original humility of its ministers; and the method which was intended to promote only the eternal interests of the Church, promoted, in some degree, the worldly consideration of the order which governed it. This change began to show itself towards the end of the second century; and it is certain that, at this period, we find the first complaints of the incipient corruption of the clergy*. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that the increased authority and influence of the hierarchy was highly serviceable to the whole body in periods of danger and persecution, and that in those times it was generally exerted to excite the courage, and sustain the constancy of the faithful.

Excommunication was the oldest weapon of ecclesiastical authority. Doubtless, every society has the right to expel its unworthy members; and this right was of extreme use to the first Christians, as it gave them frequent opportunities of exhibiting to the heathen world the scrupulousness of their moral purity. But afterwards we know how dangerous an engine it became when wielded by weak or passionate individuals, and directed by caprice, or interest, or ambition.

The question has been greatly controverted, whether an absolute community of property ever subsisted in the Church. That it did so, is a favourite opinion of some Roman Catholic writers, who would willingly discover, in the first apostolical society, the model of the monastic system; and the same, to its utmost extent, has been partly asserted, and partly insinuated by Gibbon. The learned argument of Mosheim† disposes us to the contrary belief; and if the words of Scripture in one place‡ should seem to prove that such community did actually exist among the original converts in the Church of Jerusalem, we are obliged to infer from other passages§, not only that it did not universally prevail as one law of the whole Church, but that it gained no favour or footing in the several Churches which were founded elsewhere. This inference is generally confirmed by the uninspired records of Christianity; and it is indeed obvious that a society of both sexes, constituted on that principle, could not possibly have had a permanent existence. The truth appears to be this, that the ministers of religion, and the poorer brethren, were maintained by contributions perfectly voluntary, and that a great and general intercourse of mutual support and charity prevailed, as well among the various Churches, as among the members of each.

It is probable that the ceremonies of religion had somewhat outstripped their primitive simplicity, even before the conclusion of the second century. Some additions were introduced even thus early, out of a spirit of

* From the moment that the interests of the ministers became at all distinguished from the interests of the religion, the corruption of Christianity may be considered to have begun.

† *Dissertationes ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentes*, vol. ii. Mosheim's object is to prove that St. Luke means community of *use*, not of *possession*. Some suppose the passage in Acts v. 4 to be at variance with that opinion.

‡ Acts iv. 32, 34, 35.

§ Acts v. 4. 'After it was sold, was it not in thine own power?'

conciliation with the various forms of Paganism which were beginning gradually to melt into Christianity; but they were seemingly different in different countries; and it is not easy, or perhaps very important, to detect them with certainty, or to enumerate them with confidence. We shall, probably, recur to this subject at some future period, when we shall have stronger light to guide us.

The first Christians were unanimous* in setting apart the first day of the week, as being that on which our Saviour rose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, on the express appointment of the Apostles. On these occasions, portions of Scripture were publicly read to the people from the earliest age.

The two most ancient feasts of the Church were in honour of the resurrection of Christ, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit. At a period when belief must almost have amounted to knowledge, the first Christians, the companions of the Apostles, perhaps the disciples of our Saviour himself, were so seriously and practically earnest in their belief, and so satisfied of the generality of that belief, in the truth of those two mighty miracles, which have presented, perhaps, the greatest difficulties to the sceptical inquirers of after ages, as to establish their two first festivals in solemn commemoration of them.

We find no mention of any public fast, except on the day of the crucifixion. The superstitious multiplication of such acts of mistaken devotion was the work of a later age.

Christian schools existed in the second century, as well at Rome, Ephesus, and Smyrna †, as at Alexandria; they were conducted on the model of the schools of philosophy, and even the terms, by which the different classes of the faithful were designated, were borrowed from these latter. There appears to have been as yet no costume peculiar to the ministers of religion. The bishops usually adopted the garb of the heathen philosophers.

(3.) The first Christians used no written Creed; the Confession of Faith, which was held necessary for salvation, was delivered to children or converts by word of mouth, and entrusted to their memory. Moreover, in the several independent Churches, the rule of faith was liable to some slight changes, according to the opinion and discretion of the Bishop presiding in each. Hence it arose, that when the creeds of those numerous communities came at length to be written and compared together, they were found to contain some variations; this was natural and necessary; but when we add that those variations were for the most part merely verbal, and in no instance involved any question of essential importance, we advance a truth which will seem strange to those who are familiar with the angry disputations of later ages. But the fact is easily accounted for,—the earliest pastors of the Church drew their belief from the Scripture itself, as delivered to them by writing or preaching ‡, and they were contented to express that belief in the language of

* Mosh. Gen. Hist., l. i. p. ii. c. 4.

† Iren. ad Florinum, ap. Euseb. l. v. c. 20. Mosh. Gen. Hist., c. i. p. ii. ch. 3.

‡ It is expressly affirmed by Eusebius (E. H. book iii. c. 24) that the four gospels were collected during the life of St. John, and that the three received the approbation of that apostle. And though there is great difficulty in ascertaining the precise period in which all the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume, it is unquestionable that before the middle of the second century the greatest part of them were received as the rule of faith in every Christian society. Mosh. c. 1. p. ii. ch. 2.

Scripture. They were not curious to investigate that which is not clearly revealed, but they adhered firmly and faithfully to that which they *knew* to be true; therefore their variations were without schism and their differences without acrimony. The creed which was first adopted, and that perhaps in the very earliest age, by the Church of Rome, was that which is now called the Apostles' Creed, and it was the general opinion, from the fourth century downwards, that it was actually the production of those blessed persons assembled for that purpose; our evidence* is not sufficient to establish that fact, and some writers† very confidently reject it. But there is reasonable ground for our assurance that the form of faith which we still repeat and inculcate was in use and honour in the very early propagation of our religion.

The sacraments of the primitive Church were two—those of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The ceremony of immersion (the oldest form of baptism) was performed in the name of the three Persons of the Trinity; it was believed to be attended by the remission of original sin, and the entire regeneration of the infant or convert, by the passage from the land of bondage into the kingdom of salvation. A great proportion of those baptized in the first ages were, of course, adults, and since the Church was then scrupulous to admit none among its members, excepting those whose sincere repentance gave promise of a holy life ‡, the administration of that sacrament was in some sense accompanied by the remission, not only of the sin from Adam, but of all sin that had been previously committed by the proselyte—that is to say, such absolution was given to the repentance necessary for admission into Christ's Church. In after ages, by an error common in the growth of superstition, the efficacy inherent in the repentance was attributed to the ceremony, and the act which washed away the inherited corruption of nature was supposed to secure a general impunity, even for unrepented offences. But this double delusion gained very little ground during the two first centuries.

The celebration of the sacrament of the Eucharist was originally accompanied by meetings which somewhat partook of a hospitable, or at least of a charitable character, and were called *Agapæ* or Feasts of Love. Every Christian, according to his circumstances, brought to the assembly portions of bread, wine, and other things, as gifts, as it were, or oblations to the Lord. Of the bread and wine such as was required for the administration of the sacrament was separated from the rest, and consecrated by the bishop alone §; its distribution was followed by a frugal and serious repast. Undoubtedly, those assemblies acted not only as excitements to ardent piety, but also as bonds of strict religious union and mutual devotion, during the dark days of terror and persecution. It was probably on those occasions, more than any other, that the sufferers rallied their scat-

* Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus make no mention of it, but they occasionally repeat some words contained in it, which is held as proof that they knew it by heart.—See Cent. Magdeb., cent. i. lib. ii. c. 4.

† As Mosheim, cent. i. p. ii. ch. 3; admitting however, (c. ii. p. ii. ch. 3) that the first teachers inculcated no other doctrines than those contained in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed.

‡ 'Whosoever are persuaded that those things are true which are taught and inculcated by us, and engage to live according to them, are taught to pray to God, fasting, for the remission of their former sins, while we pray and fast with them. Then they are led by us to some place where water is, and are regenerated even as we ourselves were regenerated; for they are then immersed in the water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.'—Justin Martyr, *Apol. i. ch. 61.*

§ Mosh., c. i. p. ii. ch. 4. Justin, *Mart. Ap. 2. p. 98.*

tered ranks, and encouraged each other, by one solemn act of brotherly communion, to constancy in one faith and association in the same afflictions. We observe, moreover, that as the dangers passed away from the Church, that more social form* (if we may so express it) of eucharistical administration gradually fell into disuse.

(4.) The morality of the primitive Church is the subject to which we proceed with high confidence and unalloyed satisfaction—

Morality. for since, in the various history on which we are entering, our admiration of the excellence of Christianity will be sometimes interrupted by sighs for the degeneracy of its professors, it is delightful to pause on that period when the faith, yet fresh from heaven, did really carry practice and devotion along with it—a period which preceded the birth of intestine persecution, and was unstained by the furious contests of sectaries; which did not witness the superstitious debasement of the Church, or the vulgar vices of its ministers, or the burning passions of its rulers. We are taught, indeed, humbly to believe that at some future, and probably distant period, the whole world will be united in the true spirit and practice of Christianity; but in reviewing the history of the past, we are compelled to confess that the only model at all approaching to that perfection is confined to the two first centuries of our faith, and that it began to fall off in excellence even before the conclusion of that period. But transient as it was, we still recur to it with pious satisfaction, and we rejoice both as men and as Christians that our nature has been found capable of such holy exaltation, and that our religion was the instrument which exalted it.

Certainly the character of the first Christians, and we are not without guides who make us acquainted with it, presents to us a *singular* spectacle of virtue and piety, the more splendid as it was surrounded by very mournful and very general depravity. We cannot read either St. Clement's description of the early condition of the Church of Corinth, or Origen's panegyric on that of Athens, without recognising a state of society and morality such as all the annals of paganism do not discover to us, and such as its principles (if it had any fixed principles) could not ever have created. The following lines are a quotation from the former. 'You were all humble in spirit, nothing boasting, subject rather than subjecting, giving rather than receiving. Contented with the food of God, and carefully embracing his words, your feelings were expanded, and his sufferings were before your eyes—so profound and beautiful the peace that was given to you, and so insatiable the desire of beneficence. Every division, every schism was detestable to you; *you wept over the failings of your neighbours*; you thought their defects your own, and were impatient after every good work,' &c.

It is true that soon after the period celebrated by this glowing description, some dissensions disturbed the peace, and probably the morality, of the Church of Corinth—but we have no reason to believe that they were of long duration, or left any lasting consequences behind them.

The above passage refers to the Christians of Greece; and there is a sentence in the letter of Pliny to Trajan, already quoted, giving still stronger testimony to the virtues of the Asiatics. 'They bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery,—never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it.'

* Acts ii. 42. Mosheim, l. c. Hinds' Early Ch., vol. ii. p. 211, &c.

Bardesanes*, a learned Christian of Mesopotamia, who lived in the time of Marcus Antoninus, has the following passage, preserved to us by Eusebius. 'Neither do Christians in Parthia indulge in polygamy, though they be Parthians; nor do they marry their own daughters in Persia, though Persians. Among the Bactrians and the Gauls, they do not commit adultery; but, wheresoever they are, they rise above the evil laws and customs of the country.' This is not only a very powerful, but almost an universal testimony in favour of Christian morality; and there are some to whom its truth will appear the less questionable, because it comes from the pen of a heretic.

The virtue of chastity, which however it may have been celebrated in the heroic ages of paganism, was certainly little reputed in the east, during the more enlightened rule of philosophy, was very rigidly cultivated by the primitive converts. This truth, which is generally attested by the passages above quoted, is made the subject of peculiar exultation by Justin Martyr†. But the continence of the first Christians did not degenerate into any superstitious practice; yet it seems certain that, in the ages immediately subsequent, the simple principle of the Gospel began to be unreasonably exaggerated; and somewhat later the progress of monasticism was forwarded by the exalted value placed on that virtue. So that excess of admiration blinded enthusiasts as to its real nature and character, and led them to invest it with perfections and pretensions which were at variance with the advancement and happiness of human society.

The heathen governments, even the Roman, in its highest civilization, tolerated, and perhaps encouraged, the unnatural practice of exposing infants—who in that condition were left, as it might happen, to perish from cold or starvation, or preserved for the more dreadful fate of public prostitution. This practice was held in deserved detestation by the followers of Christ‡.

Charity was the corner-stone of the moral edifice of Christianity, and its earliest characteristic; and as this is still the virtue by which it is most distinguished, both publicly and privately, from every false religion, so we need not hesitate to avow that this of all its excellencies was the most efficient under Divine providence in its original establishment. Every Christian society provided for the maintenance of its poorer members; and when the funds were not sufficient for this purpose, they were aided by the superfluities of more wealthy brethren§. The same spirit—which 'preached the Gospel to the poor,' extended its provisions to their temporal necessities; and so far from thinking it any reproach to our faith that it first addressed itself, by its peculiar virtues as well as precepts, to the lower orders of mankind, we derive from this very fact our strongest argument against those who would persuade us that the patronage of kings was necessary for its establishment: it rather becomes to us matter of pious exultation that its progress was precisely in the opposite direction. By far the majority of the early converts were men of low rank; and their numbers were concealed by their obscurity, until they became too powerful to dread persecution. Every step which they took was *upwards*. Until the middle of the second century, they could scarcely

* Euseb. H. E., l. iv., c. 30.

† C. 15. Apol. A.

‡ Justin Martyr, Apol. A., c. 27.

§ Our readers will recollect that Dionysius of Corinth, in his Epistle to the Romans, desires them to continue the custom established from the beginning, of sending charitable contributions to all churches.

discover among their thousands one learned man. From the schools they advanced into the senate, and from the senate to the throne; and they had possessed themselves of every other office in society, before they attained the highest. It is important to attend to this fact, that we may not be misled; it is important to observe, that the basis from which the pyramid started up was the faith and constancy of the *common people*—the spirit of the religion, and the earliest government of the Church, was popular; and it is in its earliest history that we find those proofs of general moral purity on which we now dwell with the more pleasure, because, in the succeeding pages, the picture will never again be presented to us.

We will make one short extract from the writings of a very witty pagan of the second century, which throws great light on the character of the Christians of that age. Lucian, who considered every form of worship as equally an object of ridicule, tells a story of one Peregrinus, who had been expelled from his country, Armenia, for the most horrible crimes; who thence wandered into Palestine, became acquainted with the doctrine of the Christians, and affected to embrace it. Being a man of talents and education, he acquired great influence among their illiterate body; and, in consequence, he soon attracted the notice of the Roman governor, and was thrown into prison for being a Christian. In prison he is represented to have been consoled by the pious charity of the faithful:—‘There came Christians, deputed from many cities in Asia, to relieve, to encourage, and to comfort him, for the care and diligence which the Christians exert on these occasions is incredible—in a word, they spare nothing. They sent, therefore, large sums to Peregrinus, and his confinement was an occasion of amassing great riches; for these poor creatures are firmly persuaded they shall one day enjoy eternal life; therefore they despise death with wonderful courage, and offer themselves voluntarily to punishment. Their first lawgiver has taught them that they are all brethren, when once they have passed over and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worship that Master of theirs who was crucified, and regulate their manner and conduct by his laws. They despise, therefore, all earthly possessions, and look upon them as common, having received such rules without any certain grounds of faith. Therefore, if any juggler, or cunning fellow, who knows how to make his advantage of opportunity, happens to get into their society, he immediately grows rich; because it is easy to abuse the simplicity of these silly people.’ We have no reason to complain of such description from the pen of an adversary; for, on the one hand, it attributes to our ancestors in faith boundless charity, zeal inexhaustible, brotherly love, contempt of death, and of all earthly possessions, and a steady adherence to the faith and precepts of Christ; on the other hand, it lays no charge against them except simplicity, the usual associate of innocence.

There is one quality mentioned in the above passage which we shall take occasion to notice hereafter, without entirely overlooking it now, the suffering courage of the persecuted. We consider it a strong proof of the lively faith of the sufferers in the atoning merits of their Saviour, since it could seldom proceed from any other conviction than that the change which they were about to undergo would lead them to a state of recompense; a confidence which seems scarcely consistent with the consciousness of unrepented sin. Such, at least, we know to have been the impression sometimes produced on the more enlightened, even among the heathen spectators. The ancient author of the Second Apology, attributed

to Justin Martyr, urges this proof with much fervour and reason* ; and the conversion of Justin himself is, in a great degree, ascribed to the persuasion of Christian excellence and sincerity, wrought in him by those awful spectacles.

We shall conclude this chapter by a quotation from his First Apology (c. xiv.) :—‘ We who formerly rejoiced in licentiousness, now embrace discretion and chastity ; we who rejoiced in magical arts, now devote ourselves to the unbegotten God, the God of goodness ; we who set our affections upon wealth and possessions, now bring into the common stock all our property, and share it with the indigent ; we, who, owing to the diversity of customs, would not partake of the same hearth with those of a different race, now, since the appearance of Christ, live together, and *pray for our enemies*, and endeavour to persuade those who unjustly hate us, that, by leading a life conformed to the excellent precepts of Christianity, they may be filled with the good hope of obtaining the same happiness with ourselves from that God, who is Lord above all things †.’

CHAPTER III.

The Progress of Christianity from the year 200, A. D. till the Accession of Constantine, A. D. 313.

Incipient corruption of the Church—Reasons for it—Its extent—External progress of religion in Asia and in Europe—Claims, character, and prosperity of the Church of Rome—That of Alexandria.—Origin—His character—Industry—Success—Defect.—The Church of Carthage.—Tertullian—His character—Heresy—Merits.—Cyprian.—Government of the Church—Increase of episcopal power, or, rather, influence—Degeneracy of the Ministers of Religion exaggerated—Institution of inferior orders—Division of the people into Faithful and Catechumens—Corruption of the sacrament of Baptism—Effect of this—The Eucharist—Dæmons—Exorcism—Alliance with philosophy—Its consequences.—Pious frauds—Their origin—Excuses for such corruptions—Eclectic philosophy—Ammonius Saccas—Plotinus—Porphyry—Compromise with certain philosophers—The Millennium—The writings of the early Fathers—Apologies.

RESERVING for subsequent consideration the persecutions and the heresies by which the early Church was disturbed, we shall now pursue its more peaceful annals as far as its establishment by the first Christian emperor. We have found it almost necessary to separate, and indeed widely to distinguish the events of the two first from those of the third century, for nearly at this point are we disposed to place the first crisis in the internal history of the Church. It is true that the first operations of corruption are slow, and generally imperceptible, so that it is not easy to ascertain the precise moment of its commencement. But a candid inquirer cannot avoid perceiving that, about the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, some changes had taken place in the ecclesiastical system which indicated a departure from its primitive purity. Indeed, such a state of society as that which we have recently described could scarcely hope for permanent endurance, unless through a fundamental alteration in human nature and in the necessary course of human affairs. In addition to this, the very principles of Christianity prevented it from remaining stationary ; the spirit of the faith is active, penetrating, and progressive ; and thus, as it expanded itself in numerical extent—as it rose in rank, in learning, in wealth—as it came in contact with the people of all nations, and with all classes of the people, a great variety of human passions and motives was comprehended by it, which had no place

* Cap. xii.

† See also Lactant. Div. Inst., lib. iii., c. 26.

in its early existence. As it increased in the number of converts, the zeal of brotherly love and ardent charity became more contracted, since it could no longer be universally exerted. As it rose in rank, it lost that perfect equality among its members which formed the very essence of its original and best character—false learning corrupted its simplicity, and wealth undermined its morality. If it gained in prosperity and worldly consideration, it resigned the native innocence and freshness of childhood.

We are far from intending to assert that any sudden demoralization or violent apostacy from its first principles took place in the Church during the third century—far from it—we feel even strongly assured that it still continued to embrace the great proportion of whatever was truly virtuous and excellent in the Roman empire*. But, in closely attending to its history, we observe that it becomes thenceforward the history of men rather than of things; the body of the Church is not so much in view, but the acts of its ministers and teachers are continually before us. We read little of the clergy of the two first centuries; they appear to have discharged their pastoral duties with silent diligence and disinterested piety. We learn their character, for the most part, from the effects of their labours; and we find its ample and indisputable record in the progress of their religion, and in the virtues of their converts.

The progress of religion, indeed, continued, under easier circumstances, with equal rapidity; and we have reason to believe that, before the time of Constantine, it was deeply rooted in all the eastern † provinces of the Roman, as well as in the Persian empire. Gibbon ‡ has candidly acknowledged his error in attributing the conversion of Armenia to the reign of that emperor; and, perhaps, a more impartial reflexion on the mission of Pantænus, which we have no reason to believe fruitless, would have led him to doubt his own accuracy when he makes a similar assertion respecting Æthiopia. The light of Christianity had certainly penetrated, with varying splendour, among the Bactrians, the Parthians, the Scythians, Germans, Gauls, and Britons; the Goths of Mysia and Thrace were converted by missionaries from Asia, and laid aside, on the reception of the faith, the primeval barbarity of their manners§.

While the Church of Antioch retained, after the fall of Jerusalem, a nominal supremacy among the Christians of the east, that of Rome con-

* 'Who will not confess (says Origen to Celsus) that the worst members of the Church, who are few in comparison with the better, are much more virtuous than those who compose the popular assemblies? The Church of God, at Athens, if you will, is tranquil and peaceable, searching only to do God's pleasure: the Assembly of the Athenians is seditious, and bearing no comparison to it. The same is true of the Churches of Corinth and Alexandria, compared to the popular assemblies of those cities. . . . So that, if we compare the senate of the Church with the senate of every city, we shall find the senators of the Church worthy to govern the city of God; while the others have nothing in their morals which fits them for their rank, or places them above the ordinary qualities of citizens. And, if we carry the comparison further, we shall observe the immense moral superiority of the most dissolute and imperfect of the bishops and presbyters over the civil magistrates.'—See Fleury, lib. vii., sec. 18.

† Dionys. ap. Euseb., H. E., vii. 5. Dionysius was Bishop of Alexandria during the middle of the third century. Tillemont (vol. iii. p. 405), on the authority of Origen, asserts that the Christians, before the middle of the second century, not only had built a number of churches, but had ventured in some places an assault upon temples, altars, and idols.

‡ Vindication, p. 74. We give him credit for this admission, because the error was of his own discovery. He adds, 'The seeds of the faith were deeply sown here during the last and greatest persecution. Tridates may dispute with Constantine the honour of being the first Christian sovereign.'

§ Mosh. Gen. Hist., c. iii., p. 1., ch. 1. The progress of Christianity in Gaul was not rapid. Even as late as the reign of Decius, we observe that it was necessary to send fresh missionaries from Rome for the complete conversion of that country.

tinued to advance, among the western churches, certain vague assertions of authority. On one occasion indeed, in the conviction of a heretical bishop, Paul of Samosata, its claims appear to have been indirectly encouraged* by the Emperor Aurelian; but they were not then acknowledged by any Christian Church, and were very warmly contested by Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. That prelate maintained with equal zeal and truth the primitive equality of the churches. If the early Christians had for the most part derived the rudiments of their learning † from Alexandria, their charitable exertions had been principally animated by the wealth and munificence of Rome. Those two cities appear still to have maintained their respective advantages. During the suspension of persecution, in the reign of Commodus, many great and opulent families were converted; and we learn from an epistle of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, that it was among his duties to provide for the maintenance of more than 1500 widows and mourners.‡ The excellencies of the religion contributed to its progress, and so rapid at this period was that progress, that at the synod assembled at Rome in the year 251 to pronounce upon the heresy (or schism) of Novatian,§ sixty bishops, and a greater number of presbyters and deacons were present, though the rustic pastors in the other districts held their separate meetings respecting the same question. Under such of the emperors as were not decidedly opposed to Christianity, a considerable number of its professors were to be found in the army and even at the court, since their profession did not exclude them from public preferment; and their assemblage for divine worship, in certain houses || set apart for that purpose, was permitted by the *connivance* of the civil magistrate.¶

The best history of the Church of Alexandria during the first half of the third century, is furnished by the life of Origen. That extraordinary person, the most eminent among the early fathers, was a *Origen*. native of Egypt, the son of one Leonidas, who suffered martyrdom in the year 202. When in prison he received an epistle from his son, of which one sentence only is preserved to us. ‘Take heed, father, that you do not change your mind for our sake.’ Origen was then about seventeen years old—his religious instructions he had received from Clemens Alexandrinus, his philosophical lore from Ammonius Saccas, and such proficiency had he made in both those studies, that he was called to preside over the Catechetical School of Christianity at the age of eighteen. He filled that office for nearly thirty years, and discharged its duties with zeal and genius so distinguished, with such fruitful diligence of composition, such persuasiveness of oral eloquence, as to make it a question whether our religion was ever so much advanced, in point of numbers, by the mere intellectual

* Euseb. H. E., l. vii., c. 30. Pagi. ad ann. 271, n. 3, 4.

† The Catechetical School there established, was clearly the most important among the early literary institutions of Christianity.

‡ *βλ. βόμματα*. See Semler, vol. i., p. 66. The clergy of Rome then consisted of forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, besides the inferior orders. Euseb. lib. vi., c. 43.

§ Euseb., H. E., vi. 43. Novatus originated the heresy; Novatian carried it into a schism. See Tillem., vol. iii., p. 433 to 493.

|| Mosh., cent. iii., p. ii., ch. 4.

¶ Mosh. c. iii., p. i., ch. 1. The emperors during this age who were most favourable to Christianity were Caracalla, Heliogabalus, Alexander Severus, Gordian, and his two successors, the Philips. Respecting the first of these two, a great mass of authorities is adduced to prove that he had actually, though secretly, embraced the religion.

exertions of any other individual.* He merited the honour of persecution, and had the double fortune to be expelled from his chair and country by the jealousy † of the Bishop Demetrius, and to be tortured in his old age by the brutality of a Roman emperor.‡ The works of Origen exhibit the operation of a bold and comprehensive mind, burning with religious warmth, unrestrained by any low prejudices or interests, and sincerely bent on the attainment of truth. In the main plan and outline of his course, he seized the means best calculated to his object, for his principal labours were directed to the collection of correct copies of the Holy Scriptures, to their strict and faithful translation, to the explanation of their numerous difficulties. In the two first of these objects he was singularly successful; but in the accomplishment of the last part of his noble scheme the heat of his imagination and his attachment to philosophical speculation carried him away into error and absurdity: for he applied to the explanation of the Old Testament the same fanciful method of allegory by which the Platonists were accustomed to veil the fabulous history of their gods. This error, so fascinating to the loose imagination of the East, was rapidly propagated by numerous disciples, and became the foundation of that doubtful system of theology, called *Philosophical* or *Scholastic*.

The fame of Origen was not confined to his native country, or to the schools of philosophy, or to the professors of the Faith. Mammæa, the mother of the Emperor Alexander, sought a conference with him in Syria; he was held in high repute at Rome; his personal exertions were extended to Greece, and among the most fortunate efforts of his genius we may be allowed to mention, that when a numerous synod was twice convoked in Arabia on two occasions of heresy, Origen, who was present by invitation, was twice successful in convincing his opponents.§ His school gave birth to a number of learned men, Plutarch, Serenus, Heraclides, Heron, who proved the sincerity and multiplied the followers of their religion, by the industry with which they adorned life, and the constancy with which they quitted it.

The Latin Church of Carthage attained little celebrity till the end of the second century, when it was adorned by Tertullian; *Tertullian*. and we find that, about that period, Christianity, which had already scattered its blessings along the banks of the Nile, and into the adjacent deserts, also made great|| progress along the

* The diligent distribution of his translation of the Scriptures was among the most certain means of accomplishing that work.

† Mosheim appears to think that, because Demetrius patronized Origen in his youth, it is not probable that he was jealous of him afterwards.

‡ Decius. The reader may find a satisfactory account of the life and writings of Origen in Tillem. Mem., vol. iii. p. 494, 495. "He was followed by the same fate (says that author) after his death as during his life. The saints themselves were divided on that subject. Martyrs have made his defence, and martyrs have written his condemnation. The one party has regarded him as the greatest doctor possessed by the Church since the apostles; the other has execrated him as the parent of Arius and every other heresiarch, &c." Tillemont takes the favourable side.

§ Euseb. H. E. vi. 19 and 37. Origen had also the credit of converting various other heretics, especially one Ambrose, whose errors had some celebrity at the moment.

|| Tertullian in several places indulges in somewhat exaggerated descriptions of the multitude and power of the Christians throughout the empire. But when he tells Scapula, proconsul of Africa, that the effect of continuing the persecution against the Christians would be to decimate the inhabitants of Carthage, he probably does not exceed the truth. Yet Carthage was at that time one of the youngest among the Churches. See Bishop Kaye, p. 92.

northern coast of Africa. Tertullian is described by Jerome* as ‘a man of eager and violent temper;’ and he appears to have possessed the usual vice of such a temperament—inconstancy. The same is the character of his writings; they contain some irregular eloquence, much confidence of assertion, and a mixture of good with very bad reasoning. He wrote many tracts against heretics, and then adopted the opinions of the least rational of all heretics, the Montanists. But in spite of many imperfections, his genius, his zeal, and his industry place him at the head of the Latin fathers of that period; his moral writings must have been eminently serviceable to converts who had been educated with no fixed principles of morality; and his “Apology” is among the most valuable monuments of early Christianity. He appears to have been made a presbyter of the Church of Carthage about 192 A. D., at the age of forty-five. His secession from the Church may have taken place seven years afterwards, and some of his most valuable works were probably composed during the period of his heresy.†

The fame of Tertullian was succeeded in the same Church, but not surpassed, by that of Cyprian, an African and a heathen, who was converted to Christianity late in life, and presently raised to the see of Carthage about the year 250. It is said that he was exalted to that dangerous honour rather by the popular voice of the Church than by his own inclination: it is certain that, after a very short and disturbed possession of it, he suffered martyrdom with great fortitude in the reign of Valerian. An interesting and probably faithful account of his sufferings will be found in a later page.

The government of the Church at the beginning of the third century was nearly such as we have described in the last chapter. The more important Churches were severally superintended by a bishop, possessed of a certain, but not very definite degree of authority, who ruled in concert with the body of presbyters, and even consulted on matters of great moment the opinion of the whole assembly. The provincial synods, of which we have spoken, composed of those bishops, assisted by a few presbyters, now began to meet with great regularity‡ and to publish canons for the general ordination of ecclesiastical affairs. The Metropolitans gradually rose in consequence. Their dignity seems to have been conferred for life; but their legitimate power was confined to the calling and presiding in councils, and the fraternal admonition of offenders. Still it was the natural consequence of this system, acting on human imperfection, that the occasional presidents insensibly asserted a general pre-eminence over the other bishops, which it became their next step to dispute with each other; and that the other bishops, being now constantly distinguished from their presbyters by these synodical meetings, assumed both over them and the people a degree of ascendancy not originally acknowledged, but which it was not difficult

* Catalogus Script. Ecclesiast.

† We acknowledge great obligations to Bishop Kaye for the manner in which he has brought within the reach of ordinary readers of theology the works of Justin and Tertullian. Whoever shall imitate his example in the treatment of the other principal Fathers, examining with the same learning, judgment, and moderation their merits and defects, and sifting from the various contents of their folios what is really valuable to the history and right understanding of religion, will complete an undertaking of incalculable use in the study of early Christianity. And at the same time he will perform a secondary, but not unworthy, office—that of placing those writers in their just rank in literature—a rank from which they are equally far removed by the enthusiasm of those who reverence them too highly, and by the ignorance of the more numerous party who scorn them altogether.

‡ Twice every year—in the spring and autumn.

gradually to convert into authority. If we are to bestow on any individual the credit of having accomplished a change so natural and so nearly insensible, that distinction may possibly be due to Cyprian; certain it is, that he pleaded for episcopal supremacy with much more zeal and vehemence than had hitherto been employed in that cause.* It seems clear, indeed, from several of his epistles,† especially that addressed to Rogatian, that bishops possessed in his time, or at least in his Church, the power of suspending or deposing delinquents among the clergy; yet even this was liable to some indefinite restrictions as to circumstance and custom, and to a direct appeal to a provincial council. And it does not appear that such power was frequently exerted without the consent of the presbyterial college, or ‘senate of the Church.’ From these facts, compared with the assertions afterwards made by St. Jerome and St. Chrysostom, (which we have already mentioned,) we infer that the actual progress of episcopal usurpation, during the third century, was much less than some have imagined—or at least, that the power of the bishops grew chiefly through the growth of their *influence*, and was not yet publicly acknowledged by the constitution of the Church.‡

We admit, however, with sorrowful reflection, that the individual conduct of some, perhaps many, among the directors of the Church, during the course, and especially the conclusion, of this century, deserved the reprehensions of contemporary and succeeding writers.§ Some assumption of the ensigns of temporal dignity—the splendid throne, the sumptuous garments, the parade of external pomp—indicated a departure from apostolical simplicity; and a contentious ambition succeeded to the devoted humility of former days. And though we believe this evil to have been exaggerated by all the writers who have dwelt upon it, since the abuses which we have noticed could scarcely be carried to violent excess by an order possessing no legally recognised rights or property, we may still be convinced, by the institution of certain inferior classes in the ministry, such as subdeacons, acoluthi, readers, exorcists, and others, that the higher ranks had made some advances in luxurious indolence.||

This deterioration in the character of the ministers was attended by a

* Mosh. Gen. Hist. c. iii. p. ii. ch. 2.

† Bingham, Ch. Antiq. b. ii. ch. 3. The apostolical canons confirm these pretensions, and so do certain canons of the councils of Nice, Sardica, Antioch, Chalcedon, and others; but, according to the first and second councils of Carthage, the consent of three bishops was necessary for the censure of a deacon, of six for that of a presbyter, of twelve for that of a bishop. ‘Reliquorum Clericorum causas solus Episcopus loci agnoscat et finiat.’—Conc. Carth. iii. Can. 8. Cyprian himself (Epist. v. p. 11. Ep. xiii. p. 23. Ep. xxviii. p. 29, and in many other places) avows that he cannot act without his council of presbyters and deacons, and the consent of the people. See Mosh. (De Reb. Christ. ant. Const. sec. iii. sec. xxiii. xxiv.) for a full examination of the principles and conduct of Cyprian. The writings of that prelate seem to have been more effectual in exalting the episcopal dignity in following times than during his own.

‡ We are disposed to attribute much of this increase of influence to a cause not sufficiently attended to by ecclesiastical writers,—the judicial, or rather arbitral, authority originally vested in the bishops by the consent of their people, and which would naturally extend its limits, as it was confirmed by time and usage.

§ Origen. Comm. in Matthæum, par. i. app. p. 420, 441, 442; Euseb. H. E. l. viii. c. 1. Cyprian himself rates his contemporary prelates with great severity. (Laps. p. 239, &c.) The language of Mosheim, who is always extremely violent on this subject, will not bear careful examination. Gen. Hist. cent. iii. p. ii. ch. 2. See also Tillem. vol. iii. p. 306. The praise which Origen has bestowed on Christians generally, may be contrasted with his censures on the clergy, and they will serve to moderate each other.

|| Mosh. de Reb. Ch. ante Const. sec. iii. sect. 23.

corresponding change in the ceremonies of the Church. The division of the people into two classes, the Faithful and the Catechumens, was the practice, if not the invention, of the third *Catechumens*. century. It was borrowed from the pagan principle of initiation; and the outward distinction between those classes was this: that after the performance of public worship the latter were dismissed, while the former, the true and initiated Christians, remained to celebrate the mysteries* of their religion; and this term is by some thought to have expressed not only the administration of the sacraments, but the delivery of some doctrinal instructions. The original simplicity of the office of baptism had already undergone some corruption. The symbol had been gradually exalted at the expense of the thing signified, and the spirit of the ceremony was beginning to be lost in its form. Hence a belief was gaining ground among the converts, and was inculcated among the heathen, that the act of baptism gave remission of all sins† committed previously to it. It was not fit, then, that so important a rite should be hastily performed or inconsiderately received; and, therefore, the new proselytes were, in the first instance, admitted into a probationary state under the name of Catechumens, whence they were chosen, according to their progress in grace, into the body of the Faithful. As long as they remained in that class, great care was taken to instruct them in the important truths, and especially in the moral obligations, of religion; yet doubtless there would be some among them in whom the love of sin survived the practice of superstition,‡ and such would naturally defer their baptism and their pardon until the fear of death, or satiety of enjoyment, overtook them. It is true, that baptism was not supposed to bestow any impunity for future sins; on the contrary, the first offence committed after it required the expiation of a public confession,§ and the second was punished by excommunication. But if the hope and easy condition of pardon for the past tended, as it may have done, to fill the ranks of the catechumens, we may reasonably indulge the belief that the great majority were amended and perfected by the religious instruction which was then opened to them.

About the same time, and from causes connected with this misapprehension of the real nature of baptism, and the division of the converts, a vague and mysterious veneration began to attach itself to the other Sacrament; its nature and merits were exaggerated by those who administered and partook of it; it was regarded with superstitious curiosity by those to whom it was refused; and reports were already propagated of the miraculous efficacy of the consecrated elements.

An opinion at this time became prevalent in the Christian world, that the demons, the enemies of man, were, in fact, the same beings whom the

* The term *mystery* is in the Greek Church synonymous with *sacrament*. See Semler, Cent. iii. p. 63; and particularly Le Clerc, cent. ii. ann. 101. and ad ann. 118. Neither were the catechumens allowed to use the Lord's Prayer, which was even denominated *εὐχὴ πιστῶν*, the prayer of the faithful. Chrysost. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 740, and Hom. x. in Coloss. For other references see Bingham, Ch. Antiq. b. i. ch. 4.

† Cyprian, Epistle 73. 'It is manifest when and by whom the remission of sins, which is conferred in baptism, is administered. They who are presented to the rulers of the Church obtain, by our prayers and imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost.' See also Euseb. H. E. l. vii. c. 8. Mosh. c. iii. p. ii. c. 4. Compare Cyprian's language with the passage of Justin Martyr, on the same subject.

‡ Origen, however, assures us, that among his converts there were more who had previously led a moral life than of the opposite description—a fact which may serve as an answer to one of Gibbon's insinuations. See Cels. l. iii. p. 150, 151. Tillem. Mem. vol. iii. p. 116.

§ Called *ἕξομαλόγησις*.

heathen worshipped as gods, who inhabited their temples and animated their statues. It became, therefore, the duty of the soldiers of Christ to assail them under every form, and expel them from every residence. That, indeed, which they are related most frequently to have occupied was the body of man,* and from this refuge they were perseveringly disturbed by the pious exorcisms of the clergy; and this practice was carried to such superstitious excess, that none were admitted to the ordinance of baptism until they had been solemnly delivered from the dominion of the Prince of Darkness.† The Sign of the Cross, which was already in much honour in the time of Tertullian,‡ was held to be of great effect in the expulsion of demons, and in other miracles. We also find that the use of prayers for the dead obtained very general prevalence during this age.

A dispute had divided the Church during the second century, as to the propriety of adopting, in its contests with the heathen, the *Philosophy*. weapons of philosophy, and it was finally decided by the authority of Origen, and the superior loquacity of the philosophical party. By this condescension the Christians gained great advantages in the display of argument, in subtlety of investigation, in plausibility of conclusion, in the abuse and even in the use of reason; but they lost that manly and simple integrity of disputation which well became, in spite of its occasional rusticity, the defender of truth. It is to this alliance§ that some are disposed to trace the birth of those pious frauds which cover the face of ecclesiastical history. The original source of this evil was at least free from any stain or shame. It had long been a practice among ancient philosophical writers to ascribe their works to some name of undisputed authority, in order to secure attention to their opinions, though the opinions were well known to be only those of the writer; but the consequences which flowed from it have infected the Church of Christ with some of its deepest and most dangerous pollutions. Books written in later ages were zealously circulated as the writings of the Apostles, or of the Apostolical Fathers.|| The works of these last were altered or interpolated, according to the notions of after times or the caprices of the interpolator; but usually for the purpose of proving the antiquity of some

* Celibacy, though under no circumstances considered as a duty either by clergy or laity, acquired some unmerited honour during this age, through the absurd, but general persuasion, that those who had wives were peculiarly liable to the influence of malignant demons. At least Mosheim (cent. iii. p. ii. ch. 2) asserts this on the authority of Porphyry, *περὶ Ἀποχρῆς* l. iv. p. 417. In the time of Irenæus, (l. i. c. 24.) the profession of celibacy was a heresy.

† Mosh. Gen. Hist. cent. iii. p. ii. ch. 4.

‡ De Corona, cap. iii. Semler, Hist. Eccl. cent. iii. cap. 3.

§ Le Clerc adjudges to an earlier year (ann. 122) the celebrated forgery, under the name of Hermes Trismegistus, of which the object was to trace the doctrine of Christ to a much higher period than his incarnation, and thus to increase its sanctity. The interpolation of the Sibylline Books is referred by the same historian to the year 131. This latter imposture, as foolish as shameful, was warmly patronised by a host of Fathers, including Clemens Alex., Tertullian, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustin, &c. and thus occasioned much scandal to Christians in general among their enemies in that age, and no little disrepute to its ancient patrons among candid writers of every age. See Le Clerc, vol. i. p. 106. Jortin, Remarks, &c. vol. i. p. 183.

|| Such, in the second century, were the celebrated Apostolical Canons; and, afterwards, the Apostolical Constitutions, attributed to the diligence of Clemens Romanus; and such were the False Decretals in the eighth.—Mosh. G. Hist. c. i. p. ii. ch. 2. Le Clerc (sec. i. ad ann. 100) supposes the Canons to be of the third, the Constitutions of a later age. Jortin, supposing that the Canons may have been forged, some in the second and some in the third century, refers the Constitutions to some period after Constantine. vol. i. pp. 152, 185.

new opinion, some innovation in discipline, some usurpation in authority. The practice was justified by the detestable, but popular principle, 'that truth may be defended by falsehood; it was encouraged by the difficulties of detection in ignorant ages; and it continued for more than six centuries to disgrace the Roman Church. It was the same principle, pushed a little farther, which has stained the writings of so many among the early Fathers with statements at least doubtful, if not with palpable falsehood. But, on the other hand, we should ever recollect that Christianity in those days was chiefly in the hands of Greeks and Africans,* men of subtle intellects and violent passions, whose habits and whose climate too often carried them into the extreme either of metaphysical sophistry or wild enthusiasm—men who could speculate on their faith, or who could die for it, but who were little calculated for the tranquil equanimity of sober and reasonable belief. We should recollect also, that some of our best and commonest principles of action were then unknown or partially received; and that, in fact, many of them are the result of the patient operation of Christianity on the human character, through a long succession of ages. We shall never do justice to the history of our religion, unless we continually bear in mind the low condition of society and morals existing among the people to whom it was first delivered.

During the concluding part of the second century, a philosophical sect arose at Alexandria, who professed to form their own tenets, by selecting and reconciling what was reasonable in the tenets of all others, and rejecting what was contrary to reason—they were called the new Platonics, or Eclectics. What they professed respecting philosophy, they easily extended to religion, since with them religion was entirely founded on philosophical principles. It is strange that the great founder of this sect, Ammonius Saccas†, had been educated in Christianity; and he seems never to have abandoned the name ‡ of the faith, while he was disparaging its doctrines and its essence. A sect, which was founded on the seductive principle of universal concord, soon made extraordinary progress. In his eminent disciple Plotinus, Ammonius left a successor not inferior to himself in subtlety of genius, and power of profound and abstruse investigation; and next to Plotinus in age and reputation, is the celebrated name of Porphyry§. The efforts of these philosophers were for the most part directed against Christianity, and the contest was waged with great ardour during the third century. But as Origen and his scholars, on the one hand, adopted into the service of religion some of the peculiar principles of their adversaries, so, on the other, certain disciples of Plotinus assumed the name and professed the faith of Christians, on condition that they should be allowed to retain some favourite opinions of their master ||; an

* It is certainly very remarkable, that for the first three centuries, Rome produced no ecclesiastical writer of any merit, excepting Clement; and the western provinces not one of any description: Rome was very nearly as barren during the three which followed.

† Mosh. Gen. Hist. c. ii. p. ii. ch. 1. Mémoires de Tillem. tom. iii. p. 279.

‡ Porphyry asserts that Ammonius deserted Christianity, Eusebius that he adhered to it. To these two opinions, variously advocated by most modern divines, others have added a third, that Eusebius mistook a Christian writer of the same name for the heathen philosopher; and this is warmly maintained by Lardner (Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies.) The question was not worth one page of controversy; and, in our mind, Christian writers would act a more politic, as well as a more manly part, if they at once disclaimed their *ambiguous* defenders.

§ Mosh. de Reb. Ch. ante Constant. sect. iii., xxi.

|| August. Epist. 56, ad Dioscor.—Mosh. c. iii. p. ii. ch. 1.

accession which was only valuable in so far as it swelled the body and increased the lustre of the church.*

It has been too hastily asserted by some historians, and too readily admitted by others, that the expectation of the Millennium, or *Millennium*. presence of Christ on earth to reign with his elect, was the universal opinion of the ancient church. The fair statement of that much-disputed question appears to be this:—Eusebius† informs us that Papias, ‘among certain parables and sermons of the Saviour, and other seemingly fabulous records which he professed to have received traditionally, said, that there would be a thousand years after the resurrection of the dead, during which Christ was to reign bodily upon the earth; in which I think that he misunderstood the apostolic narrations, not penetrating what was mystically spoken by them; for he appears to have been exceedingly limited in understanding (σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν), as one may conjecture from his discourses.’ The historian then proceeds to attribute the general reception of this opinion among ecclesiastics, and particularly by Irenæus, to their respect for ‘the antiquity of the man.’‡ To Papias, then, we may attribute the origin of the belief. It was first adopted by Justin Martyr,§ next by Irenæus, and connected by both of them with the resurrection of the flesh. But the passage of the latter|| plainly declares ‘that there were some in the church, in divers nations and by various works, who, believing, do consent with the just, who do yet endeavour ‘to turn these things into metaphors;’ which proves that even the orthodox were divided on the question at that early age, though the names of the disputants have not reached us. The first distinguished opponent of the doctrine was Origen, who attacked it with great earnestness and ingenuity, and seems, in spite of some opposition, to have thrown it into general discredit; and, probably, we shall not have occasion to notice the opinion again until we arrive at the tenth century.

Dr. Whitby expresses his belief that the Fathers who adopted that doctrine ‘received it from the traditions and notions of the Jews;’ and he proceeds very truly to assert that that error ‘will not invalidate their authority in any thing delivered by them as witnesses of what they

* To give some idea of the nature of Christian literature in this age, it may be worth while to mention the subjects of some of the most celebrated productions—On Temptations—The Baptism of Heretics—Promises—Chastity—The Creation—The Origin of Evil—The Vanity of Idols—The Dress of Virgins—The Unity of the Church—Circumcision—Clean and Unclean Animals—The Lapsed, or those who had fallen from the Faith during Persecution—The Millennium; besides numerous books against heretics.

† H. E. lib. iii. c. 39.—On this important subject see Whitby’s excellent ‘Treatise on the Millennium,’ at the end of vol. ii. of his ‘Commentaries.’ This obscure doctrine was probably known to very few except the Fathers of the Church, and is very sparingly mentioned by them during the two first centuries. And there is reason to believe that it scarcely attained much notoriety even among learned Christians until it was made matter of controversy by Origen, and then rejected by the great majority. In fact, we find Origen himself, in his Prolegomena to the Canticles (69 B.), asserting that it was confined ‘to those of the simpler sort;’ and, in his Philocalia (c. xxvi. p. 99) he directly declares that the few (τινεις) who held it did so with such secrecy, that *it had not yet come to the ears of the heathen*. . . . In all fairness, then, we must consider the opposite declarations of Origen and Eusebius either to have been applied to different parts of Christendom, or to qualify each other: always recollecting that the latter is confined to ecclesiastics, while the former extends to all classes.

‡ The words are these—πλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ’ αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆς ἡμοίας αὐτῶν δοξῆς παροίτιος γίγοντι, τὴν ἀρχαίτητα τάνδρος προβεβλημένοις· ὥσπερ οὖν Εἰρηναῖο καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος τὰ ὁμοῖα φρονῶν ἀνεπέφηνεν.

§ Dial. cum Tryph.

|| Adv. Hær. l. v. c. 33.

have seen, or declared to have been then the practice of the Church of Christ.' In these points, indeed, consists a great portion of the direct value of their works. But they are also greatly, perhaps principally, useful to us, as they prove, by numerous quotations, the early existence of the books of the New Testament *as we now read them*, and their reception in the primitive Church.*

CHAPTER IV.

Persecutions of several Roman Emperors.

Claims of Roman Paganism to the character of tolerance—examined—Theory of pure Polytheism—Roman policy—Various laws of the Republic—continued under the emperors—Mecænas—Remarks—The ten persecutions—how many general—That of Nero—its character—Of Domitian—The grandsons of St. Jude—The epistle of Pliny to Trajan—His answer—Real object of Trajan—Letter of Serenius Granianus to Hadrian—Antoninus Pius—Marcus Antoninus—Gibbon's partiality—Real character of this persecution compared with those preceding it—His principles and knowledge, and superstition—His talents and virtues—Connection of his philosophy and his intolerance—Commodus—Decius—His persecution—accounted for—its nature—Valerian—Martyrdom of Cyprian—Persecution of Diocletian—Its origin and motives—Influence of Pagan priesthood—Progress of the persecution—Its mitigation by Constantius, and final cessation at the accession of Constantine.—General Remarks—Unpopularity of the Christians—accounted for—Calumnies by which they suffered—Their contempt of all false gods—Change in the character of their adversaries—Philosophy—Excuses advanced for the persecutors—their futility—General character of persecuting emperors—Absurd opinions on this subject—Effect of the persecutions—upon the whole favourable—For what reasons.

CERTAIN writers have industriously exerted themselves to display the mild and tolerant nature of the religion which prevailed in the Roman world at the introduction of Christianity; and then, when its seeming claims to this excellence have been established, they have placed it in contrast with the persecuting spirit which has occasionally broken out from the corruptions of our faith; insomuch that some persons may possibly have been persuaded that there was some latent virtue in that superstition, which Christianity does not possess. We shall not here pause to show, what none can seriously deny, that the intolerance of Christians, like all their other vices, is in spite, and not in consequence, of their belief; but it is worth while shortly to examine the pretensions of Polytheism to one of the virtues in which we are most disposed to exult, and which we are accustomed to consider most peculiarly our own.

The religion called Polytheism means 'the worship of many gods.' Now the observation which first occurs to us is this—that, when the number of gods is not limited, the easy reception of an additional divinity does little more than satisfy the definition of the word; it is not the endurance of a new religion, but the slight extension of that already established. The intrusion of one stranger would scarcely be noticed in the numerous synod of Mount Olympus; the golden portals were

* The Apologies for Christianity, published by the early Fathers, however imperfect as specimens of reasoning or even as representations of religion, were probably, at the time, the most useful of their labours, not only because they brought Christianity into notice, and challenged examination, and put forward some of its leading excellencies, but also because they publicly assailed the tottering temples of Paganism, and exposed to irresistible contempt and contumely its origin, its rites, its morals, and its mythology. And those Apologies were very numerous—to those of Justin, Athenagoras, Tatian, Melito, Quadratus, Aristides, and Tertullian, already mentioned, we may add others by Clemens Apollinaris, and Theophilus of Antioch.—Mosh. G. Hist. c. ii. p. ii. chap. 3. Fleury, l. iv, sect. 4, &c.

ever open—useful virtue or splendid vice gave an equal claim to admission; and the policy or servility of Rome bowed with the same pliancy to the captive gods of her enemies or the manes of her imperial tyrants. This was not a virtue, but a *part* of Polytheism; the new deities became new members of the same monstrous body; they assisted and sustained each other; and the whole mass was held together by ignorance, and animated by the gross spirit of superstition. It seems, indeed, that a Pagan statesman, who may have permitted additions to the calendar of his gods, deserves no higher description of praise than that which we should bestow on a pope, who has been zealous in the canonization of saints. For one idol will presently become as holy as another idol; nor could there be any reason why Jove should scorn the society of Serapis, since their respective divinity was founded on the same evidence, and their worship conducted on the same principles.

Such is the real theory of pure Polytheism. But we should be doing it much more than justice, if we were to confine ourselves to its abstract nature, without mention of the political uses to which it was converted; and which, indeed, subjected it to so much restraint and limitation, that we shall be unable to discover in its practice even that ambiguous virtue which some have supposed to be inherent in it.

The belief or infidelity of the statesmen of antiquity, who were left to wander over the fields of conjecture, with no better guide than reason, may have varied in individuals, according to the understanding, or the passions, or the wishes of each; but those were certainly very rare, who admitted into their closet the various and irrational worship which they encouraged in the people. They supported religion only as one of the easiest means of governing; and valued devotion to the gods as they supposed it naturally connected with obedience to man—a just supposition, in a case where the gods were little removed from the nature, and generally tainted with the vices, of humanity. Our short inquiry into the manner in which the ancients wielded this engine of state shall be confined to the History of Rome, as being immediately connected with the subject of the present chapter.

Cicero (*de Legibus*, c. ii. s. 8.) gives us the following extract from the most ancient laws of Rome. ‘Let no one have any separate worship, nor hold any new gods; neither to strange gods, unless they have been publicly adopted, let any private worship be offered; men should attend the temples erected by their ancestors,’ &c. From Livy (*b. iv. c. 30.*) we learn that about 430 years before Christ orders were given to the *Ædiles* to see ‘that none except Roman gods were worshipped, nor in any other than the established forms.’ Somewhat more than 200 years after this edict, to crush certain external rites which were becoming common in the city, the following edict was published, ‘that whoever possesses books of oracle, or prayer, or any written act of sacrifice, deliver all such books and writings to the Pretor before the Calends of April; and that no one sacrifice on public or sacred ground after new or foreign rites.’ But it may seem needless to produce separate instances, when from the same historian (*b. xxxix. c. 16.*) we learn, that it had been customary in all the early ages of the republic to empower the magistrates ‘to prevent all foreign worship, to expel its ministers from the forum, the circus, and the city, to search for and burn the religious books (*vaticinos libros*), and to abolish every form of sacrifice except the national and established form.’

The authority of Livy is confirmed by that of Valerius Maximus, who wrote under the emperor Tiberius, and bears testimony to the jealousy

with which all foreign religions were prohibited by the Roman republic (b. i. c. 3.). That the same principle, which had been consecrated by the practice of seven hundred years, was not discontinued by the emperors, is clearly attested by the historian Dio Cassius * (p. 490-2.). It appears that Mecænas, in the most earnest terms, exhorted Augustus 'to hate and punish' all foreign religions, and to compel all men to conform to the national worship; and we are assured that the scheme of government thus proposed was pursued by Augustus and adopted by his successors.

Now, from the first of the passages before us it appears that all right of private judgment in matters of religion was explicitly forbidden by an original law of Rome—which never was repealed. We know not what stronger proof it would be possible to adduce of the inherent intolerance of Roman Polytheism. The four next references prove to us that the ancient law, subversive of the most obvious right of human nature, was strictly acted upon during the long continuance of the commonwealth. The established form of Paganism might not be violated by individual schism or dissent; the gods whom the government created the people were compelled to worship according to the forms imposed by the government. Under the early emperors the same was still the maxim of state; and if the influx of idolaters from every nation under Heaven made it difficult to preserve the purity of the Roman religion, that religion became more domestic and (let us add) more Roman by the successive and easy deification of some of the most vicious of mankind.

These few lines may suffice for the present to disprove the plausible theory of the tolerance of Paganism, and they may lead us, perhaps, to discover the true reason why the worship of Christ was forbidden in that city which acknowledged the divinity of Nero. At least, we shall learn from them, that the religion which Christianity supplanted was very far from possessing the only point of superiority which its admirers have ever claimed for it. And we shall not forget, in the following pages, to direct to the religious system of Rome some portion of the abhorrence which is usually confined to the individuals who administered it.

Hitherto we have followed the progress of Christianity through nearly all the provinces of the Roman empire, and some countries without its limits, as if we had been attending a *Number of* triumphal procession. The less pleasing duty remains to *persecutions*. describe its difficulties and its afflictions. And in so doing it is not easy to ascertain the precise path of truth, entangled as it is, on one side, by the exaggerated fictions of enthusiasts, and perplexed, on the other, by the perversity of scepticism.

Early, though not the most ancient, ecclesiastical historians, followed by many moderns, have fixed the number of persecutions at ten; and if we thought proper indiscriminately to designate by that name every partial outrage to which Christians were subjected from the reign of Nero to that of Constantine, perhaps even this number might be considerably extended.† On the other hand, Gibbon has so carefully palliated the

* In the year U. C. 701 the temples of Isis and Osiris were destroyed by order of the Senate (B. 40.).

† Mosh. Gen. Hist. Cent. i. p. i. ch. 5. Idem de Chr. Ant. Const. Sæc. i. sect. xxvi. The number of ten persecutions was an invention of the fifth century, derived from arbitrary interpretation of prophecy rather than historical evidence. Lactantius, in the fourth age, enumerates only six. Eusebius specifies no number, though he appears to mention nine. The same number is adopted by Sulpicius Severus, in the fifth century, who prepares his readers, however, for the infliction of the tenth and last by Antichrist at the end of the world; from his time *ten* became the popular computation.

guilt, and softened down the asperity of those successive inflictions, that in his representation not one of them wears a serious aspect, excepting that of Diocletian; though he admits that some transient excesses may be charged upon Nero, Domitian, Decius, and perhaps one or two others.

Differing in many respects from that author in our view of this portion of history, and animated, perhaps, by a more general and impartial humanity, we are still willing, in this matter, to make some concessions to his opinion; and though other occasions to prove the sincerity and constancy of Christians were abundantly presented, yet we are not disposed to impute the shame of deliberate unrelenting persecution to more than four or five among the emperors; but in one important respect our estimate of these events will still differ from that of the philosophical historian, as we shall bestow a much greater share of attention on the conduct of Marcus Antoninus. Our reasons will appear in the progress of the narrative.

The persecution of Nero was the first to which the Christian name was subjected, and the best account which has reached us respecting it *Nero*. is that of the historian Tacitus, which we have translated in a former chapter. From his description it appears, that the sufferings of the Christians did not originate in any evil that had been committed by them, nor even in the general calumnies which blackened their character,* but in a specific charge, which was notoriously false, that they had occasioned the destructive conflagration so generally attributed to the madness of the Emperor himself. The nature of their tortures is related, and the very spots particularized on which they were inflicted. But their duration is not mentioned, nor the extent to which the persecution prevailed (if it at all prevailed) in other parts of the empire. The fact, that it arose in the first instance from a charge which was necessarily confined to the inhabitants of Rome, is certainly not a conclusive argument that it might not afterwards spread beyond the boundaries of the city; and yet both the words and the silence of Tacitus are such as indirectly persuade us, that the calamity, which he is describing, was both local and transient. The imperfect account of Eusebius† throws little more light on these questions, which have in vain divided the opinions and exercised the ingenuity of a multitude of critics.‡ For our own part, if that were sufficiently proved which is continually asserted, that the persecution lasted for four years, until the death of Nero,§ we should very readily admit the probability that it was general. But whatever uncertainty may rest on this point, the expressions of the Pagan historian unhappily convey sufficient evidence that the assault was exceedingly destructive and attended by every circumstance of barbarity.

Much difference has also existed respecting the laws supposed to have been enacted by Nero against the Christians, and their continuance or

* Suetonius, Vit. Neronis, cap. 16., mentions the same event, in the midst of some trifling details of sumptuary restrictions, in these few words—'Afflicti supplicii Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ et maleficæ.' But we must follow the circumstantial narrative of Tacitus.

† Euseb. H. E. lib. ii. c. 25.

‡ In this question, which involves the historical accuracy of Tertullian, compare the reasoning of Semler (sæc. i. cap. 6.) with that of Mosheim (Gen. Hist. Cent. i. p. 1. ch. 5.) The forgery of the Lusitanian inscription, according to which Nero 'purged that province from the new superstition,' is now universally admitted.

§ In the year 68. Mosh. de Re. Christ. ante Const. sæc. i. sct. xxxiv.

repeal* by subsequent emperors. And this question is so far at least connected with the preceding, that the mere existence of any general edicts against Christians *as such*, proves that the particular charge on which the persecution was founded had been gradually lost in more general accusations, which had been followed by general inflictions. But even in this case, it becomes a question, whether Nero's edicts proceeded any further than to enforce against Christians specifically the ancient statutes universally directed against religious innovation—whether it was not rather a precedent which that emperor established, than a law which he enacted—a precedent which would be followed or disregarded by his successors, as their character and religious policy might lead them to execute or suspend the standing statutes of the empire. At least it is strange that, when his other laws were repealed, that against the Christians should alone remain in force, unless we conclude that that alone had existed before his time, and had been applied or perverted, but not enacted, by him.

After this first affliction, the Christians passed about thirty years in the silent and undisturbed propagation of their religion. In the year 94 or 95, they again attracted the attention of the civil *Domitian*. power, by exciting, as it would seem, the political fears of the emperor. Domitian was no doubt acquainted with an ancient prophecy prevalent throughout the east, and probably an imperfect adumbration of the prophecies of the Old Testament, that the imperial sceptre was destined one day to pass into the hands of a Jew. This led to some inquiries into the actual condition of the royal family of Jerusalem; and the grandsons of St. Jude the Apostle, the brother of the Saviour, are said to have been brought before the throne of the tyrant: but his jealousy was disarmed by their poverty and simplicity,—their hands were hardened ‡ with daily labour,—and their whole property consisted in one small farm of about twenty-four acres. And when the emperor inquired respecting the nature of their prophetic hopes, and the character of the monarch who was to rise up from among them, he was informed, 'that his kingdom was not of earth, but heavenly and angelical; and that in the completion of time he would come in glory to judge both the living and the dead, according to their merits.' They were dismissed without injury; and soon after this event, some severities,

* Some declare them to have been repealed by the Senate (Mosh. de R. Christ. ante Const. sæc. ii. sect. viii.), and Tertullian (lib. i. ad Nationes, c. 7.) asserts that while all Nero's other institutes were repealed, that against the Christians alone remained.

† Tertullian (lib. i. ad Nationes, c. 7.) calls Nero's edict Institutum Neronianum, and in other places (as Apol. cap. 5, and 7,) speaks of *laws* existing, and occasionally enforced against Christians; still we suspect him of error, if he intended to attribute to Nero the invention of those laws—an error very naturally rising from the fact, that that Emperor was the first who applied them to Christianity. See, however, Bishop Kaye on this subject, (Lec. on Tertull. pp. 115, et seq.) Certainly Gibbon is rather presumptuous in his manner of concluding, 'that the effects, as well as the cause, of Nero's persecution were confined to the walls of Rome, and that the religious tenets of the Christians were never made a subject of punishment or even of inquiry.' (Chap. 16.) Still we are disposed to assent at least to the first of his conclusions, as we are aware of no express authority for the contrary opinion earlier than the fifth century. (Sulp. l. ii. p. 146.; Oros. l. vii. c. 7, &c.) And if, on the one hand, Tillemont enumerates a great variety of martyrs who perished in that persecution (tom. ii. p. 71, et seq.); on the other, Le Clerc has anticipated Gibbon in both his positions, and argues very plausibly in favour of them. (Hist. Eccles. ad ann. 64.)

‡ Hegesippus apud Euseb. iii. 20. Le Clerc, who is generally and justly suspicious of the authority of Hegesippus, is persuaded of the truth of this narrative, by its simplicity and candour.—Hist. Eccl. ad ann. 96.

which had lately been exercised against the Christians, were suspended by the prudence* or the death † of the emperor.

The celebrated epistle of Pliny to Trajan was written ten or twelve years afterwards, and proves that the Christians in Bithynia
Trajan. (and probably in every province of the east) were subjected to many vexations and sufferings. The emperor's answer amounted to this—'that the Christians are not to be sought for, nor molested on anonymous information; but that on conviction they ought to be punished.' ‡ From a comparison of these two documents, we collect, first, that the spirit of persecution in this instance § originated rather in their heathen fellow-subjects than in the character of the emperor; and secondly, that the laws by which they were punished were not any recent edicts issued by an express act of legislation against Christians, but the original statutes of the republic continued and applied to them. ¶ The object of Trajan, in this rescript, was their mitigation; it is probable that he knew little respecting the nature and evidence of the new religion, but was desirous somewhat to soften the practical intolerance of his own; but the effect was not in the end favourable to the Christians, ¶ since it gave a sanction to legal persecution, and established on high authority the fatal maxim, that the mere profession of Christianity was a criminal offence. **

The truth of the first of the above conclusions is confirmed by the annals of succeeding reigns. About the year 120, Serenius Granianus, Proconsul of Asia, wrote to Adrian, 'that it seemed to him unreasonable that Christians should be put to death merely to gratify the clamours of the people, without trial and without any crime proved against them.' And there is a rescript of the emperor, addressed to Minucius Fundanus, in which this letter is noticed, and in which it is enjoined that Christians should not be sacrificed to the *clamours* of the multitude.

During the long reign of Antoninus Pius (from 138 to 161 A. D.), no deliberate injuries were inflicted upon the Christians; and it appears that they suffered much more from the violence of popular tumult than from the operation of the ancient laws. It became common about this time to attribute national calamities of every description to the contempt of the national religion exhibited by the Christians. 'If the Tiber has overflowed its banks,' (exclaimed Tertullian in the next generation,) 'or the

* Tertull. Apol. c. 5. This author is the rather to be believed on this point, because it does not go to support his favourite theory, that the only persecutors were the bad emperors—a fancy to which he has unfortunately sacrificed many indisputable facts. See also Heg. ap. Euseb. loc. cit.

† Mosheim (Gen. Hist. c. i. p. i. ch. 5.) In another place, after adducing the authorities of Lactantius (cap. iii. De Hist. Persec.), and Xiphilinus in Nerva (De Reb. Christ. ante Const. sæc. i. sect. 36.), he leaves the question doubtful.—Gibbon follows the opinion which shortens the persecution.

‡ Tertull. Apol. c. ii., exposes with great vehemence and reason the injustice and inconsistency exhibited in this rescript. If Christians deserved condemnation, they should be sought after; if not sought after, they should not be condemned.—Si damnas, cur non et inquis; si non inquis, cur non et absolvis?

§ Euseb. H. E. lib. iii. c. 32., confirms this position.

¶ From the moment that a precedent existed for the application of those statutes to the religion of the Christians, their condition would at all times be very precarious, as being dependent not only on the policy of the emperor, but on the caprice of the provincial governors; since it would naturally seem to rest at their discretion to enforce, or not, the standing laws against a sect which had already felt their severity.

¶ Mosh. de Reb. Christ. ante Const. sæc. ii. sect. x.

** Illud solum expectatur, confessio nominis, non examinatio criminis. Tertull. Apol. c. ii.

Nile has not overflowed; if heaven has refused its rain; if the earth has been shaken; if famine or plague has spread its ravages, the cry is immediately raised—Away with the Christians to the lions.* The emperor, influenced, as some have supposed, by the Apologies of Justin Martyr, published one, possibly two,† edicts for their protection against such outrage; and during this reign especially they grew and extended in dignity as well as number, and became more generally known by writings not devoid of energy and eloquence. Pius was succeeded by Marcus, of whom Gibbon has said, that ‘during the whole course of his reign he despised the Christians as a philosopher, and *punished them as a Sovereign.*’

It seems singular, that a historian, who makes great profession of candour and universal humanity, should almost have excepted from the number of persecutors the only name (as far at least as this part of our inquiry) to which that ignominious designation appears justly and certainly to belong: for under all the preceding emperors, the injuries inflicted upon the Christians had either been occasional, as arising from some casual circumstance, or staining only a portion of their reign; or partial, as confined to a few provinces, or perhaps cities of the empire. Moreover, they had been sometimes excited, and generally encouraged, by popular irritation; they had been directed against a small and obscure and calumniated sect, through the operation, and according to the seeming intention, of the ancient statutes. And the efforts of individual emperors were, for the most part, turned rather to the suspension or mitigation of those statutes than to the rigid enforcement of them. In addition to this, let us not forget, that those individuals possessed little means or opportunity to inform themselves respecting the peculiar principles, doctrines, or habits of Christians; still less to examine the foundation of their belief, or even to understand that it had any foundation:—if they permitted the work of destruction to proceed, it was in ignorance and blindness. On the other hand, Marcus Antoninus undertook the task of ‘punishment’ or persecution among the earliest ‡ of his imperial duties, and he continued to fulfil it with unremitting diligence throughout the nineteen § years of his splendid administration. He acted on deliberate principles, and his principles were not of partial or local operation, but were equally applicable to every province of his empire. And thus he everywhere enforced the laws in their full severity; the lives || and the property of the convicted were forfeited by the most summary process of justice; and the search ¶ which was made after the suspected, and which

* Tertull. Apol. cap. 40.

† That mentioned by Justin Martyr at the end of his 1st Apol., and by Eusebius, l. 4, c. 13. (if it could establish its claims to be genuine) would, with much more probability, be ascribed to Pius than to M. Antoninus.

‡ Mosh. de Reb. Ch. ante Const. sæc. ii. sect. xv., xvi.

§ From 161 A. D. to 180.

|| Euseb. H. E. lib. v. c. 1. ‘The Emperor’s edict was, that those who denied the charge of Christianity should be spared, but the rest put to death by torture.’

¶ Moyle on Marcus Antoninus. We do not accuse him of promulgating any new laws against the Christians, though Melito tells us of a violent persecution in this reign ‘by new edicts.’ In fact, such a step was perfectly unnecessary, for the original statutes, to which the Christians were made liable, contained every penalty. His letter to the Assembly of Asia seems indeed to be a forgery. Moyle certainly makes out this point, and Jortin is of the same opinion. It is attributed by Eusebius to Antoninus Pius, and his rescript it must be, if it be genuine at all. We should add, that Moyle believes Adrian’s letter to Fundanus to be ‘as arrant a juggle as that of Antoninus, though the conveyance be a little more cleanly;’ but he does not *prove* this opinion.

the uninformed humanity of Trajan had so nobly discouraged, sufficiently proves the activity of the pursuit, and the earnestness of the pursuer. But the most important point of distinction is probably this: Marcus Antoninus knew much better the nature of the evil which he was committing: he was acquainted, to a certain extent at least, with the opinions of the Christians, and the innocence of their character; and it is not likely that he had entirely neglected to examine the grounds of their faith. He watched the process of his own inflictions, and when he perceived the fortitude with which all endured, and the eagerness with which many courted them, he coldly reproved the unphilosophic enthusiasm of the Martyrs.* And yet, perhaps, his own philosophy was not quite devoid of enthusiasm, or, at least, it was not strictly regulated by reason, when it led him to labour for the destruction of the most moral and loyal portion of his subjects, only because they disclaimed the very superstitions which he placed his pride in despising. Nor again was his practice consistent with his professed contempt of these: for it is said, and seemingly on good foundation, that Marcus Antoninus was frequent in consultation with the Chaldæan sages, deeply conversant with the mysteries of astrology, credulously attentive to oracular prophecy, obedient to the premonitions of dreams, which he believed to descend from Heaven—assertions not incredible, nor inconsistent with his studies or his principles; and there is ground to hesitate whether we should not rather convict him of superstition than hypocrisy. But it is certain that his understanding was of the broadest and most comprehensive description; that it was enlightened by every worldly knowledge, and fortified by frequent meditation; that his character was founded in excellent dispositions, confirmed by the best principles which were known to the Pagan world. His general regard for justice has never been questioned; even his humanity is commonly celebrated; and if the representations of history be not exaggerated, he reached as high a degree both of wisdom and of moral excellence as is attainable by the unassisted faculties of man—and yet this prince polluted every year of a long reign with innocent blood.

In our natural anxiety to honour every form of human excellence, we search for his excuse in the religious policy so long established in the empire. But we find that those of his predecessors who were disposed to soften or suspend its operation upon Christians, possessed the power to do so; and we cannot doubt that the despotic authority of Marcus would have enabled him to revise or repeal those oppressive statutes, if he had learnt from the books of his philosophers the virtue or the meaning of Toleration. This, indeed, is the real and only ground of his defence; and we shall regard his conduct with less indignation, if we reflect how feeble were the mightiest principles of conduct with which he was acquainted; on what a loose and shifting foundation they rested; how large was the class of virtues which they did not comprehend, and how imperfect were the motives which they proposed for the practice of any. And thus considered, we shall discover, perhaps, some trace of heavenly providence in the circumstance, that the imperial philosopher, flourishing in the maturity of his science, and deficient in nothing which nature or

* B. xi., sec. iii. He asserts that men should meet their death, 'not through mere ostentation as do the Christians, but considerably and with dignity, and without theatrical display.' *Μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν πυράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ, ἀλλὰ λογιζομένως, καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ἀσπραγμῶδες.* The word which we have rendered ostentation, parade (*πυράταξιν*), is in this passage usually interpreted obstinacy.

man could bestow, was armed with the highest temporal authority and permitted to direct it against the *infancy* of our faith. From the splendid imperfection of Marcus Antoninus, from the perseverance of his powerful enmity, from its final failure, we may learn what narrow limits have been assigned to the virtue and wisdom and power of unassisted man; and we derive a new motive of gratitude for that heavenly aid, which has fixed our social happiness on a certain and eternal foundation.

The greatest prince of antiquity was succeeded by a son, who neither inherited his virtues, nor imitated his crime; so far from this, that we might almost imagine it to have been the object of Commodus to redeem his numerous vices by his humanity towards the Christian name.

Severus ascended the throne in the year 193, and is represented by Tertullian * to have bestowed testimonies of approbation on several distinguished Christians, and openly to have withstood the popular fury which assailed the sect. But this account will apply only to the earlier part of his reign; for in the year 202 (about the time of the publication of Tertullian's Apology) he issued an edict, which indirectly occasioned a variety of inflictions, the most barbarous of which appear to have been perpetrated in Egypt. The professed object of that edict was only to prevent conversion either to Judaism or Christianity; for the fears of the emperor began to be awakened by the extraordinary progress of the latter. Its effect was to oppress and torture the most zealous ministers of the faith, and to inflame the prejudices of the people against all believers. This enactment continued in force for about nine years, until the death of Severus; and from that period, if indeed we except the injuries inflicted by Maximin † (from 235 to 238 A. D.), and directed chiefly against the instructors and rulers of the churches, the Christians, though occasionally liable to popular outrage, had not much reason to complain of the injustice of the government until the accession of Decius, in the year 249.

Decius, like Marcus Antoninus, is also ranked, and justly ranked, among the most virtuous of the emperors. The virtues of a pagan were usually connected with his philosophy, and his philosophy taught *Decius*. him to despise every form of worship. Perhaps, too, an imperial eye might view with natural distrust the free and independent principles of Christianity, which were now spreading into more general operation and notice—principles which acknowledged an authority superior to the throne of man; and though they devoted the body to Cæsar, yet set apart the soul for God. It would be observed, too, with some jealousy, that the progress of that worship was rapid and universal, in spite of ancient law, popular opposition, and imperial edict. Its *truth* was seldom investigated, because it was not yet sufficiently distinguished from surrounding superstitions, which laid no claim to truth, nor even professed to rest on any evidences; and thus the prejudices of the schools at once assumed that the worship of Christ was no better founded than those of Jove and Serapis ‡.

* Tertul. ad Scap., cap. iv. Sed et clarissimas feminas et clarissimos viros Severus sciens hujus sectæ esse non modo non læsit verum et testimonio ornavit, &c. His affection for the Christians is attributed to a cure formerly performed on him, by the application of oil, by a Christian named Proculus. We must be careful not to confound this medical use of oil with the practice of extreme unction, which did not then exist.

† Euseb., II. E., lib. vi. c. 28. Tillem., tom. iii. p. 305.

‡ In the entire pagan scheme (could we properly consider it as one scheme), religion and philosophy together professed to furnish that, which Christianity supplies to us: the

These reasons, carefully considered, will partly account for the peculiar suspicion which armed itself against the 'Christian superstition,' and at the same time will exhibit to us the motives, through the influence of which some of the wisest and best among the emperors unhappily numbered themselves among our adversaries*.

The persecution of Decius proceeded on a broader principle than that of Severus, as it pretended no less than to constrain all subjects of the empire to return to the religion of their ancestors †; it was also strictly universal, as neither confined to particular provinces nor classes, but extending from the lowest confessors to the highest authorities of the Church. Several were consigned to exile or death: Fabienus, bishop of Rome, Alexander of Jerusalem, Babylas of Antioch, were among the latter; and the celebrated Origen was subjected to imprisonment and torture ‡. At Alexandria, in the year preceding the accession of Decius, some Christians had been massacred by the hatred or the avarice of the Pagau mob; and as such fatal outrages, in addition to authorized injustice, were rather tolerated than promptly repressed by the government which succeeded that sanguinary reign, it was much more calamitous to the faith than its short duration of three years would lead us to apprehend. Indeed, the unusual number of those who fell away from their profession in the hour of trial, by which this persecution is distinguished from those preceding it, is a sufficient proof of its intolerable barbarity §.

We pass over the comparatively lenient inflictions of Gallus and Volusianus; but the sceptre of Valerian was more darkly stained *Valerian.* by the blood of Cyprian ||, bishop of Carthage, a man of learning and eloquence and piety, whose blameless life and final calmness and constancy have escaped the censure and almost the sarcasm of history. It will be instructive, as well as interesting, to transcribe the simple narrative of his martyrdom.

On the 13th of September, 258, an officer with soldiers was sent to Cyprian's gardens by the proconsul to bring him into his presence. Cyprian

mysteries, which also held the place of doctrines, the ceremonies, and the name were provided by the religion; the ethics by philosophy. We need not particularize the numerous points of advantage which both branches of the Christian system possess over the corresponding departments of paganism. But the distinctions chiefly to be remarked, are, that *the religion* demanded no belief, proposed no creed, inculcated no *faith*, but was, in fact, identified with its ceremonies, procession and sacrifice; and that *the philosophy* which undertook the whole charge of morals, in vain proposed an elaborate series of barren rules and lifeless exhortations, since it possessed no substantial motive whereby to enforce them. When we reflect how essential are these distinctions, we shall see reason sufficient for the jealousy with which Christianity was assailed both by the one and the other. But their incongruity and incoherence with each other formed the most striking and hopeless deformity of the system; for philosophy lived in open warfare with her senseless associate, and employed a great portion of her diligence and her wit in exposing the multifarious absurdities of polytheism. 'Quinimo et Deos vestros palam destruant. . . laudantibus vobis!' Tertul. Apol., c. 46.

* Eusebius (H. E., lib. vi. c. 39.) very concisely attributes the persecution of Decius to the hatred borne by that emperor to his predecessor Philip. Cyprian considers it as a divine chastisement for the sins of the Church.

† Tillemont, vol. iii. p. 310, on the authority of Greg. Nyssensis, who gives a very vivid description of the effects of the edict.

‡ Alexander and Babylas died in prison. Some of the sufferings of Origen are particularized in Eusebius, loc. cit.; and those of the most celebrated martyrs who perished on this occasion occupy above a hundred pages in the Mémoires de Tillem. vol. iii. p. 325—428. Ed. 2.

§ The fable of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus belongs to this persecution; the supposed martyrdom of the Theban legion to the reign of Diocletian.

|| It appears from Cyprian's Epistles that, in his Church at least, the full severity of the persecution scarcely raged for more than one year. See Tillem., vol. iii. p. 324.

then knew his end was near; and with a ready and constant mind and cheerful countenance he went without delay to Sexti, a place about six miles from Carthage, where the proconsul resided. Cyprian's cause was deferred for that day. He was therefore ordered to the house of an officer, where he was detained for the night, but was well accommodated and his friends had free access to him. The news of this having been brought to Carthage, a great number of people of all sorts, and the Christians in general, flocked thence to Sexti; and Cyprian's people lay all night before the door of the officer, thus keeping, as Pontius expresses it, the vigil of their bishop's passion.

On the next morning, the 14th of September, he was led to the proconsul's palace, surrounded by a mixed multitude of people and a strong guard of soldiers. After some time, the proconsul came out into the hall, and Cyprian being placed before him, he said, 'Art thou Thascius Cyprian?' Cyprian the bishop answered, 'I am.' Galerius Maximus the proconsul said, 'The most sacred emperors have commanded thee to sacrifice.' Cyprian the bishop answered, 'I do not sacrifice.' Galerius Maximus said, 'Be well advised.' Cyprian the bishop answered, 'Do as thou art commanded; in so just a cause thou needest no consultation.' The proconsul having advised with his council, spoke to Cyprian in angry terms as being an enemy to the gods and a seducer of the people, and then read his sentence from a tablet, 'It is decreed that Thascius Cyprian be beheaded.' Cyprian the bishop said, 'God be praised;' and the crowd of his brethren exclaimed, 'Let us too be beheaded with him.'

This is the account given in the acts of Cyprian's passion, and that of Pontius is to the same purpose*.

For nearly fifty years after this outrage, the peace and progress of religion were not seriously interrupted. The earliest portion even of the reign of Diocletian was favourable to its security, and it was *Diocletian*. through the weakness of that prince, rather than his wickedness, that his name is now inscribed on the tablets of infamy as the most savage among our persecutors. Two circumstances may be mentioned as having engaged his tardy consent† to the commencement of a plan into which he appears to have entered with the most considerate calmness, though it is also true that during its progress some incidents occurred which enlisted his passions in the cause, and even so inflamed them that, in the height of his madness, he certainly proposed nothing less than the extermination of the Christian name. The influence of the Cæsar, Galerius, who was animated, from whatsoever motive, by an unmitigated detestation of the worshippers of Christ, and who thirsted for their destruction, was probably the most powerful of those circumstances. But the second must not be forgotten. In the disputes, now become general, between the Christian ministers and the pagan priests, the teachers of philosophy are almost invariably found on the side of the latter; and as it is not denied—not even by Gibbon—that those learned persons directed the course and suggested the means of persecution, we need not hesitate to attribute a considerable share in the guilt of its origin to their pernicious eloquence.

Diocletian published his first edict in the February of 303. Three others

* Lardner, vol. iii. p. 141. The more usual date of Cyprian's martyrdom is 257.

† Galerius represented to him that the permanence of the Roman institutions was incompatible with the prevalence of Christianity, which should therefore be extirpated. Diocletian proposed the subject to a sort of Council, composed of some eminent military and judicial officers. They assented to the opinion of Galerius; but the emperor still hesitated, until the measure was sanctioned and sanctified by the oracle of the Milesian Apollo.

of greater severity succeeded it; and, during a shameful period of ten years, they were very generally and rigorously enforced by himself, his colleagues, and successors. It is needless to particularize the degrees of barbarity by which those edicts were severally distinguished; the substance of the whole series is this*. The sacred books of the Christians were sought for and burnt; death was the punishment of all who assembled secretly for religious worship; imprisonment, slavery, and infamy were inflicted on the dignitaries and presidents of the Churches; every art and method was enjoined for the conversion of the believers, and among those methods were various descriptions of torture, some of them fatal. During the preceding ninety years, the Church had availed itself of the consent or connivance of the civil government to erect numerous religious edifices, and to purchase some landed property; these buildings were now demolished, and the property underwent the usual process of confiscation. A more degrading, but less effectual, measure attended these; Christians were excluded from all public honours and offices, and even removed without the pale of the laws and the protection of justice; liable to all accusations, and inviting them by their adversity, they were deprived of every form of legal redress. Such were the penalties contained in those edicts; and though it be true that in some of the western provinces of the empire, as in Gaul and perhaps Britain, their asperity was somewhat softened by the character and influence of the Cæsar, Constantius, we are not allowed to believe that their execution even there was generally neglected, and we have too much reason to be assured that it was conducted with very subservient zeal throughout the rest of the empire. In process of time the sufferings of the Christians were partially alleviated by the victories of Constantine; but they did not finally terminate till his accession.

Accession of Constantine. That event, which took place in the year 313, and which marks the first grand epoch in ecclesiastical history, ended at the same time both the fears and the sufferings of the followers of Christ, and established his worship as the acknowledged religion of the Roman empire.

As the account here given of the persecutions of the early Christians differs in some respects from the views usually taken of this important portion of our history, it may be proper to close this chapter with a few additional remarks.

1st. Contemporary evidence obliges us to admit, that the Christian name was for many years (so late at least as the reign of Decius) an object of decided aversion to many of those who did not profess it; whether of the learned, who scorned the origin, were ignorant of the principles, and feared the progress, of the new religion, or of the vulgar, who believed the calumnies so industriously propagated against its professors. Hence proceeded those popular tumults, which, during the first two centuries (if we except from them the reign of Marcus Antoninus), may have destroyed as many victims as the deliberate policy of the emperors, or the established system of religious government. Still it must appear singular that a body of persons, distinguished by the moral qualities which are almost universally attributed to the first Christians, should have incurred the hatred of their fellow-subjects, rather than the admiration, or at least the sympathy, which was claimed by the character

* Nearly the whole of Eusebius's 8th book is devoted to this subject; on which he possesses, indeed, the authority of a contemporary, as he is believed to have been born about the year 270 A. D. See, too, Lactant. de Morte Persecut. cap. 13.

of their virtues. There are several reasons by which we may account for this strange circumstance. The prejudices and passions of mankind were opposed to the new religion; it contradicted their received ways of worship, the dictates and practices of their forefathers, their own indulged lusts and evil habits. Even the fame and semblance of peculiar sanctity are ever objects of bitter jealousy to those who are incapable of its practice, and who consequently dispute its reality. Again, when it was observed that Christians were not contented with mere inactive profession, but were animated with industrious zeal for the extension of their faith, a disposition to suspect and resist it, as it were in self-defence, was excited among many; and those who might have tolerated an indifferent or merely speculative superstition, armed themselves against the active and converting spirit of Christianity. Another, perhaps the most effective, and certainly the original cause of that aversion, was the persevering hostility of the Jews to the name of Christ. In some of the more populous and commercial cities, the Jews formed no inconsiderable portion of the inhabitants, and they were scattered in smaller numbers over the whole face of the East. The destruction of their capital increased the crowd of exiles, and inflamed the angry spirit by which they were animated. It is true that, in their attempts at open outrage, they were sometimes restrained by the civil power; but they were more successful in their secret endeavours to excite against the rising sect the contempt or malice of the heathen. To their malignity we may probably attribute those monstrous calumnies which tainted the Christian name, at the very period when its professors were farthest removed from corruption. It was rumoured and believed that the religious meetings of the faithful were polluted by alternate excesses of superstition and debauchery; the mysteries especially were invested with the most revolting character; the Eucharist was said to be celebrated by the sacrifice of an infant, and the Feast of Charity was represented to be a revel of cannibals*. These stories contained nothing incredible to a pagan, whom the external piety of the new religionists rendered still more suspicious of their private conversation. Without difficulty he believed in the perpetration of rites which bore some resemblance to the darker parts of his own superstition; and his belief was followed by insult and outrage.

The notorious malevolence of the Jews did not prevent the prevalence of another very early and very injurious opinion respecting Christianity—that it was merely a form, and a rejected form, of Judaism. This was a natural error—since the religion proceeded from Judæa, and many among its original preachers, and all its most active enemies were Jews—it was indeed gradually, though slowly, removed by the writings of the early fathers, and the progress of the faith; but the prejudice arising from it was the chief cause of that contempt with which the worship was regarded for above one hundred years both by philosophers and statesmen.

Again, in the scenes of public festivity, in the temples, and at the sacrifices of the gods, the Christian was never present; he partook not in triumphs and rejoicings of which religion formed any portion, and appeared not at the sports of the amphitheatre, except as a victim. This seclusion from the amusements of his fellow-countrymen was mistaken for indifference to the happiness and interests of his country; it was mistaken for disaffection to the government, for moroseness or misanthropy; its real motive was never estimated or even conceived; for the careless temper of poly-

* See Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 35, ii. 14.

theism was unable to comprehend an exclusive religion, or to understand why the worship of Jupiter was not consistent with that of Christ. Another difficulty was created by the spiritual nature of our religion. It was in vain that the Roman magistrate inquired for the images and statues of the God of the Christians, for the altars and temples consecrated to him. Unwilling, or unable to believe that an Invisible Being could be the immediate object of adoration, he pronounced that to be atheism, which differed so widely from the general appearance of theism; and thus, among the ignorant at least, the Christians were liable to the double imputation, not only that they repudiated the national divinities, but that they substituted none other in their place. It was probably this last charge which inflamed and envenomed the rest; for the same moral enormities which were pardonable in the devotee of Apollo, became infamous in those who partook of no devotion, and the worshippers of every idol under heaven united their clamours against the impiety of the atheists; and unhappily, among the impassioned natives of the East, clamours are seldom unattended by violence, and violence is only satisfied with blood.

There is, perhaps, no characteristic by which Christianity was so early and so strongly distinguished, as the pious horror of every approach to idolatry*; this singularity would be more commonly forced on the attention of pagans than any other, and no doubt, in the opinion of the vast majority, with whom the image was in fact the object of worship, it would be sufficient alone to constitute irreligion. Again, it led them into a second and scarcely less dangerous imputation, that of disloyalty; since the image of the emperor, which was usually exalted among the standards and in public places, was not honoured by the devout salutation of the Christian; and this omission naturally gave pretext to a *political* charge.

As another cause of the early unpopularity of the Christians, we may mention the unceasing opposition of all whose personal interests were concerned in the support of paganism. The magnificent temples and gorgeous ceremonies of that superstition were a source of unfailing profit, not only to a numerous race of priests and hierodules, of architects and statuaries, but to multitudes of citizens, who lived, like the craftsmen of Ephesus, on the treasury of the temple, and were engaged by their most immediate necessities to maintain the worship; and not these only, but the whole mass of the populace, were in some degree gainers by the sacrificial profusion which distinguished their religion; to say nothing of the share which they took in those splendid processions and rites, which converted the practice of religion into mere sensual enjoyment and careless festivity. When, in the place of this pompous pageantry, it was proposed to substitute a simple spiritual worship, recommended, not by the display of external ceremony, which it scorned, but by inward purity and the sanctity of moral excellence, in opposition at the same time to the passions of all men, and to the immediate interests of many, it would have been strange indeed if the popular voice had not been raised against it.

To the many causes of excitement already mentioned we may add one more—the substantial motive of avarice; since we invariably find that the Christians, who were the objects of these popular commotions, sustained, among other injuries, the loss of their property. And we must not

* This extreme aversion from every form of idolatry is ascribed to a prevalent belief, that the statues were actually animated by those supposed beings whom the pagans worshipped as gods, and whom the Christians abominated as devils.

forget that, in many instances *, the Roman police tolerated, perhaps encouraged, excesses which it might possibly consider as an innocent exercise of popular feeling, or as a part of a religious ceremony.

The evils which we have here noticed, or at least, the causes which produced them, were most prevalent in the earliest age of the religion, and seem gradually to have died away during the third century. For they were chiefly founded in ignorance of the real principles of Christianity, aided by contempt for the weakness of its professors; circumstances which were gradually removed as the members of the Church advanced in numbers and its ministers in learning. But this progress of the faith (as we have had occasion to observe) did not immediately reconcile or disarm its adversaries, but rather changed their character and their weapons. For instance, during the first ages we do not observe that the pagan priesthood were distinguished by any systematic exertions against the new worship, and they may possibly have despised and overlooked it; but presently their seeming indifference was changed into suspicious jealousy, and then into active and persevering hatred †; and we may be assured that the influence which they possessed over the people (whatsoever that may have been) was exerted to the prejudice of the rival religion. In the next place, philosophy descended from the contempt with which she had professedly viewed the earliest efforts of Christianity, and proceeded to distinguish it from all other 'superstitions' by her malice and enmity; and she knew not in so doing how honourable a distinction she had conferred on it. This coalition of philosophy with paganism, though strange, was not unnatural; nor would any evil consequences have followed it, had it not engaged the concurrence, and advanced under the banners, of civil authority ‡. And if it be true that from her numerous chastisements and inflictions our religion may have somewhat profited in purity, we must admit that she learnt one hateful lesson in the school of adversity, which in after ages she did not forget to practise; it was deeply ingrafted on her infancy by her sufferings, and it brought forth in her maturity the bitter fruits of crime and misery. However, the poisonous plant was not the native of her own vineyard, and it is now, for the most part, rooted up and cast away; and she accounts it the severest among the wrongs of her pagan oppressors that they instructed her in the maxims, and accustomed her to the spectacle, of persecution.

II. As an excuse for the rigour of the Roman government, it has been argued that the Christians were not punished for their worship of Christ,

* During the whole course of these persecutions, with the exception of those few in which the emperor pronounced his will by an express specification of the penalties, very much rested on the discretion of the magistrates, and, undoubtedly, many among these were guided by the common feelings of humanity. (Tertul. Apol., c. 27. Ad Scapulam, c. 4. Scorpiace, c. 1.) But the clamours of an importunate populace also demand more than common firmness, to be invariably resisted. Gibbon, in his endeavour to exaggerate the humanity of the Roman magistrates, has forgotten his own:—'They were far from punishing with death *all* those who were convicted of an obstinate adherence to the new superstition; contenting themselves for the most part with the *milder* chastisements of imprisonment, exile, or *slavery in the mines*, they left the unhappy victims of their *justice* some reason to hope for a prosperous event—the accession, the marriage, or the triumph of an emperor, which might restore them by a general pardon to their former state.'—Chap. xvi.

† See Mosh. de Reb. Christ. Ant. Const. Sæc. iv. sec. 1.

‡ There seems reason to believe that this alliance was fortified by the powerful addition of the Roman bar; at least we are assured that the proconsuls felt themselves so interested in the defence of ancient laws, during Ulpian's time, as to endeavour to excite Alexander Severus against an illegal religion. This took place about 223. Baron. Ann. t. ii. p. 367, 369.

but for their refusal to sacrifice to the gods of their ancestors and their government*; and that the crime for which they suffered was not in fact their religion, but their contumacy; and some set great value on this argument. In our opinion it amounts to nothing more than this: the laws of Rome punished all religious dissent with death; openly to oppose those laws was sedition; and thus the punishment was inflicted on the sedition, not on the dissent. This is foolish and unworthy sophistry; and its utmost consequence could go no farther than to excuse the individual who executed the laws, and to throw the whole odium upon the system†. But to allow it even this weight is too much concession; for we perceive, by the very different manner in which the law was enforced by different emperors, that they possessed, in fact, an authority superior to it, and power to suspend or revise it; and that there was not one of whom it can be truly said that he was barbarous on compulsion. But on the other hand, if any will persist to justify the personal character of certain emperors at the expense of the religious policy of the empire, they give us only additional reason to rejoice at the triumph of Christian principles over the inherent depravity of the pagan system.

Another and a very fruitless dispute has been raised respecting the general virtues or vices or fortunes of those sovereigns who are most remarkable for severity towards the Christians; and while some have asserted that our persecutors are to be found only among the most odious and vicious of the emperors, and while others endeavour to establish a sort of temporal retribution which overtook, by violent or untimely deaths, all who were hostile to our name; there are again other writers who have been willing to insinuate that the wisest and most virtuous monarchs were those most sensible of the necessity to repress the growing religion. All these writers are almost equally remote from truth. The former are obliged to qualify the unrelenting injustice of Marcus Antoninus out of respect to his various virtues and his natural end; and the last must extenuate the outrages not of Nero only, or Domitian, or Maximin, but of Galerius and the stupid barbarian Licinius. But if the insinuation were really founded in fact, the only important conclusion which could be derived from it is one which we are not anxious to dispute; that the noblest human wisdom was not exempt from shameful folly, and that the highest principles of justice

* The dialogue, which is supposed to have taken place during the reign of Severus (about 200) between Saturninus, proconsul of Africa, and Speratus, one of the famous Scyllitan martyrs, whether genuine or not, is very ancient and perfectly consistent with probability. 'You may hope for the pardon of the emperors our masters, if you come to your senses and observe the ceremonies of the gods.' 'We have never done any evil, nor partaken in injustice. We recollect not to have injured any one; on the contrary, when we suffer we render thanks to God: in which respect we obey *our* Emperor, who has ordained that rule for us.' 'We also have a very simple religion; we swear by the genius of the emperors, and make vows for their health; you must do as much.' 'If you will listen to me calmly, I will tell you the mystery of Christian simplicity.' 'Shall I listen to your insults on our ceremonies? Swear rather by the genius of the emperors our masters, that you may continue to live.' 'I recognize not the genius of the emperor of this world, but I serve the God of Heaven, whom no man hath seen or can see. I have never committed any crime punishable by the laws.' They were remanded, and on the following day brought up again. 'Do you persevere in being a Christian?' 'Yes, I persevere: I call you all to witness—I am a Christian.' All those who had been arrested with him heard him, and cried, 'We also are Christians.' 'You will neither deliberate then nor receive pardon.' 'We need no pardon with justice on our side; do what you will; we die with joy for Jesus Christ.' &c. &c. Art. Mart. Scyll. p. 77. Fleury, H. É., l. v. sect. 2.

† Precisely of the same value is another excuse, derived from the admission that it was difficult or impossible for a pagan to comprehend even the *meaning* of toleration, according to the latitude which we give to it. Its only effect can be to turn away our indignation from the individuals upon the system which made them tyrants and persecutors.

discoverable by man permitted the perpetration of revolting enormities. In the mean time, the truth appears to be nearly this: that, in the want of any fixed and substantial rule of action, the imperial character fluctuated between the extreme limits of depravity and (what was called) *virtue*; that the motives of all our enemies (except M. Antoninus and Diocletian) and of many of our protectors are to be sought either in accidental circumstances or in their own caprices; and that in both those classes we may number princes of the highest moral and intellectual excellence and of the lowest imaginable turpitude*.

III. Without giving our universal assent to the popular paradox, that the effect of persecution is to nourish that which it seems to consume, we may admit that the pagan persecutions were not, perhaps, upon the whole unfavourable to the progress of our religion †. Among many reasons for this opinion, there are three which appear to us important.

(1.) The first of these is the nature of the persecutions themselves; which, in the first place, were usually of short duration, and relieved by longer intermissions, if not of security, at least of repose and hope, so that the survivors had space to refit their shattered vessel against the tempests which were still in the horizon; and which, in the next, were generally signalized by such extreme barbarity, and such obvious injustice as civil punishments, as not only to revolt whatever humanity might be found among the spectators, but to harden and fortify the obstinacy of the sufferers. (2.) The noble and devoted constancy with which martyrdom was generally endured, excited the admiration of the best portion of the Gentile world; and not their admiration only, for those who reflected on what they beheld were persuaded, first, of the piety of the sufferers, and next of their sincerity; and this persuasion led some among them to examine the foundation of those motives and principles which seemed to infuse an original energy into the human soul. If a new crime was invented for the affliction of the Christians, a new virtue appeared to be sent down to them for their support; and it became a serious question, whether that virtue could otherwise have sustained them, than by the direct interference of Heaven. (3.) Several driven from their country by persecution, carried with them into distant and barbarous exile the faith of the Christian, and the zeal of the missionary and the martyr. And thus the victims of man's blind and insensate impiety became instruments in the scheme of Providence for the advancement of his great purposes in the propagation of faith and knowledge.

* Another question has been raised concerning the probable number of the martyrs; and this has led to wider difference, as it is less capable of accurate determination. (Dodwell, Dissert. in Cypr. XI. Ruinart, Pref. Act. Martyr.) The spirit of exaggeration or credulity on the one hand has excited that of disparagement or scepticism on the other; and the truth, if it could be ascertained at all, would be found to lie between them. It is certain, however, that when Gibbon estimates the whole number of Diocletian's victims throughout the provinces of the Eastern empire according to the trifling portion who perished in Palestine, he infers neither very fairly nor very consistently; for in other places he is forward enough to acknowledge the narrow limits and to extenuate the population of Palestine, and he was not ignorant that even the *proportion* of Christians in that country was less than in any other province. Semler (sec. 1. c. 6.) inclines to the opinion of Dodwell, admitting the difficulty of the question; and Bishop Kaye (Lect. on Tertull. p. 133.) remarks that 'though the number may have been greater than Dodwell was willing to allow, it is certain that his opinion approaches much nearer to truth than that of his opponents.' It has been one cause of the exaggeration, that the term martyr (witness) was in the early Church indiscriminately extended to all whose religion had exposed them to *any* infliction, as loss of property or liberty—a class of sufferers now usually called confessors.

† The same was the professed opinion even of Tertullian himself.

CHAPTER V.

On the Heresies of the three first Centuries.

Meaning of the word Heresy—Charges of immorality brought against Heretics—Their treatment by early Church—Number of early Heresies—Moderation of the primitive Church—Three classes of Heretics. (1.) Two kinds of Philosophy—Gnosticism—Origin and nature of that doctrine—its association with Christianity—Moral practice of the Gnostics—Their martyrs—Various forms of Gnosticism—Basilides—Carpocrates—Valentinus—Cerdo and Marcion—Tatian and the Encratites. (2.) The Ebionites—Eusebius's account of them—Conclusions from it—The Heresy of Artemon—revived by Paul of Samosata—his sentence and expulsion—how finally enforced—Heresy of Praseas—Doctrines of the Church stated by Tertullian—Sabellius—his opinions—Patripassians. (3.) Simon Magus—Montanus—his preaching and success—Controversy on the Baptism of Heretics—The Novatians—their schism and opinions—Conclusions respecting the general character of the early Heresies, and the manner of opposing them—On the Fathers of the primitive Church—Real importance of their writings—Shepherd of Hermas—Epistle of St. Barnabas—Ignatius—Polycarp—Clement of Rome—Respecting their doctrine—Irenæus.

THE original meaning of the word heresy is *choice*; it was long used by the philosophers to designate the preference and selection of some speculative opinion, and in process of time* was applied without any sense of reproach to every *sect*—a term with which it thus became nearly synonymous. From philosophy it passed into the service of religion, and we find it applied both by St. Luke and Josephus† to the Pharisees and Sadducees, with no imputation of censure or error. Next we observe, that it was employed by the Jews to distinguish the new opinions of the Christians; St. Paul is accused of being the ‘ringleader of the heresy of the Nazarenes,’ and confesses that he ‘worships the God of his fathers, after the way which they call heresy’—an expression which indicates, that some reproach had been intended by the term. The word was then adopted by Christians; and though it still continued for some ages to be used, in its first and most general sense, to designate every denomination, not only of sects but of false religions‡, yet for the most part it was employed in speaking of those who, professing Christianity, had departed from the doctrine which was taught by the Apostles. In the mouth of an orthodox Christian it could not, in any of these senses, be a term of indifference; since, according to the necessary exclusiveness of our principles, the faith which was revealed through Christ and interpreted by his Apostles is alone truth; every other belief is error.

We next observe, that the notion of wilfulness and perversity (perhaps a much worse notion) was very early attached to it; and even by the writers of the New Testament it is sometimes so used, that a somewhat indefinite idea of evil appears to have been affixed to it. Some, indeed, have supposed that it was understood by early Christian writers to contain the imputation of immorality §, and thus we may partly account for the exceeding zeal with which

* Cicero. (Paradox I. vol. vii. p. 845. Ed. Oxon.) Philo Judæus. (Fragm. e lib. II. in Exod.) Burton, Bampton Lect. I.

† Acts of Apostl. v. 17. xv. 5. Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 5. 9.

‡ Epiphanius, in his Book on Heresies, mentions *Βαρβαρισμοὺς*, *Σχυρισμοὺς*, *Ἑλληνισμοὺς*, *Ἰουδαϊσμοὺς*, *Σαμαρειτισμοὺς*, all under the name of heresy. Balsamon (Comment. 14th Can. Council of Chalcedon) expresses himself thus:—‘Heretics are divided into two kinds: 1. Those who receive the Christian religion, but err in points, who, when they come over to the Church, are anointed with oil; 2. those who do not receive it at all, and are unbelievers, such as Jews and Greeks; and these we baptize.’ See Burton’s Bampton Lect. I.

§ The argument amounts to this: heresy is opposed by St. Paul to faith, and is commensurate with it; and as faith comprehends as its essence and sends forth as its emanation purity of heart and excellence of conduct, so heresy must contain, of necessity, the contrary qualities.

many of them laboured for its extirpation, and the language which they applied to those who had deviated into it. Charges, indeed, or insinuations of the grossest impurities are sometimes thrown out by the orthodox writers against the early heretics; but we are bound to receive them with great caution; because the answers which may have been given to them are lost; and because they are not generally justified by any authentic records which we possess respecting the lives of those heretics. The truth appears to be this; that some flagrant immoralities were notoriously perpetrated by some of the wildest among their sects, and that these have given colouring to the charges which have been thrown upon them too indiscriminately.

But whatsoever uncertainty may rest on this inquiry, it cannot be disputed, first, that the Apostolical Fathers, following the footsteps of the Apostles themselves, regarded with great jealousy the birth and growth of erroneous opinions; and next, that they did not authorize, either by instruction or example, any severity on the *persons* of those in error. They opposed it by their reasoning and their eloquence, and they avoided its contagion by removing from their communion those who persisted in it; but they were also mindful that within these limits was confined the power which the Church received from the Apostle who founded it over the spiritual disobedience of its members.

The heretics or seceders from the primitive Church were extremely various, at least in name, and there is no period in ecclesiastical history in which dissent has appeared under so many denominations as the earliest. But it seems doubtful whether many of those sects had very numerous adherents, or were at all generally dispersed over the surface of Christendom; some of them were merely local, scarcely extending beyond the spot which gave them birth, and others were chiefly confined to the controversial writers, as the difference was on points too abstruse to create much interest in those days among the body of the people. Many, again, have left behind them no traces of their existence, and their very names have only been preserved through the labours of their adversaries; so that we may fairly presume, in spite of the display and parade of denominations, that the great majority of the early Christians remained attached to the primitive faith. In the mean time, the mere fact of the existence of so many different forms of Christianity certainly proves, not only the zeal, but also the *numbers* of the early converts; for if these had been inconsiderable, we should have heard little either about dissenters from the orthodox body, or of their divisions among themselves. The paucity and weakness of the faithful would have been a sufficient guarantee for their unanimity.

That many of those errors gained footing at a very early period, long before the conclusion of the first century, has not been disputed with any probability*; and the fact is attributed with great appearance of truth to the twelve or perhaps fifteen years which intervened between the ascension of Christ and the departure of the Apostles from Judæa. During this period, partly through the dispersion of the converts after the martyrdom of Stephen, partly through the periodical religious communications of foreign Jews with their native country, some imperfect accounts of the history and doctrine of the Saviour were spread abroad, even before

* Tittman, 'De Vestig. Gnosticorum,' &c. has, in our opinion, entirely failed in his endless attempt to fix the origin of the Gnostic heresies in the second century. The passages which seem most in his favour are Clem. Alex. Strom. l. vii. p. 764. Ed. Sylburg. Hægisipp. ap. Euseb. l. iii. c. 32. But the general voice of history is on the other side.

the fulness of the truth was delivered by the Apostles. This circumstance will assist us in accounting for the great variety of forms in which error presented itself, especially if we consider the vast extent of country and the widely separated regions over which the faith was diffused. But the cause to which we should more directly ascribe the multiplicity of heresies is the philosophical subdivisions of the heathen world, and the facility of combining opinions the most incongruous. Thus, while all parties were desirous to adapt the particular tenets of Christianity to their own preconceived opinions, which again materially differed in different sects, the forms created by such associations were necessarily very numerous, and frequently very monstrous.

Again, the manner in which the differences between the Church and those at variance with it were conducted, was not entirely free from violence of feeling and invective; the contrary would have been wonderful indeed, when we consider the situation and character of the parties. For, in the first place, as we shall presently see, a very large proportion of the early heresies were divided from the doctrine of the Gospel, not by slight or partial deviations, but by delusions so extravagant and irrational as to place them almost in direct opposition to the true spirit of Christianity. But this was not all; in themselves they were pitiable and pardonable, but in their effects on the Church they were fraught with injury and danger. Because the real character of the religion was not yet generally comprehended, and the heathens formed their estimation of it according to the specimen which was presented to them; and when they observed that absurdities were professed, and perhaps immoralities practised, in the name of Christ, they extended their contempt and indignation to the whole body of his followers.* The individual expression of those sentiments would naturally retard the progress of the faith; but neither was this the whole evil, for calumnies springing from that origin not only tainted the Christian name, but contributed to call down upon it, during the moments of its most perilous weakness, those visitations of popular fury and imperial injustice, which threatened to crush and exterminate it. Under such circumstances we shall scarcely condemn some intemperance of expression into which the early defenders of the apostolical doctrine were occasionally betrayed. At the same time we may remark, that as the controversies of those days were at least exempt from personal infliction, so religious dissent, being unrepressed by civil penalties, was less rancorous, as well as less consistent and less permanent.

The great multitude of those heresies was not only reconcilable with the moderation of the primitive Church, but may, in some degree, have proceeded from it. For as the imperfection of human nature will not allow us to hope, under any circumstances, for perfect unanimity in religious opinion, so the *names* of dissent will generally become more numerous as its expression is less discouraged. But as the differences of dissenters from each other are generally greater than their deviations from the Church, from which they branch out in all directions as from a common centre, so any lasting coalition is little to be apprehended, and least so, when no temporal authority is exerted to chastise, and by chastisement to multiply and unite them.

* See Orig. Contr. Celsus, lib. iii. p. 119. l. v. p. 271. Le Clerc, H. E., ad ann. 83. Notwithstanding, Gibbon supposes the exertions of the heretics to have promoted, upon the whole, the progress of Christianity; because (as he thinks) the heathen, to whom they communicated an imperfect knowledge of the faith, subsequently threw off their errors and melted into the body of the Church.

It would be tedious and unprofitable successively to enumerate all the heresies and dissensions of the early Christians; and it is very difficult to classify them with accuracy; for several, which were distinct in their origin, arrived by different roads so nearly at the same conclusions, that they may there seem to be identified; while others are so obscure in their own nature, or from defects in our information, as to make it neither very certain, nor perhaps very important, to which class they most properly belong.

Mosheim distinguishes three classes of early heretics: (1.) those who associated Christianity with Judaism, who were the Nazarenes and Ebionites; (2.) those who engrafted some of its doctrines on the system of the oriental philosophy, among whom are accounted, of the Asiatic school, Elxai, Simon Magus, Menander, Saturninus, Cerdo, and Marcion; of the Alexandrian, Basilides, Carpocrates, and the perfecter of the system, Valentinus; (3.) those who endeavoured to explain certain of the Christian mysteries by the principles of the Grecian philosophy, among whom are placed Praxeas, Artemon, Theodotus, and others. It has been objected to this division, that it is not supported by the authority of the ancient fathers, who, in no instance, derive the opinions which they combat from the oriental philosophy. Tertullian, indeed, expressly calls the philosophers the parents or 'patriarchs of the heretics,' but it is to the Grecian school that he intends to confine that charge, and especially to the sects of Pythagoras and Plato, against which he constantly alleges it. Other writers hold the same language, and Irenæus goes so far as to derive the doctrine of the succession of Æons, promulgated by Valentinus, from the Greek Theogonies, not from the speculations of the eastern sages. From this circumstance we are at liberty to infer, either that the eastern philosophy had no share in the origin of the early heresies, or that those fathers were entirely unacquainted with its existence.

A different view is taken of this subject by Dr. Burton.* He ascribes the rise of all the oldest heresies to the Gnostic philosophy. But at the same time under that comprehensive name, we understand him directly or indirectly to combine almost every form of philosophy which was professed throughout the whole extent of the eastern and western empire. The three sources which contributed to form this heterogeneous mixture, were, (1.) the eastern doctrine of the two principles; (2.) the Jewish Cabala; (3.) the Platonic philosophy: the last of these, under its various modifications, supplied the most abundant stream; and the point of their conflux and commixture is naturally supposed to have been that vast emporium of commerce and literature, Alexandria. In this city principally Gnosticism, such as it is here described, is believed to have been amalgamated into one substance, and hence distributed over the various provinces of the Roman empire not very long before the birth of Christ.

We have no space to state the learned arguments by which that opinion is supported, nor those which might reasonably be urged against it; but the fact is indisputable, that, before the period of which we are treating, the theological speculations of the eastern philosophers had been received in Europe with favour and attention, in so far that even the worship which was founded on them was in very common practice. But whether we should still continue to distinguish the Grecian from the Oriental, as peculiarly the Gnostical philosophy, or whether we should employ the term Gnosticism to designate a single system formed from their union, is a question which it is not necessary for us to discuss, since it is admitted that Gnos-

* See Bampton Lect. II. and III. and note 7.

ticism, in its more extended sense, embraced a multitude of ill-assorted opinions, impregnated more or less deeply with the character of the soil out of which they respectively rose.

For our own part, in the concise view which we are here enabled to present of the multiform family of heretics, we shall rather be directed by their subject than by their supposed origin—by the common character which runs through them, than by the source whence that character may have been derived. And with this intent, we shall *first* mention those wherein some of the Christian doctrines were corrupted by association with that extended philosophical system which took its root in the vain inquiry respecting the origin of evil; *secondly*, we shall notice those which laid the foundation of the great controversies respecting the Trinity and Incarnation, which broke out in succeeding ages; and, *lastly*, we shall mention one or two of those which appear to have been excited by mere individual enthusiasm or madness. In the mean time, we readily admit the imperfection of this division in the light of an absolute distinction, since some of the opinions held by those whom we shall place in the second class, might be traced to the principles which will be treated in the first; and there is so much wildness in the ravings* of certain in both those classes, that they might perhaps, without much error, be adjudged to the third. The mention of the Manichæans we shall entirely defer until a later period in our history.

I. The Oriental philosophy, which is commonly confounded with Gnosticism †, proceeded from the hopeless inquiry into the nature and origin of evil. Convinced that this could not possibly be ascribed to the divine agency, the speculators embraced what appeared to be the only alternative, and attributed it to matter; and matter must of consequence be eternal. And then, when they proceeded to consider the various forms of matter, senseless and animal, exhibited in the visible world, and their seeming imperfections, they found it impossible to account for so many modifications of evil, except by the supposed agency of some being, superior indeed to man, but subordinate to the Author of all good. At this point ceased the uniformity of the fanciful theory, and it branched off into inquiries like the following: What *was* this mighty, though inferior, being?—of what origin, power, attributes?—one and alone, or assisted or served by others, equal or inferior?

All these points were disputed; all however agreed as to the independent existence of the two principles, good and evil; and nearly all that the latter was the Creator of the world. Such were the philosophical notions of these persons; and such was their attachment to them, that even when they became persuaded of the divine mission of Christ, they were unwilling entirely to sacrifice them, but rather strove to associate them with the doctrines and engraft them on the history of the Bible. The first consequence of so perverse a misapplication of human reason was this—the monstrous conclusion that the God of the Jews was the evil principle, and that Jesus Christ was sent down by the good principle to put an end to his reign on earth; that the former was the God of the Old, and the latter that of the New Testament. At this point the philosophy of the Gnostics ended, and their heresy began; and the errors which we

* See Irenæus, lib. i. c. 29, et seq. Le Clerc, H. E., ann. 76.

† The word is derived from *γνῶσις*, signifying merely knowledge, erudition. But it later sense among Christian writers implies some acquaintance with mysterious doctrines or occult interpretations, not possessed by ordinary persons. See Le Clerc on the subject of Gnosticism, Hist. Eccl. ad ann. 76.

have mentioned, speedily led them into others: after rejecting—such was the necessary consequence of their opinions—the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament, they applied themselves to the misrepresentation of the New. They denied the humanity of Christ, asserting that he came not in the flesh; that he suffered not, that he died not; that what seemed to be material in his nature was a fantastic, incorporeal substance. The same principles obliged them also to dispute the resurrection of the body, a substance too gross for an eternal destiny. This opinion again variously affected their moral practice; for while there were undoubtedly some who mortified the sensual portion of our nature, for the greater perfection of the soul, there are also said to have been others, of more violent enthusiasm or fiery temperament, who permitted every license of impurity to that which lay so far beneath consideration and respect. It is chiefly to the Gnostic heretics of Egypt (who were distinguished from their brethren by greater wildness in their speculations) that these excesses are attributed; we cannot now determine how truly. But on the other hand it is just to mention that, in professing the Christian name, those heretics did not always shrink from the dangers which surrounded it; and we have evidence that many among them encountered persecution with the same courage which distinguished their brethren of the Church, and endured it with the same unbending constancy*.

Among the Gnostic heretics (thus we shall continue to denominate those who associated, however variously and diversely, the Eastern or Persian system with some belief in Christ) it is usual to account the followers of Simon Magus †, the first corrupter of the Christian doctrine: these are said to have been numerous, especially at Rome; and the celebrity of their master has been considerably increased by an error of Justin Martyr, repeated by several of the fathers, who mistook a statue inscribed to Semo, a Sabine deity, for a proof of the deification of that heresiarch ‡. Nicolas, one of the seven deacons mentioned in the Acts, is asserted to have misled the sect called Nicolaitans §; Menander, the pupil of Simon, perpetuated his teacher's errors, and through him they were transmitted to Saturninus, who disseminated them in the Asiatic, and to Basilides ||, who may have introduced them into the Egyptian school. In this prolific soil, equally favourable to the growth of evil and of good¶, they became, among the gross disciples of Carpocrates ¶¶, the

* In Diocletian's persecution, Peter and Asclepias, the former a member of the Church, the latter a Marcionite Bishop, were burnt. 'Peter,' says Tillemont, 'went to Heaven, and Asclepias to hell-fire.' That intemperate bigot might have taken a lesson of moderation even from the language of Eusebius:—'With Peter suffered Asclepias; through a zeal, as he thought, for piety, but not for that which is according to knowledge; however, they were consumed in one and the same fire.'—Jortin, Rem. Eccl. Hist., book ii. p. ii.

† 'Simon Magus taught in Samaria that he was the Father, in Judæa that he was the Son, among the Gentiles that he was the Holy Spirit.' Iren., i. c. 20. Tertull. de Præser. Her., c. 45. Simon Magus ausus est summam se dicere virtutem, i. e. summum Deum, post hunc Menander, discipulus ipsius, eadem dicens quæ Simon ipse. He denied that any one could be saved unless baptized in his name.

‡ Justin asserts that a statue was erected in his honour bearing the following inscription in Latin, *Simoni Deo Sancto*. This was generally believed until, in the year 1574, a statue was discovered in the island of the Tiber having an inscription beginning thus:—'*Semoni Sancto Deo Fidio Sacrum*.' We cannot think Dr. Burton successful in his attempt to defend Justin.

§ This appears to have been the same with the heresy of Cerinthus, against which St. John is by many believed to have written his Gospel.

|| See Le Clerc, H. E., ad ann. 78 and 118.

¶ Iren. lib. i. c. 25. Euseb. lib. iv. c. 7. This reproach is shared with the Nicolaitans. Burton, Bampton Lect. V., conclusion.

principles of deliberate immorality, while * they received from the ingenuity of Valentinus such refinement, as to call on that writer the particular attention both of Irenæus and Tertullian †. Cerdo, and after him Marcion, the most distinguished among the heretics of his day, introduced the same delusion, with certain ‡ variations, into Rome during the reign of Antoninus Pius. Here the doctrines § were immediately disclaimed by the prelates of that Church, and confuted by the ablest Christian writer, Justin Martyr. They were afterwards made the subject of a separate treatise by Tertullian. It has been inferred from the discovery of some Gnostic medals in France that the heresy was at one time generally disseminated in the western provinces. But this fact, liable as it is to some dispute, is not sufficient to counterbalance the silence of history confirmed by the certainty of the early disappearance of the sect. In the mean time we do not dispute that the *philosophy* of the Gnostics had some prevalence throughout that part of the empire during the first and second centuries, but it was not until the end of the second that Christianity can be said to have made any progress there.

Soon afterwards, in the year 172, Tatian, a man of some learning, and a disciple of Justin Martyr, built on the basis of Gnosticism the heresy of the Encratites. These sectarians professed the simplest principles of the monastic life, meditation and bodily austerities. It may be said, perhaps, that under the names of Essenes and Therapeutæ such enthusiasts existed in the very earliest age of Christianity, and even before its foundation; but it is certain that it was at this period, and under this designation, that they first attracted serious attention; and it is not disputed that they met with utter discouragement and condemnation from the Church. For the birth of monasticism was not destined to take place in an age of piety and sincere devotion; and when at length it was produced by fanaticism infuriated by persecution, its growth was still slow and unequal, keeping pace with the corruption of religion and the degradation of the Church.

It is a strong, but scarcely exaggerated expression of St. Jerome ||, that the body of our Lord was declared to be a phantom while the Apostles were still in the world, and the blood of Christ was still fresh in Judæa. The Phantastics, under the denomination of Docetæ, were, indeed, a sect of very early origin, and we connect their opinions with one peculiarity of the Gnostic system which we have not yet mentioned. Certain among those philosophers, in order to remove the Author of good to an immeasurable distance from the contact of matter, imagined a vast succession of created but superhuman beings, as the agents of

* Le Clerc places Carpocrates at the year 120 A. D., and Valentinus in the year following—aut non multo serius.

† Our information respecting Gnosticism is chiefly collected from the writers who opposed Valentinus, and especially from Irenæus.

‡ Cerdo and Marcion appear to have asserted the doctrine of the two principles with more boldness than the Valentinians; but both parties agreed in teaching that the Father of Jesus Christ was not the Creator of the world nor the God of the Old Testament. Tertull. c. Marc., lib. i. c. 15, 16. Iren., lib. i. c. 47. Burton, Bampton Lect., p. 50.

§ It appears that one of the grounds on which Marcion resisted was the refusal of the Church to make any concession to the Jews, or conciliate them by any compromise of the pure faith. This appears to prove that the principal success of the Gnostic heresy had been among the Jewish converts. Probably it was most prevalent in Judæa and Ægypt; but we also learn that the Church of Ephesus was early tainted by it, and probably it had gained some footing throughout Asia Minor. Marcion was a native of Pontus. The work of Justin is lost.

|| Advers. Lucif. xxiii., vol. ii. p. 197.

communication between the Supreme God and the world, or at least its Creator. These were emanations from the Deity; and they appear, when their office was discharged, to have been restored to the Pleroma, to the presence of Him who sent them—these beings were called *Æons*. Among them a very high rank, possibly the highest, was assigned to Christ; but from this point the Gnostics broke off into two different and almost opposite theories: many imagined that Jesus was a mere man, and maintained that the *æon* Christ descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism and left him immediately before his crucifixion, so that Christ was not, in fact, subjected to pain and death; while others held that the body, with which Christ appeared to be invested, was not really human and passible, but unsubstantial or *æthereal*, or at least immaterial: these last were called *Docetæ*. At the same time, both parties alike misunderstood that which the Church considered to be the peculiar doctrine and object of Christianity; for they agreed in believing that the mission of Christ had no further intention than to reveal the knowledge of the true God; they denied the resurrection and the final judgment, and by explaining away the death of Christ they deprived his religion of the doctrine of the Atonement.

From the above brief and very general outline of the Gnostic Heresies—which differed again widely from each other in many subordinate opinions—we perceive how very far they were removed from the precincts of reason and truth. Indeed, they retained so much more of Gnosticism than they assumed of Christianity, that it was only in the ancient and very broad acceptation of the term that they could be fairly denominated *Heresies*, and thus we are less disposed to censure the severity of those Fathers who refused them the name of Christian. For however cautious we should be in withholding that appellation from those whose errors are founded on the mere perversion of reason, we may safely disclaim our fraternity with men, who substitute for the fundamental doctrines and the clearest truths of the Gospel, wild visions and theories which have not any ground or existence, except in vain and lawless imagination. We shall do well to conclude this subject in the words of *Le Clerc*—one of the most rational and faithful among our historical guides. ‘I am weary of the *Valentinians*, (thus he begins his account of the year 145,) and so I imagine are my readers; but the history of the second century is so crammed with them, and the Fathers, both of those and of later times, so often refer to them, that it is necessary to expose monstrous opinions, which in themselves do not merit one moment’s attention.’ In truth, their principal, if not their only claim on our attention, is, that the Books of the New Testament appear to contain some allusions to them, which it is our duty to examine and understand*.

II. We have just observed, that among the earliest corrupters of the Christian doctrines, there were some who disputed the human nature of Christ. It appears to us equally clear there were also others who denied his divinity. The oldest and perhaps the most numerous among these were the *Ebionites*.

Tertullian considers them as a sect of Judaizing Christians, named from their founder *Ebion*, who strictly maintained the observance of the ceremonial law, and rejected the miraculous

Ebionites.

* Any one desirous of more ample details respecting the Gnostic Heresies may safely consult the learned author in the *Encycl. Britan.*, pp. 24, 25, 26.

conception and the divine nature of the Saviour.* Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, (book iii. c. xxvii.) describes them in these words:—

‘The Ebionites were so called from the poverty and meanness with which they dogmatized concerning Christ; for they considered him as a mere man born of the connexion of a man and Mary. And they thought too that the ceremonial law (*νομικὴ ὀρησκεία*) was to be followed; as neither faith in Christ, nor the life led through that faith, was sufficient for salvation. But there were others bearing the same appellation, who escaped the extravagant absurdity of these former, since they did not deny that the Lord was born of a virgin and the Holy Spirit. But neither did these, acknowledging his pre-existence, and that he was Logos and Sophia, (the Word and the Wisdom,) turn entirely away from the unrighteousness of the former, chiefly because they too were careful about the bodily service (*σωματικὴν λάτρειαν*) of the law. These then did not receive the epistles of the apostle, calling him an apostate from the law, and only used the gospel according to the Hebrews; but they observed Sunday in commemoration of the resurrection, keeping the Jewish sabbath.†

This description agrees in all material points with the account of Tertullian; and without proceeding to deeper investigation, we may safely infer from it two historical truths—that the peculiar opinions of the Ebionites were confined (or nearly so) to the Jewish converts—and that they were neither wholly nor in part the doctrines of the ante-Nicene Church.

It is well known that the high antiquity of the opinions of the Ebionites has been held by some to be an evidence of their truth; but the same inference might be drawn, with the same reason, respecting the delusions of the Phantastics, which had at least as early an origin. The Ebionites probably arose after the publication of three of the gospels. The Gnostic errors of the Docetæ may even have† preceded the preaching of the Apostles; they were certainly contemporary with it. Again, if it be admitted that the Apostles were the interpreters of God’s word, and if it be not proved that the sect of the Ebionites was founded by any one of them, and if it be certain that the fathers who subsequently directed the Church, and explained its doctrine, did invariably disclaim that sect, we may fairly conclude, that its opinions were neither favourably received, nor at all commonly adopted. On the other hand, it is endeavoured, by confounding the Ebionites with the Gnostic Heretics, to make them in some degree accountable for all the absurdities of the latter; and these, it is truly urged, had all a tendency to the opposite extreme, to spiritualize the body rather than to degrade the divine nature of Christ. And it is hence inferred, that it was *Jesus* alone to whom the Ebionites attributed a human nature, while

* De Prescript. Heret. c. 33.; De Virgin. Veland. c. 6. ‘Quam utique Virginem fuisse constat, licet Ebion resistat.’ De Carne Christi, c. 14. 18, 19. The Ebionites are classed by Mosheim among the Judaizing sects; and Ebion, if he existed at all, was probably a Jew: the numbers and influence of those sects diminished so rapidly during the second century, after the promulgation of Adrian’s Edict, and are consequently so little noticed by the fathers of the third and following ages, that it seems unnecessary to bestow a separate notice on them.

† Le Clerc distinguishes the early from the more recent Ebionites, placing them respectively at ann. 72 and 103. The former he considers, on the authority of Jerome, to have been merely Judaizing Christians—who, as that Father remarks, in their wish to be both Jews and Christians, were neither. Le Clerc considers the Nazarenes to have been the same sect as the early Ebionites, ann. 72. Mosheim (De Reb. Christ. ant. Const. Sec. i. sect. lviii. and Sec. ii., sect. xxxix., xl. &c.) refers the rise of the Ebionites to the second century.

they acknowledged the uncontaminated divinity of *Christ*. It is possible that there were some, calling themselves Ebionites, who were in fact merely Gnostics. But in the face of our direct authorities we cannot admit the hypothesis in question. What Tertullian and Eusebius* expressly tell us to have been the Ebionitical opinions respecting *Christ*, we cannot suppose to be meant of *Jesus* as *opposed to Christ*. And we feel obliged to believe, that those are as far removed from truth on the one hand, who dispute the early *existence* of the Unitarian opinions, as those are, on the other, who assert their early reception by the Church; they have existed from the beginning, and from the beginning they have been condemned.

Again, the doctrine of the mere humanity of *Christ*, separated from the judaism of the Ebionites, was advanced towards the end of the second century by Theodotus and Artemon; and during the episcopacy of Victor, the former was expelled from the Church of Rome for that error. Eusebius in this place designates him as the '*father of an impious apostacy*,'—and in so far as he had divested the old opinion of its judaism, and advanced it nakedly in the very face of the Church, the assertion is true. For any claim, which it may have advanced to a previous existence at Rome, or in any of the European Churches, is sufficiently answered by reference to the writings of Justin, and Miltiades, and Tatian, and Clement, and Irenæus, and Melito, 'by all of whom (says Eusebius) the divinity of *Christ* is asserted.†

In the next century the heresy of Artemon (it became more generally known by his name) was revived by Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch.‡ A synod of Bishops, Presbyters and *Artemon*. Deacons was convoked at Antioch in the year 269, to take cognizance of the offence; and Eusebius notices the eagerness with which they hurried 'from all directions against the defiler of *Christ's* flock.' In a numerous assembly, in his own metropolis, the Bishop found many defenders, but he was at length convicted and sentenced to expulsion from his throne. But as he resisted the execution of the sentence, and as the Church was not yet able to enforce its own judgments, application was made to the Emperor Aurelian, whose authority§ finally removed the refractory offender.¶ These facts are sufficient to prove beyond controversy, that the opinion in question, whatever may have been the zeal or number of its individual supporters, was not at any period acknowledged by the Church.

The controversy respecting the nature of *Christ's* existence on earth, which presently so branched out, as to involvè the doctrine of the Trinity as well as the Incarnation, may be said *Praxeas*. to have first assumed a tangible form under the pen of *Praxeas*, a writer of the Grecian school. He published his opinions

* See also Irenæus L. iii. c. 24, and Epiphanius. Hæres. 30.

† *ἐν οἷς ἀπ᾿ αὐτοῦ θεολογῆται ὁ Χριστός.* End of ch. 5.

‡ We follow in this statement the authority of Eusebius, and the opinion almost universally received. But it is fair to mention that Dr. Burton ingeniously argues, from a careful examination of contemporary evidence, compared chiefly with the assertions of Athanasius, that 'Paul believed *Jesus* to be a mere human being, but conceived him to become *Christ*, by being united to the eternal *Logos* of God.'—(Bampt. Lect. viii. notes 99. 102.) It does not appear that the contemporaries of the Heretic placed that construction upon his doctrine. And Eusebius (H. E. L. vii. c. 27) expressly says—*τούτου δὲ ταπεινὰ καὶ χαμαιαισχρῆ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διδασκαλίαν φρονήσαντες, ὡς κοινοῦ τῆν φύσιν ἀνθρώπου γενόμενου,* &c. &c. See Mosheim, De R. Christ. ante Const. Sæc. iii. sect. 35.

§ This was the first instance of the interference of the secular power in the internal affairs of the Church; and consequently Baronius is warm in his praise of Aurelian—

about the year 200 A. D., and was answered very soon afterwards by the great champion of the Church, Tertullian. The opinions of Praxeas (as is natural in a question capable of so much metaphysical subtilty) are variously represented;* but the doctrine of the Church is very clearly stated in the following words of his antagonist.† ‘We believe in one God, but under the following dispensation or economy—that there is also a Son of God, his Word, who proceeded from Him; by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made; who was sent by him into the Virgin, and was born of her; being both man and God, the son of man and the son of God, and called Jesus Christ; he suffered, died and was buried, according to the Scriptures; and was raised up again by the Father; and was taken up into Heaven, there to sit at the right hand of the Father; and thence to come to judge the quick and the dead; who sent from Heaven, from his Father, according to his promise, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Sanctifier of the faith of all who believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.’ Such, according to this author, was the faith handed down in the Church, from the first preaching of the Gospel; and we consider this to be historical truth of no small importance.‡

The heresy of Praxeas was succeeded, (or revived,) in the course of about fifty years, by that of Sabellius. Both proceeded, *Sabellius*. in appearance, from the difficulty of reconciling the trinity with the unity of the Godhead—in reality, from our human and necessary incapacity to comprehend the nature of the union. But Greek philosophy was too vain to admit any limits to the human comprehension, and too disputatious to quit so fine a field for sophistry as was opened to it by an abstruse and inexplicable question. And certainly that philosophy lost nothing either in minuteness or pertinacity, when it ascended to the climate, and employed the genius of Africans.§ Sabellius was an African, and seemingly either Bishop, or Presbyter at Barce, the capital of the Cyrenaica; he denied the distinct personality of the second and third persons of the Trinity, and maintained that a certain energy only, proceeding from the supreme Parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature, was united to the son of God, the man Jesus.||

“He was the first to point out, that the imperial authority should be called in to chastise those who did not acquiesce in episcopal decision.” Ad ann. 314. Sect. xxxv. We shall have occasion to recur to this subject hereafter.

* They are chiefly to be divined from the treatise written against Tertullian. It should be mentioned also, that Praxeas had declared very strongly against *Montanism*, before Tertullian attacked him.

† To us it is the great use of these controversies, that we learn from them the original doctrine of the Church. Thus during that respecting Paul of Samosata, the Council declared, (as we learn from Athanasius,) ‘that the Son existed before all things, and that he did not become God from being human, but that being God he took upon him the form of a servant, and being the Logos he became flesh.’

‡ It appears too from the examination of Irenæus’ writings against the Valentinians, that that more antient Father maintained, as far as he particularizes them, the same opinions. It has been observed, that Tertullian was the first author who used the words *Trinitas* and *Persona* in the theological sense.

§ See Mosheim, De R. Christ. ante Const. Sæc. III. sect. 33. The different opinions, or rather the different shades of the same opinion, which have been ascribed to Sabellius, are there accurately treated.

|| We perceive how nearly this opinion approaches to the old Gnostic heresy, which considered Christ as an Æon or Divine Emanation united for a time to the man Jesus—but for a time only—the Gnostics withdrew the Æon before the Crucifixion, and thus avoided the conclusion charged against the Patripassians.

And in the same manner he considered the Holy Ghost to be a portion of the everlasting Father. This error, into which he was led by an excessive fear of Tritheism, (the acknowledgment of three Gods,) was liable to the inference, that the Being who suffered on the Cross was in fact the Father; hence his followers were called Patripassians. He was confuted by Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria.

III. We shall not dwell upon the varying shapes of mere frenzy. The deliberate errors of an informed and serious mind, however in appearance remote from reason, always merit some sort of consideration; but the dreams of an ignorant fanatic can have no claims on our time or reflection. Perhaps we should place under this head some of the wilder of those heresies usually called Gnostic; and some would refer to the same origin the opinions of the Manichæan sect; but we shall here confine ourselves to those of the Montanists. About the year 170 A. D., a vain and superstitious enthusiast, named Montanus, began to prophesy in Phrygia and other provinces of Asia Minor—he professed to be the Paraclete or Comforter, the same* who had descended upon the Apostles, and whose return on earth before the second coming of Christ, for the purpose of completing the divine Revelation, was expected by many of the faithful; and his trances, and extatic raptures, and fanatic ravings, were probably regarded by the credulous and wondering multitude as the surest signs of divine inspiration. Certainly there were many in those regions who followed him; and his success was promoted by his association with two prophetesses, named Maximilla and Priscilla, who confirmed his mission, and shared his spirit. Another cause of the temporary fame of Montanism was the severity of the morality inculcated by it; the strictest celibacy and the most rigid fasts were exacted from the proselytes, and this circumstance threw an appearance of sanctity round the sect, which seems to have deadened the penetration of Tertullian, for he presently professed himself its advocate. To that circumstance perhaps this heresy may be indebted for most of its celebrity; for it was condemned by certain Asiatic councils at the time of its eruption, and it appears to have made very little progress after the second century, and at no time to have found general reception beyond the precincts of its birth-place, though some remains of it subsisted there for two or three ages. †

Before we quit the subject of Heresy, we must mention a controversy which divided the Church during the third century, respecting the form of receiving a converted heretic into the number of the orthodox. The Churches of the west ‡ were, for the most part, of opinion, that the baptism of Heretics was valid, and that the mere imposition of hands, attended by prayer, was form sufficient to solemnize their introduction within the pale: whereas the less moderate Christians of Asia decided in council, that their admission must be preceded by repetition of baptism; and this decision was approved and enforced by Cyprian in the Churches of Africa. § Stephen, Bishop of Rome, who was at the head of those who held the

* See Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, p. 23 et seq.

† We observe the name of Montanism among the heresies stigmatized in the Theodosian Code.

‡ We may account for this greater moderation of the western Churches, by their having escaped some of the most extravagant and revolting among the early heresies—these, as they chiefly originated in the fanatic imaginations of the east, were for the most part confined to those regions.

§ The council of Carthage held by Cyprian, on this question, was in the year 256. Mosh. Gen. H. c. iii. p. ii. chap. iii.

contrary opinion, conducted his opposition with injudicious violence; he excommunicated all who differed from him, and discovered, even thus early, the germs of papal arrogance.* The mention of this controversy is important, at least on one account, as it gives us an additional proof of the very serious view in which Heresy was regarded by the Churchmen of those days, and the scrupulousness of their care to preserve the purity of the true faith.

We may conclude with some notice of the sect of the Novatians, who were stigmatized at the time, both as schismatics and heretics; † *Novatians*. but who may perhaps be more properly considered as the earliest body of ecclesiastical reformers. They arose at Rome about the year 250 A. D.; and subsisted until the fifth century throughout every part of Christendom. ‡ Novatian, a Presbyter of Rome, § was a man of great talents and learning, and of character so austere, that he was unwilling, under any circumstances of contrition, to readmit those who had been once separated from the communion of the Church. And this severity he would have extended not only to those who had fallen by deliberate transgression, but even to such as had made a forced compromise of their faith under the terrors of persecution. He considered the Christian Church as a society, where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and refused any longer to acknowledge, as members of it, those who had once degenerated into unrighteousness. || This endeavour to revive the spotless moral purity of the primitive faith was found inconsistent with the corruptions even of that early age: it was regarded with suspicion by the leading prelates, ¶ as a vain and visionary scheme; and those rigid principles, which had characterized and sanctified the Church in the first century, were abandoned to the profession of schismatic sectaries in the third.

From a review of what has been written on this subject, some truths may be derived of considerable historical importance; the following are among them: (1.) In the midst of perpetual dissent and occasional controversy, a steady and distinguishable line, both in doctrine and practice, was maintained by the early Church, and its efforts against those, whom it called Heretics, were zealous and persevering, and for the most part consistent. Its contests were fought with the 'sword of the Spirit,' with the arms of reason and eloquence; and as they were always unattended by personal oppression, so were they most effectually successful—successful, not in establishing a nominal unity, nor silencing the expression of private opinion, but in maintaining the purity of the faith, in preserving the at-

* This controversy resembles, in two points, that before mentioned, respecting the celebration of Easter. The Roman was right perhaps in the principle, but overbearing and insolent in the manner.

† Cornel. ap. Cypr. Ep. 50 (or 48); Cyprian, Ep. 54. As to the latter charge, even their adversaries do not advance any point of doctrine on which they deviated from the Church. See Note 4, or p. 33. *supr.*

‡ (Mosh. Gen. Hist. Cent. iii. end)—Especially, as it would seem, in Phrygia—where their rigid practices brought them into danger of being confounded with the Montanists. Lardner, Cred. Gosp. Hist. p. ii. ch. 47.

§ Euseb. H. E. L. vi. c. 43.—Jerom. de Vir. Illust. c. 70. He is believed to have been a convert from some sect of philosophy, probably the Stoic. Lardner perseveres in calling him Novatus; not, however, intending to confound him with an unworthy associate, presbyter of Carthage, also named Novatus—and severely censured by Cyprian.—See Tillem. Mem. H. Eccles. vol. iii. p. 433, 435, ad. ann. 251.

|| His followers called themselves Cathari—Puritans.

¶ It should be mentioned that Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, the principal opponent of Novatian's opinions, had motives for personal enmity against that Ecclesiastic.

tachment of the great majority of the believers, and in consigning, either to immediate disrepute, or early neglect, all the unscriptural doctrines which were successively arrayed against it. (2.) The greater part of the early heresies was derived from the impure mixture of profane philosophy with the simple revelation of the Gospel. Hence proceeded those vain and subtile disputations respecting things incomprehensible, which would indeed have been less pernicious, had they only exercised the ingenuity of men, without engaging their passions; their bitter fruits were not fully gathered until a later age: but they served, even in their origin, to perplex the faith, and disturb the harmony of many devout Christians. (3.) No public dispute had hitherto risen respecting the manner of salvation—for the conclusions deducible from the Gnostic hallucinations are not worthy of serious consideration; the great questions respecting predestination and grace had not yet become matter of controversy, nor had any of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity been assailed, excepting the Trinity and the Incarnation. (4.) There was yet no dissent on the subject of Church Government. It was universally and undisputedly Episcopal; even the reformer Novatian, after his expulsion from the Church, assumed the direction of his own rigid sect under the title of Bishop; and if any dissatisfaction had existed as to the established method of directing the Church, it would certainly have displayed itself on the occasion of a schism, which entirely respected matters of practice and discipline.

As we have made frequent mention of the principal writers, commonly called Fathers, of the ancient Church, we shall subjoin to this chapter a very short account of some of the earliest *Early Fathers*. among them. We do not profess any blind veneration for their names, or submission to their opinions; but we are very far removed from the contempt of either. For if we are to bend to any human *authority* (as in such matters some of us must always do, and all of us sometimes), those are assuredly the safest objects of our reverence, who stood nearest to the source of revelation, and received the cup of knowledge from the very hands of the Apostles. They were erring and feeble mortals, like ourselves; much inferior in intellectual discipline, and vitiated by early prejudices necessarily proceeding from the oblique principles and perverse systems of their day. Nevertheless they were earnest and ardent Christians; in respect at least to their religion they had access to infallible instructors, and the lessons which they have transmitted to us, howsoever imperfectly transmitted, should be received with attention and respect.

The Apostolical Fathers are those who were contemporary with the Apostles; some of whom are known, and all of whom may be reasonably believed, to have shared their conversation, and profited by their instruction. These are St. Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius and Polycarp. They were all (excepting probably Clement) natives of the east, and all originally wrote in the Greek language. The works which have reached us under their names are not numerous; and though the genuineness of some of them has been justly suspected, there is no reason to doubt the very high antiquity of all. They were composed with various objects, according to the dispositions or circumstances of their writers. The design of the epistle attributed to St. Barnabas was to abate the respect for the peculiar rites and institutions of the Jewish laws, and to shew that they were not binding upon Christians. The 'Shepherd of Hermas' consists of three books, in the first of which are four visions, in the second twelve commands, in the third ten similitudes. The first and

third parts are of course very fanciful, yet were they not perhaps unsuited to the genius of the countries and the age to which they were addressed; the second contains some excellent moral precepts; and all abound with paraphrasticall allusions to the books of the New Testament. The epistles of Ignatius have suffered many obvious interpolations and corruptions; but learned and candid critics, who have distinguished and rejected these, still leave us much behind of undisputed origin. The author was Bishop of Antioch; he suffered martyrdom about the year 107 A. D., and the opinion that he invited, rather than shunned this fate, seems to be consistent with the ardour of his character. The genuineness of Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians has scarcely been questioned;* it was written (soon after the death of Ignatius) in the spirit of sincere piety; it abounds with scriptural expressions and frequent quotations of the recorded words of Christ. Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna on the appointment (as is asserted without any improbability) of the Apostle St. John; and he suffered martyrdom, as we have already described, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus. But the most important record of the apostolical age remaining to us is the 'Epistle of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth,' written about the year 96 A. D. by Clement Bishop of Rome. Its object was to allay some internal dissensions of the Corinthians, and it contains many useful and noble truths, flowing from a vigorous mind and purely Christian spirit, in language never feeble, and occasionally eloquent.

Those pious persons wrote before any association had taken place between philosophy and religion, and were better instructed in the knowledge of Scripture than in the lessons of the Schools; and their method of reasoning, no less than their style, attests the want of profane education; still it possesses a persuasive simplicity well suited both to the character of the writers, and the integrity of their faith. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are clearly and scripturally inculcated by them; and these are every where so interwoven with the highest precepts of morality, as to prove to us that the belief of those men was inseparable from their practice, and that it had not ever occurred to them to draw any verbal distinction between these; they delivered the truths which had been entrusted to them, and associated their moral and doctrinal instructions as inseparable parts of the same scheme. This perhaps is the most peculiar feature in their compositions, and that in which they most resemble the inspired writings. Another is the utter neglect of formal arrangement in the display of their arguments, or the delivery of their rules of conduct; a neglect which unquestionably exposed them to the contempt of the philosopher, who sought in vain for a *system* in their lore, but which well accorded with the plain and unpretending character of truth. But that merit by which they have conferred the most lasting advantage on Christianity, (at least the three last of them,) and which will make them very valuable monuments, in every age, is their frequent reference to almost all the books of the New Testament, such as we now possess them. Thus they furnish us with decisive evidence of the genuineness of those books; and their testimony is liable to no suspicion, because it was not given with any such view.

The principal Greek writers, who immediately succeeded the apostolical Fathers, were Justin Martyr and Irenæus. Justin Martyr was a learned Samaritan, who, after having successively attached himself to the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists, discovered the insuffi-

* Lardner, Cred. of Gosp. Hist. p. ii. ch. vi.

ciency and emptiness of philosophy. His attention was called to Christianity by the sufferings inflicted upon its profession, and the firmness with which he had beheld them endured. He inferred that men so contemptuous of death were far removed from the moral degradation with which they were charged; and that the faith for which they died so fearlessly must stand on some foundation. He examined that foundation, and discovered its stability.* The sincerity of his conversion is attested by his martyrdom. He was executed by the Emperor, whose philosophy he had deserted; and he perhaps never was so strongly sensible of the superiority of that which he had preferred, as at the moment when he died for it.† He wrote two apologies for Christianity, the first probably addressed to Antoninus Pius, the second to Marcus;—and a (supposed) dialogue with a Jew named Trypho. This last contains many weak arguments, and trifling and even erroneous interpretations of Scripture, mixed up with some useful matter. The two former are more valuable compositions; they were so in those days—because they contained the best defence of religion which had then been published, maintained by arguments very well calculated to persuade those to whom they were addressed; and they are still so, because we find in them many quotations from the same four Gospels which we now acknowledge; they relate many interesting facts, respecting the religious customs and ceremonies of the Christians of those times; and they prove the general acceptance of all the fundamental articles of our belief. As Justin flourished only one century after the preaching of Christ, (his conversion is usually placed at the year 133 from the birth of our Saviour,) we are not extending the value of tradition beyond its just limits, when we consider his opinions as receiving some additional weight from their contiguity to the apostolical times; and if it were possible to mark by any decided limit the extent of traditionary authority, we should be disposed to trace the line immediately after his name; for admitting that Irenæus, who presently succeeded him, by his oriental birth and correspondence may have received some uncorrupted communications transmitted through two generations from the divine origin, we shall still find it very difficult to distinguish these from the mere human matter with which they may be associated; and this difficulty will increase, as we descend lower down the stream; so that we may safely detach the notion of peculiar sanctity or conclusive authority‡ from the names and writings of the succeeding Fathers, though they contain much that may excite our piety, and animate our morality, and confirm our faith.

Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons, about the year 178 A. D. He is chiefly celebrated for his five books ‘Against Heresies;’ containing confutations of

* See Jortin—Remarks, &c. B. ii. p. i. A. D. 150. Also *supra* pp. 30, 31.

† It has been often asserted, and we believe without contradiction, that no man ever died in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenet. But those who lay much stress on this fact should show, that an opportunity for martyrdom has ever been afforded to any philosophical sect.

‡ We might divide the first 313 years of the Christian æra into three periods, in respect to its internal history. The first century was the age of Christ and the Apostles, of miracles and inspiration inherent in the Church; the next fifty years we may consider as that of the Apostolical Fathers, enlightened by some lingering rays of the departed glory, which were successively and insensibly withdrawn; the third was the period of severe probation and bitter anxiety, unalleviated by extraordinary aids, and so far removed from human consolation, that the powers of the earth might seem to have conspired with the meanest of its progeny, in order to oppress and desolate the Church of Christ—yet even this was not without the Spirit of God.

most of the errors which had then appeared in the Church. Though the language which he employs in this contest is not always that best adapted either to persuade or to conciliate, his sincere aversion from religious dissension is not questioned. It is proved indeed by the epistle which he addressed to Victor, Bishop of Rome, on his insolent demeanour in the controversy respecting Easter, and which breathes a generous spirit of Christian moderation. And in good truth the individual exertions of Churchmen against the progress of unscriptural opinions were in those days the more necessary, and their warmth the more excusable, as there were yet no articles of faith to trace out the limits of orthodoxy, nor any acknowledged head, nor any legally established system of ecclesiastical government. The unity and purity of the Church were chiefly preserved by the independent labours of its most eminent and influential ministers, divided as they were both by language, and manners, and distance, and entirely unsupported by any temporal authority. So that, if we were still disposed to feel any surprise at finding such numerous forms of heresy, so very near both to the time and place where the Revelation was delivered, the above considerations would tend to remove it; while they certainly teach us, that such errors cannot permanently or generally prevail against scriptural truth, as long as they are steadily opposed by temperate and reasonable argument, and by no other weapon than argument only.

END OF PART THE FIRST.

PART II.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE.

CHAPTER VI.—*Constantine the Great.*

The Luminous Cross—Edict of Milan—Character, Conversion, Policy of Constantine—Changes in the Constitution of the Church—Imperial Supremacy—Rights of the Church—Its internal Administration—External—Conclusion.

CHAPTER VII.—*The Arian Controversy.*

Controversies among Christians accounted for—Conduct of Constantine—Alexander—Arius—Council of Nice—Constantius—Athanasius—Council of Rimini—Theodosius—Council of Constantinople—Arianism of the Barbarians—Justinian—Spain—Council of Toledo—Termination of the Controversy—Observations.

CHAPTER VIII.—*Fall of Paganism.*

Policy of Constantine—of Julian—Designed Reformation of Paganism—Attempt to restore the Temple of Jerusalem—Gradual Decline of the Superstition and virtual overthrow by Theodosius.

CHAPTER IX.—*From the Fall of Paganism to the Death of Justinian.*

Conversion of the Northern Barbarians—Superstitions of the Church—Leo the Great—Papal Aggrandizement—Justinian—his Ecclesiastical Policy—Established Laws against Heresy—Literature, Profane and Christian—Causes and Periods of the Decay of either—Moral Condition of the Clergy and People—Note on certain Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.

CHAPTER X.—*From the Death of Justinian to that of Charlemagne.*

1. Mission of St. Austin to England—of St. Boniface to Germany—Mahomet and his Successors—Victory of Charles Martel—Charlemagne. 2. Gregory the Great—his Character—Policy—its permanent Results—Council of Francfort—Deposition of Childeric—Donation of Peplin—Charlemagne's Liberty to the Church.

CHAPTER XI.—*The Dissensions of the Church from Constantine to Charlemagne.*

1. Schism of the Donatists—St. Augustin. 2. Priscillian—his Opinions, and Death. 3. Jovinian—Vigilantius—St. Jerome. 4. Pelagian Controversy—Councils of Jerusalem and Diospolis—St. Augustin. 5. Controversy respecting the Incarnation—Apollinaris—Nestorius—Council of Ephesus—Eutyches—Second Council of Ephesus—Council of Chalcedon—The Monothelites—Council of C. P. 6. Worship of Images—Leo the Isaurian—The Empress Irene—Seventh General Council—Empress Theodora—Observations.

CHAPTER XII.—*Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches.*

Origin of the Dispute—Council of Chalcedon—Title of Œcumenical Bishop—John the Faster—Gregory the Great—Procession of the Holy Spirit—Photus—his Fortunes—Michael Cerularius—Anathema by the Legates of Leo IX.

CHAPTER XIII.—*The Constitution of the Church as fixed by Charlemagne.*

Retrospect of the Condition of the Church at preceding Periods—at the Accession of Constantine—the Death of St. Gregory—the Accession of Charlemagne—The Judicial Rights of the Clergy under Constantine—Justinian—Charlemagne—The false Decretals—Donation of Constantine—The Revenues of the Church—their Sources and Objects.

CHAPTER VI.—*Constantine the Great.*

Victory over Maxentius—supposed conversion—the miracle of the luminous Cross—evidence for and against it—the latter conclusive—The Edict of Milan—its nature and effects—union of the whole Empire under Constantine—His moral character—sincerity of his conversion—unjustly disputed—Remarks on his policy—power of the Christians—Alterations introduced into the constitution of the Church—Its nature at Constantine's accession—spiritual and temporal power—union and strength of the early Church—how cemented—View of the Church probably taken by Constantine—he sought its alliance—Three periods of the ecclesiastical life of Constantine—How circumstanced with regard to the state Constantine found the Church—He assumes the supremacy—Rights of the Church—Its *Internal* administration—little altered in theory—permission to bequeath property to the Church—Independent jurisdiction of the Bishops—on what founded—*External*—subject to the Emperor—what particulars included in it—General observations—Constantine usurped nothing from the Church—Indeterminate limits of the civil and spiritual authority—Alterations in the titles and gradations of the Hierarchy—pre-eminence unattended by authority—Conclusion—Note on Eusebius.

DURING the early part of Diocletian's persecution Constantius Chlorus ruled, with as much humanity as circumstances permitted him to exercise, the provinces of the West. On his death, at York, in the year 306, the army proclaimed Constantine, his son, Emperor. In the mean time, the provinces eastward of Gaul were distracted by the dissensions of rival emperors which favoured the growing strength of Constantine. In 311, Galerius, the fiercest among the assailants of Christianity, died, and his dominions were divided between Maximin and Licinius; Maxentius had already usurped the government of Italy and Africa. Presently Constantine, justified, as most assert, by sufficient provocation, marched into Italy and overthrew Maxentius in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome; that tyrant (as all admit him to have been) was drowned in the Tiber, and his dominions were added to the possessions of the conqueror. This event took place in the year 312; and it has been usually assigned as marking the period of Constantine's conversion to Christianity. A miraculous story* is connected with this epoch in our history. As the Emperor was marching toward Rome, at the head of his army, he beheld a luminous Cross, suspended about noonday in the air, and inscribed with the following words—*Τουτῷ νικά*—'By this conquer.' The phenomenon confirmed his uncertain faith, and afforded him the surest omen of victory. But this was not all: during the ensuing night the form of Christ himself presented itself with the same Cross, and directed him to frame a standard after that shape. And it is certain that, about that period, and possibly on that occasion, a standard was so framed, and continued for many following years to be displayed, whenever it became necessary to excite the enthusiasm of the Christian soldiers—but the extraordinary appearances to which its adoption is ascribed demand the most rigid examination.

In the first place, the story which we have shortly given is related by no contemporary author, excepting Eusebius; next, it is related in his *Life*† of Constantine, and not in his *Ecclesiastical History*; it is related in the year 338, or six-and-twenty years after the supposed appearance; it is related on the authority of Constantine alone, though it must have been witnessed by his whole army, and notorious throughout his whole empire; and lastly it was published after the death of Constantine. In an age, wherein pious

* In the relation of this story we have ventured to omit the dream published by the uncertain author of the book *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, as well as Nazarius's army of divine warriors. We confine ourselves to that, which appears under the more respectable authority of Eusebius. See Gibbon, chap. xx.

† Euseb. Vit. Const. l. 1., c. 28, 29, 30, 31.

frauds had already acquired some honour; by a writer, who, respectable as he undoubtedly is, and faithful in most of his historical records, does not even profess those rigid rules of veracity which command universal credit;* in a book, which rather wears the character of partial panegyric, than of exact and scrupulous history—a flattering fable might be published and believed; but it can claim no place among the authentic records of history, and by writers, whose only object is truth, it may very safely be consigned to contempt and oblivion.†

The defeat of Maxentius was followed by a conference between Constantine and Licinius, which led to the publication, in the March of 313, of the celebrated Edict of Milan.

This Edict was a proclamation of universal toleration; but its advantages were of course chiefly or entirely reaped by the Christians, as theirs had been the only religion not already tolerated. *Edict of Milan.* It gave back to them the civil and religious rights of which they had been deprived; it restored without dispute, delay or expense, the places of worship which had been demolished, and the lands which had been confiscated—and free and absolute power was granted to the Christians, and to all others, of following the religion which every individual might think proper to follow.

Immediately afterwards, Licinius, who was no friend to Christianity, overthrew the eastern Emperor Maximin, who had been its savage adversary, and became master of the empire of the east. A war followed between the conqueror and Constantine, which terminated, in 315, to the advantage of the latter, who on that occasion extended his empire to the eastern limits of Europe; eight years of peace succeeded, which were employed by the Christian Emperor in securing the real interests and legislating for the happiness of his subjects. This period of rare tranquillity was succeeded by a second war‡ with Licinius, which terminated in 324 by his submission and death, and by the consequent union of the whole empire under the sceptre of Constantine.

The year which followed the final success of Constantine was disgraced by the execution of his eldest son; and it is not disputed, that the progress of his career was marked by the usual excesses of intemperate and worldly ambition. Some of his laws§ were severe even to cruelty, and the

* Eusebius says, that Constantine related the story to himself on oath. May we not believe Eusebius in this? And may we not also suppose, that the Emperor received him in some moment, when enthusiasm, or indisposition, or mere human weakness had brought him first to deceive himself? He may really have recollected some uncommon appearance about the Sun, not strongly noticed at the moment, but which the imagination of memory heated by exciting events, or by passion, or by feverish sickness, may have converted into a miracle. The story of the vision (which stands indeed on *rather* better authority) might be merely the exaggeration of a dream. At least this supposition has nothing in it unnatural; and it is the only supposition which can save both the *intention* of the Emperor and the veracity of the historian. See Note at the end of the chapter.

† It is somewhat singular, that on this same occasion, Maxentius is related by the Pagan historian, Zosimus, (who makes no mention of the Christian miracle, lib. ii.) to have carefully consulted the Sibylline books, and credulously applied to his own circumstances a prediction which he found there.

‡ This is considered by Eusebius (Vit. Constant. lib. ii.) almost in the light of a religious war—the first, if it was so, among the many by which the name of Christ has been profaned.

§ Nevertheless, the general spirit of his laws was decidedly humane and favourable to the progress of civilization—for instance, he made decrees tending to the termination of slavery; he abolished some barbarous forms of punishment, as branding, for instance; he restrained exorbitant usury, and endeavoured to prevent the exposure of children, by relieving the poor. See Jortin, Ecc. Hist. book iii. Fleury. Hist. Eccl. L. X. Sect. 21. Baronius, ad ann. 315. Sect. 30.

general propriety of his moral conduct cannot with any justice be maintained. Hence a suspicion has arisen as to the sincerity of his conversion—chiefly, as it appears to us, or entirely founded on the inadequacy of his character to his profession. But is there any page in Christian history, or any form of Christian society, which does not mournfully attest the possibility of combining the most immoral conduct with the most unhesitating faith? Or is this a condition of humanity, from which monarchs are more exempt than their subjects? We should recollect, moreover, that the character of Constantine, notwithstanding its grievous stains, will bear a comparison with some of the best among his pagan predecessors; while it was free from those monstrous deformities which distinguished not a few of them, and which have indeed been rarely paralleled in Christian history. But even had his conduct been more reprehensible, than in truth it was, it would have furnished very insufficient evidence against the sincerity of his belief. Again, it was usual in those days, in continuance of a practice of which we have mentioned the cause and origin, to defer the sacrament of Baptism until the approach of death, and then once to administer it, as the means of regeneration and the assurance of pardon and grace. In compliance with this custom* the emperor was not baptized (he did not even become a Catechumen†) until his last illness; but no argument can hence be drawn against his sincerity, which would not equally apply to a large proportion of the Christians in his empire. In his favour the following facts should be observed. For many years he had publicly and consistently professed his belief in Christianity: in a long discourse, which is still extant, he even expatiated on its various proofs; he began his reign by protecting the believers; in its progress he favoured and honoured them; he inscribed the cross on the banners of the empire; he celebrated the festivals of the Church; he associated in the closest intimacy with Christian writers‡ and prelates; he inquired into all the particulars of their faith, and displayed what some have thought an inconsiderate zeal for its purity. By such reasons, according to every fair principle of historical inference, we are precluded from any reasonable doubt on this subject; nor need we hesitate for a moment to acquit a wise and, in many respects, a virtuous Prince of the odious charge of the foulest description of hypocrisy.§

* Constantius in like manner put off his Baptism till his last illness, (Athan. lib. de Synodis) so did Theodosius the Great, until the illness which he mistook for his last. Socrat. l. v. c. 6.

† From Euseb. de Vit. Const. lib. iv. c. 61, it appears that the Emperor, just before his baptism, received for the first time the imposition of hands, usual in making a Catechumen. But in the same work, (lib. i. c. 32,) it would seem that he was *κατηχουδης* on his first profession of Christianity, immediately after the vision. We are disposed to attach greater credit to the former account. See Fleury, l. xi. sect. 60.

‡ Lactantius possessed his confidence, while his command was confined to the West, and Eusebius enjoyed throughout his life great influence at the Court of Constantinople. The respect which he paid to the festivals of the Church, his 'diligence in prayer,' the issuing of medals throughout the Empire, in which he is represented in the attitude of devotion, are facts mentioned by Euseb. Vit. Const. l. iv. c. 15 & 22.

§ A vain dispute has been raised as to the probable moment of his conversion, into which we shall not enter, because the truth is not discoverable, and if it were, would still be unprofitable. Gibbon affects to set some value on it, because he would willingly prove that Constantine was no real proselyte. Two facts he mentions in support of his suspicion—that Constantine 'persevered till he was near forty years of age in the practice of the established religion,' especially in the worship of Apollo; and that in the same year (321) he published two Edicts, the first of which enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, (Euseb. Vit. Const. l. iv. c. 18,) and the second directed the regular consultation of

At the same time, we are willing to admit that his conduct to the Christians was strictly in accordance with his interests; and it is very probable, that the protection with which he distinguished them may *in the first instance* have originated in his policy. But this is perfectly consistent with his subsequent conversion. And we may here remark, that those who assign policy as his chief or only motive, bear the strongest evidence to the power and real importance which the Church of Christ had acquired before his time; they attest, that its stability had not been shaken by the sword of Diocletian; that by its own unassisted and increasing energy it had triumphed over the fury of the most determined of its persecutors, and that its claims on the justice and respect of the Throne, though only urged by perseverance in suffering, could no longer be overlooked with safety. And this fact is of much greater historical importance, than the motives or sincerity of any individual can possibly be.

Let us now proceed to ascertain what was the condition and constitution of the Church, as Constantine found it; what were the principal alterations introduced by him, and in what form and attitude he left it.

We have already described the free and independent constitution of the primitive Church; the Bishops and teachers were chosen by the clergy and people; the Bishop managed the ecclesiastical affairs of his diocese, in council with the Presbyters, and 'with a due regard to the suffrages of the whole assembly of the people.' Again, the great ecclesiastical divisions of the empire appear from the earliest period naturally to have followed the political; and thus for the regulation of matters relating to the interests of a whole Province, whether they were religious controversies, or the forms and rites of divine service, or other things of like moment, the Bishops of the Province assembled in council, and deliberated and legislated.

*Constitution of
the Church.*

We have also remarked, that during the course of the third century this constitution was so far changed, that the episcopal authority was somewhat advanced, at the expense of that of the inferior ministers and the people. But in all other respects the government of the Church remained in reality the same, and perhaps even in this respect it was apparently so; for the forms of the lesser or diocesan councils were still preserved, though the relative influence of the three parties composing them had undergone a change.

And here it will be proper to examine how far those are correct who consider the Church at that period, as a separate Republic or Body-poli-

aruspices. Both are literally true; but the inferences drawn from both are false—Constantine did not profess his religion, perhaps he did not adopt it, until the campaign against Maxentius in 312—he had previously protected and favoured the Christians, but till then he did not proclaim, nor could he perhaps safely have proclaimed, his own belief; but he seized the earliest moment to do so, and during the twenty-five following years, he maintained his profession with ardent and active perseverance. By bringing forward the second fact as an argument against his belief, the historian has forgotten that the Edict of Milan was an Edict of *universal* toleration, protecting all Pagan, as well as all Christian, ceremonies; so that the two proclamations, which he is willing to expose as inconsistent, were only the necessary consequence of that generous policy, which had been so little understood by the Pagan Emperors. Before we quit this subject we should mention, that Zosimus (lib. ii.) attributes Constantine's change of faith to the persuasion, instilled into him by one Ægyptius, a Spaniard, that the remission of sins attended the act of conversion to Christianity. Thus it appears, at least, that the Pagan Historian did not doubt the reality of the conversion, though he may have mistaken its motive.

* Mosheim, Cent. iv. Part 2. C. 2.

tic distinguished from the empire. In the first place—the synods which we have mentioned, local as well as provincial, assumed the office and power to arrange ecclesiastical affairs, and to punish ecclesiastical offences. But neither was their power acknowledged by the civil Government, nor were their awards or censures enforced by it. Again, the Bishop, through an authority which professed to be derived from Scripture, and which may certainly be traced to the earliest age, exerted a kind of mediative interference throughout his diocese, in the civil disputes of the Christians, to which they very frequently appealed, and admitted his decisions as conclusive; but no such jurisdiction was recognised by the Government, nor were any such decisions legally valid. Moreover, some of the Churches had become possessed, as corporate bodies, of considerable property in land or buildings purchased from the common fund, and applied to the purposes of the society; but the Government never formally acknowledged the legality of those acquisitions, and availed itself, as we have already seen, of the first pretext to confiscate them.

It is in this condition of ecclesiastical affairs, that we may discover perhaps the earliest vestige of the distinction, which will hereafter become so familiar to us, between spiritual and temporal power—though in the present indefinite shape and imperfect development of the former, we can scarcely trace any intimation of its future proportions and magnitude. We perceive also, on how strange and irregular a foundation the security of the early Church was established—in fact, to a statesman of those days, before the force of religious union and the intensity of religious attachment were generally known and understood, the society or communion which rested not on a political basis, would naturally appear to possess no principle of stability. To the eye of a Pagan its strength was imperceptible, as the elements which composed it were concealed from him; and it was this circumstance which encouraged Diocletian to an aggression, of which the barbarity indeed shocked him, but of which he never, perhaps, doubted the success, since the power which resisted it was unseen and incomprehensible. In the mean time, the public discipline, which had been made necessary by the neglect of the civil power, was cemented and fortified by its opposition; and the private sincerity of belief, which could not be understood by a Pagan, because Paganism had nothing to do with Truth, was animated into contumacy by the sense of injustice and injury.

It is even probable, that the union of the scattered Churches was facilitated by the increase of the episcopal authority in each; for they thus acquired that decision and steadiness of continuous exertion, which marks individual superintendence, and which would scarcely have been so constant and uniform, had the government of the dioceses retained, in its utmost strictness, its original popular character. The power of the Bishops made them formidable only to the persecutor; their interests demanded their union; and their union was then the only security for that of the whole Church, and thereby (without the direct interposition of Providence) for its actual preservation.

To us, indeed, it seems nearly certain, that these powerful but latent principles of ecclesiastical stability, which repelled the assault of Diocletian, would have preserved the Church through a much severer trial, if the genius of Constantine had not discovered its real strength, and courted its friendship and alliance. It is true, that in becoming acquainted with its strength, he also discovered its virtues; in the excellence of the Christian system, he perceived a great omen of its perpetuity—he saw too, that, as a rule for civilized society, it was more efficient than any human law, because

more powerful in its motives to obedience; and perhaps he remarked also, that the energy of Christians had hitherto been confined to submission and endurance—to unoffending, unresisting perseverance—and this outward display of loyalty might lead him to overlook that free spirit, which pervaded both the principles of the religion and the government of the Church, and which in later ages was so commonly found in opposition to despotism.

Constantine admired the morality of the Christians, he loved their submission to arbitrary power, and he respected that internal and advancing vigour, which had triumphed over so many persecutors. These, we doubt not, were the motives which induced him to seek the alliance of the Church, and to confer on it advantages, not more substantial, perhaps, than those which he received from it.

We are disposed to divide the ecclesiastical life of Constantine into three periods. In the first of these he confined himself, at least ostensibly, to the impartial toleration of all religions, though he legally established that of the Christians. This extends from the Edict of Milan to the council of Nice in the year 325. His next occupation was to define the doctrines, and thus to preserve the unity of the Church, which he had established. It was not till the third and latest period of his life, that he attacked the superstition of his forefathers, by edicts directly levelled against Paganism. The Arian controversy and the overthrow of Paganism will form the subjects of separate chapters—at present we shall endeavour to point out the most important alterations introduced during this reign into the constitution of the Church, and their immediate effects upon its ministers and members. Constantine found the Church an independent body, a kind of self-constituted commonwealth, which might sometimes be at peace, and sometimes at variance with the civil government, but which was never acknowledged as any part of the whole body politic; it had a separate administration, separate laws, and frequently (through the perversity of its persecutors) separate interests also. The Christian, as a citizen of the empire, was subject of course to the universal statutes of the empire—as a member of the Church, he owed a distinct allegiance to the spiritual directors of the Church; and though this allegiance was never inconsistent with his civil obedience, except when that obedience would have deprived him of his religion, it was founded on more commanding motives, and was one from which no earthly authority was sufficient to absolve him. Thus far, and thus far only, his ecclesiastical divided him from his civil duties; to this extent they placed him, at all times, in divergency from the State, and, in times of persecution, in actual opposition to it. And so long as the Church which he honoured was disclaimed as a part, or associate, of the State; so long as the space between them was broad and distinguishable, so long the limits of his allegiance to either were very clearly marked. Constantine comprehended the nature, and perceived the inconveniences and the danger, of this disunion; and he therefore employed the earliest exertion of his power and policy to acknowledge the existence, to consolidate the elements, to establish the authority, and to diminish the independence of the Church. To accomplish the three first of these objects, he received that body into strict alliance with the state—to effect the last, he so received it, as to constitute himself its director as well as its guardian, and to combine in his own person the highest ecclesiastical with the highest civil authority. His right to this authority (if he condescended to consider that point) he might derive with some plausibility from the original institutions of Rome. From the earliest ages of its history, the

chief magistrate of the nation had been entrusted with the superintendence of the national religion; and it seemed fair that he should impose the same, as the condition of the *establishment* of Christianity. And yet a great distinction is to be observed even in this point. For, according to the principles of Polytheism, the most sacred functions of religion might be performed by the hands of the civil magistrates; but the consecration of a separate order to those purposes by the Christian system excluded the Emperor from the administration of the rites of religion; and the Prince and the Priest became henceforward characters wholly distinct, and independent. It was perhaps by this restriction, that the first avowed and legal limitation was imposed upon the authority of the former; and it was not a trifling triumph to have obtained from a Roman Emperor the acknowledgment of any right in a subject, or any restraint upon himself.

Notwithstanding this assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy by the Emperor, the Church retained in many respects its separate existence, or at least the freedom of its autonomous constitution—indeed, had not this been so, the term Alliance, which is used to designate the union of Church and State under Constantine, as it implies a certain degree of independence in both parties, would be unmeaning and out of place. Some immediate advantages were also reaped by the Church; much that it had formerly held by sufferance, it now possessed by law; many privileges, which had hitherto existed through the connivance only, or the ignorance, of the Government, were now converted into rights, and as such confirmed and perpetuated.

Constantine divided the administration of the Church into (1.) Internal, and (2.) External.

(1.) The former continued, as heretofore, in the hands of the Prelates, individually and in Council—little or no alteration was introduced into this department; and it comprehended nearly every thing which was really tangible and available in the power of the Church before its association with the State, now confirmed to it by that association. The settlement of religious controversies was recommended to the wisdom of the Hierarchy;* the forms of Divine worship, the regulation of customary rites and ceremonies, or the institution of new ones, the ordination and offices of the priesthood, which included the unrestrained right of public preaching, and the formidable weapon of spiritual censure were left to the exclusive direction of the Church. The freedom of episcopal election was not violated; and the Bishops retained their power to convoke legislative synods twice a year in every Diocese, uncontrolled by the civil magistrate. We have already mentioned, that, by the Edict of Milan, the possessions of the Church were restored, and its legal right to them for the first time acknowledged; and this act of justice was followed, in the year 321, by another Edict which permitted all subjects to bequeath property to that Body.† Exemption from all civil offices was granted to the whole body of the clergy;‡ and, perhaps, a more important privilege, about the same time conferred on the higher orders, was that of independent jurisdiction, even in capital charges, over their own members: so that the Bishop, alone

* A rescript of Constantine to the Provincial Bishops on the disputes between Athanasius and Eusebius of Nicodemia, admits—*Vestri est, non mei iudicii, de ea re cognoscere.* See Baronius ad ann. 329, sect. 8.

† Constantine's personal generosity to the Church, as well as his deference to the Episcopal Order, is mentioned by Eusebius, (*Vit. Const.*, lib. i. c. 42., lib. ii., and *Hist. Eccles.*, l. x.) and was continued throughout his whole reign. The Pagan Zosimus (lib. ii.) mentions the profusion which he wasted upon 'useless persons.'

‡ Baronius, ad ann. 319, sect. 30.

among the myriads of the subjects of the empire, enjoyed the right of being tried by his Peers. This was not granted, however, with any intention of securing his impunity; for, though degradation was the severest punishment which could be inflicted by a spiritual court, the penalty was liable to increase, after condemnation, by the interference of the secular authority. While we may consider the free trial of the Bishops, in a political light, as another important inroad into the pure despotism of the imperial system, we are also assured that on the Body, thus exclusively possessing it, it conferred no inconsiderable advantages. But another privilege, even more valuable than this, and one which will more constantly be present to us in the history of succeeding ages, is traced with equal certainty to the legislation of Constantine. The arbitration of Bishops in the civil differences referred to them in their diocese was now ratified by law; and their decisions, of which the validity had formerly depended on the consent of the parties, were henceforward enforced by the civil magistrate*. On this foundation was imperceptibly established the vast and durable edifice of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; from this simple legalization of an antient custom, in process of time, the most substantial portion of sacerdotal power proceeded, and the most extravagant pretensions of spiritual ambition. But those consequences convey no reflection on the wisdom of Constantine, since they were produced by circumstances which he could not possibly foresee; and which, besides, never influenced, to any great extent, the eastern division of Christendom.

In the separate view, which we have taken of the internal constitution of the Church, we perceive a powerful, self-regulated body, armed with very ample and extensive authority, and supported, when such support was necessary, by the secular arm. Let us proceed to the second division, or the external administration of the Church.

(2.) Of this department the Emperor assumed the entire control to himself.† It comprehended every thing relating to the outward state and discipline of the Church; and was understood to include a certain degree of superintendence over such contests and debates as might arise among the ministers, of whatsoever rank, concerning their possessions, their reputation, their rights and privileges, as well as their political, or other offences against the laws of the Empire. Even the final decision of religious controversies was subjected to the discretion of judges appointed by the Emperor:‡ the same terminated any differences which might arise between the Bishops and people, fixed the limits of the ecclesiastical provinces, took cognizance of the *civil* causes subsisting between ministers, and lent his power to the execution of the punishment due to their criminal offences. And though the right of convoking local and provincial synods remained with the Church, that of assembling a General Council was exercised only by the Prince.

When we consider in succession these articles of imperial supremacy, we perceive, in the first place, that Constantine did not transfer to himself from the Church any power which had before belonged to it: most of the cases, there provided for, must by necessity have always fallen under civil cognizance—for whenever it happened, either that the external encroachments of the Church, or the differences among Christians, or their ministers, pro-

* Fleury, Hist. Eccl. l. x. sect. 27. on authority of Sozomen (l. i. c. 8 and 9) and Const. Apostol. (lib. ii. c. 46) Baronius, ad ann. 314. sect. 38, with reference to Cod. Theodos.

† The authority assumed by the Emperors appears, under various titles, in the 16th book of the Theodosian Code, as also in the Code of Justinian.

‡ Mosheim, Cent. iv. part ii. ch. ii.

ceeded to endanger public tranquillity, such offences fell, of course, under the cognizance of the secular, which was then the only acknowledged, jurisdiction.

There appear, indeed, to be two cases in which the Emperor assumed a power not before belonging to the State—interference for the arrangement of religious controversies by the appointment of judges, and the convocation of General Councils. Respecting the *first* of these—which proved indeed the least effectual part of his ecclesiastical authority—it was not probable that the Emperor would be anxious to exert it, unless called upon to undertake the office by one or both of the parties in controversy. If invited to enforce the sentence of the Church against a condemned Heretic, he might reasonably plead the interference of Aurelian in the affair of Paul of Samosata; if solicited to decide between two opinions dividing the Body of the Church itself, he would naturally have recourse to the *second* of the methods entrusted to him, the calling of a General Council. But the authority to do so was not the usurpation of a power before possessed by another, but the creation of a new power. For as a General Council of all the leading ministers of the Church neither had been, nor could have been, assembled in times when the Church, if haply not persecuted, was at least unacknowledged, so the new condition of its establishment gave birth to new circumstances, for the regulation of which a new authority was necessary; and that authority was properly vested in the highest civil magistrate.

In the next place, in comparing the privileges remaining to the Church with those assumed by the Emperor in his connexion with it, and in tracing the consequences to which either might be extended, we cannot fail to observe, that their limits are often vague and indeterminate; and that, when they are not so, the points of contact and intersection are very numerous, offering frequent means and temptations to mutual innovation. We shall see that, in after ages, they led to much aggression and injustice in both parties; but as matters then stood, with so large a portion of the population still unconverted, and even adverse to the Faith, under an Emperor possessed of undivided and seemingly unbounded authority, we should be surprised, perhaps, to find so many privileges confirmed to a distinct religious community, if we were not acquainted with the bold and vigorous character of Constantine, and also persuaded of his attachment to Christianity.

We should not omit to mention some changes at that time introduced into the titles and gradations of the Hierarchy, in order to associate their administration more intimately with that of the civil officers. To the three Prelates of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, who enjoyed a certain degree of preeminence in the Church, was added the Patriarch of Constantinople—these four corresponded with the four Prætorian Prefects then also created. After these followed the Exarchs,* who had the inspection over several provinces, and answered to the appointment of certain civil officers of the same name. The Metropolitans had the government of one province only, and under them were the Archbishops, whose inspection was confined to certain districts. The Bishops were the lowest in this gradation, but many of them possessed ample extent of authority and jurisdiction. Their number at this time was one thousand eight hundred, of whom a thousand administered the Eastern, eight hundred the Western Church. In this whole Body, the Bishop of Rome possessed a certain indeterminate

* Mosheim, loc. cit.

precedence, or pre-eminence, unattended by any authority; and this precedence is attributed, first, to the Imperial name of Rome, and next to the superiority in wealth, which he seems to have acquired at a very early period; to the splendour and extent of his religious administration, and the influence naturally rising from these causes.

The simple establishment of the Church, such as we have now described it without anticipating the measures of State afterwards applied, or misapplied, to the support of it, was favourable not only to the progress of Christianity, but also to the concord of Christians; the former has never been disputed; as to the latter, we have seen by what a cloud of heresies the religion was overshadowed before its establishment; and no one can reasonably doubt, that the additional sanction given to the Gospel by imperial adoption, and the greater dignity and influence and actual power thus acquired by its regular ministers in every province of the Empire, would conduce to dissolve and disperse them. They did so—but while the numerous forms of error, of which we have treated, fell for the most part into silence and disrepute, there was one, of which we have yet made no mention, which grew up into such vigour and attained so much consistency, that there seemed to be danger lest it should possess itself of the high places, and occupy the sanctuary itself. Its progress, and the means adopted to oppose it, form the subject of the following chapter. We shall conclude the present with one or two observations.

It is one favourite opinion of most sceptical writers, that Christianity is entirely indebted for its general propagation and stability to the Imperial patronage of Constantine; it is another, that the establishment of the Church led to the disunion of its members, and its prosperity to its corruption. The first of those theories is falsified by the history of the three first centuries—during which we observe the religion to have been gradually but rapidly progressive throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire, in spite of the persecution of some Emperors, the suspicious jealousy of others, and the indifference of the rest. We need not dwell longer on this fact; especially as it is virtually admitted by those same writers, when it suits them to attribute Constantine's *pretended* conversion to his policy. The second of their assertions has a greater show of truth, but is, in fact, almost equally erroneous. A fairer view of that question, and, if we mistake not, the correct view, is the following—the *establishment* of the Church was in itself highly beneficial both to the progress of religion, and to the happiness of society—the mere pacific alliance of that Body with the State was fraught with advantage to the whole Empire, with danger to no member of it. Many evils indeed did follow it, and many vexations were inflicted by Christians upon each other in the perverse zeal of religious controversy. But such controversies, as we have sufficiently shown, had existed in very great abundance, very long before Christianity was recognised by law; and the vexations were not at all the necessary consequence of that recognition. They originated, not in the system itself, but in the blindness of those who administered it; they proceeded from the fallacious supposition—that which afterwards animated the Romish Church, and which has misled despots and bigots in every age—that unanimity in religious belief and practice was a thing attainable; and they were conducted on a notion equally remote from reason, that such unanimity, or even the appearance of it, could be attained by force. Many ages of bitter experience have been necessary to prove the absurdity of these notions, and the fruitless wickedness of the measures proceeding from them. But a candid inquirer will admit that they were not at all inseparably connected with the establishment of

the Church; and that that Body would not only have continued to exist and to flourish, without any interference of civil authority to crush its adversaries, but that it would have subsisted in that condition with more dignity, and more honour, and much more security.

The prosperity of the Church was unquestionably followed by an increase in the number and rankness of its corruptions. But unhappily we have already had occasion to observe, that several abuses had taken root in all its departments, during at least that century which immediately preceded the reign of Constantine—to the fourth we may undoubtedly assign the extravagant honours paid to Martyrs, and the shameful superstitions which arose from them. But we should also recollect, that many among the Romish corruptions are of a much later date, and that several may be directly referred to the influence of expiring Paganism, not to the gratuitous invention of a wealthy and degenerate priesthood. Indeed, we should add, that in respect to the moral character of the clergy of the fourth century, they seem rather chargeable with the narrow, contentious, sectarian spirit, which was encouraged and flamed by the capricious interference of the civil power, than with any flagrant deficiency in piety and sanctity of life. (Euseb. H. E. lib. vii. c. i.)

The name of Eusebius has been so frequently referred to in this History, that being now arrived at the age in which he flourished, we are bound to give some account of his life and character. He is believed to have been born at Cæsarea in Palestine, about the year 270; he was raised to that See about 315, and died in 339, or 340; being thus (within two or three years) contemporary with his Emperor, and his friend, in the three circumstances of his birth, his dignity, and his death. He was extremely diligent and learned, and the Author of 'innumerable volumes.*' And among those which still exist, his Ecclesiastical History, and his Life of Constantine, furnish us with the best lights which we possess respecting his own times, and with our only consecutive narrative of the previous fortunes of Christianity. Eusebius admits, in the first chapter of his History, that he has 'entered upon a desolate and unfrequented path;' and in gleaning the scattered records of preceding writers, and presenting them for the most part in their own language and on their own authority, he has indeed very frequently discovered to us the scantiness of the harvest and the poverty of the soil. Still in that respect he has faithfully discharged his historical duties, and has rescued much valuable matter from certain oblivion. In this indeed consists one peculiar merit of his History, that it unfolds to us a number of earlier memoirs, written immediately after the events which they describe, and on all of which we are at liberty to exercise our critical judgment, as to the credit which may be due to them, without also involving that of Eusebius in our conclusion. But respecting the historical candour of the Author, when he speaks in his own person, and the fidelity with which he has delivered such circumstances as were well known to him, a few words are necessary, because the question is not usually stated with fairness.

In describing the sufferings of the Christians during the last persecution, Eusebius † (H. E. lib. viii. c. ii.) admits 'that it does not agree with our plan to relate their dissensions and wickedness before the persecution, on which account we have determined to relate nothing more concerning them than may serve to justify the Divine Judgment. We have

* Jerome de Vir. Illust. c. xxxi.

† In Vit. Constant. cap. ix., he makes the same sort of profession.

‘ therefore not been induced to make mention, either of those who were ‘ tempted in the persecution, or of those who made utter shipwreck of ‘ their salvation, and were sunk of their own accord in the depths of the ‘ storm; but shall only add those things to our General History, which ‘ may in the first place be profitable to ourselves, and afterwards to posterity.’ And in another passage he asserts, that the events most suitable to a ‘ History of Martyrs’ are those which redound to their honour. From these two passages it appears that Eusebius in his relation of that persecution has suppressed the *particulars* of the dissensions and scandals which had prevailed among the faithful, because he judged such accounts less productive of immediate edification and future profit, than the celebration of their virtues and their constancy. We may remark that in this determination, his first error was one of judgment—if indeed he imagined that the great lessons of History were more surely taught by the records of what is splendid and glorious, than by the painful, but impressive story of human imperfection, and of the calamities which man has gathered from his own folly and wickedness. But his second and less pardonable deviation was from principle—there is a direct and avowed disregard of the *second* fundamental precept of historical composition. However, the crime is less dangerous because it is avowed, and more excusable because less dangerous; and at any rate, if we shall perceive, in the *general* course and character of the work, a disposition to investigate diligently, and represent faithfully, we shall be disposed to confine our doubts to those portions only, which the writer has not even professed to treat with entire fidelity; and in the vast multitude of circumstances, in which the honour of the Martyrs is *not* concerned, we shall approach our only fountain of information with a confidence not *much* impaired by a partial dereliction of principle, which is fairly admitted.

But that delinquency of Eusebius which we have just mentioned is confined to the suppression of truth—it does not proceed to the direct assertion of falsehood—we shall now notice a still more serious suspicion, to which he has rendered himself liable. The thirty-first chapter of the twelfth book of his Evangelical Preparation bears for its title this scandalous proposition*—‘ How it may be lawful and fitting to use falsehood as a medicine, for the advantage of those who require such a method.’ We have already deplored, with sorrow and indignation, the fatal moment, when fraud and falsehood were first admitted into the service of religion. Philosophy, in the open array of her avowed hostility, was not so dan-

* We purposely copy the language of Gibbon (Vindication, p. 137, 2d ed.) Still we should fail in doing perfect justice to Eusebius, if we did not publish, together with the proposition, the very short chapter in which it is treated. It begins with a quotation from Plato (De Leg. 2.) ‘ A legislator of any value—even if the fact were not such as our ‘ discourse has just established it—if in any case he might make bold to deceive young ‘ persons for their advantage; could he possibly inculcate any falsehood more profitable ‘ than this, or more potent to lead all without force or compulsion to the practice of all ‘ justice?’ ‘ Truth, my friend, is honourable and permanent; but not, it would seem, very ‘ easy of persuasion.’ To this somewhat hypothetical passage of Plato, Eusebius adds— ‘ You may find a thousand such instances in the Scriptures, where God is described as ‘ jealous, or sleeping, or angry, or liable to other human affections, so expressed for the ad- ‘ vantage of those who require such a method (ἵπ’ ὠφελείᾳ τῶν διασώζων τὸν τοιοῦτον πρόπου.)’ This is all that is said on the subject, and it shows us perhaps to what limits Eusebius intended to confine the application of his proposition. And thus Gibbon’s account of the chapter, though it may be literally true, is calculated to mislead. ‘ In this chapter (says he) Eusebius alleges a passage of Plato, which approves the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds; nor is he ashamed to justify the sentiments of the Athenian Philosopher by the example of the sacred writers of the Old Testament.’

gerous as when she lent to her undisciplined adversaries her own poisoned weapons, and placed them in unskilful hands, as implements of self-destruction. It was disgraceful to the less enlightened fathers of the second and third centuries, that, even in the midst of trial and tribulation, they borrowed a momentary succour from the profession of falsehood—but the same expedient was still more shameful to Eusebius, who flourished during the prosperity of the Church, whose age and more extensive learning left him no excuse in ignorance or inexperience, and whose great name and unquestionable piety gave sanction and authority to all his opinions. There can be no doubt then, that the publication of that detestable principle in any one of his writings, however modified and limited by his explanation, must, to a certain extent, disturb our confidence in the rest—the mind which does not profess to be constantly guided by truth possesses no claim to our implicit submission. Nevertheless, the works of Eusebius must at last be judged by the character which severally pervades them, not by any single principle which the Author has once only laid down; to which he has not intended (as it would seem) to give general application, and which he has manifestly proposed rather as a philosophical speculation, than as a rule for his own composition. At least we feel convinced, that whoever shall calmly peruse his Ecclesiastical History will not discover in it any deliberate intention to deceive—in the relation of miraculous stories, he is more sparing than most of the Church Historians who succeeded him, and seemingly even than those whom he has copied—and upon the whole, we shall not do him more than justice, if we consider him as an avowed, but honest *advocate*, many of whose statements must be examined with suspicion, while the greater part bear direct and incontestable marks of truth.*

CHAPTER VII.

The Arian Controversy.

Controversies among Christians—their origin—how distinguished from philosophical disputations—their character—accounted for. Constantine's conduct toward Heretics and origin of the Arian controversy—Alexander—Arius—his opinions—followers—Interference of the Emperor—Council of Nice—various motives of those assembled—their proceedings and decision—Proposal of Eusebius of Cæsarea—Gibbon's account of this Council—Temporal penalties—to what extent carried. Conduct of the successors of Constantine—Constantius. Athanasius—his history—twice exiled—his triumphant restoration—contests with Constantius—methods taken by the latter to secure success—remarks on them—third banishment of Athanasius—Council of Rimini—progress of Arianism.—Theodosius—Council of Constantinople.—Arianism of the Northern Barbarians—the conquerors of the West—its effects. Justinian—Spain—Council of Toledo. Termination of the controversy. Observations—examination of Arian claims to greater purity of faith—to greater moderation—Progress of Arianism in the West to what cause attributable—confusion of sectarian and national enmity—conduct of Catholics and Arians under persecution—Note on certain Christian Writers.

WHEN Constantine established Christianity as the religion of the Empire, he probably did not foresee how soon he should be called upon to interpose his authority, in order to prescribe and define the precise tenets of that religion, which he had established. Doubtless he was well acquainted with the numerous opinions by which Christians had ever been divided; but he saw that, in spite of them, the Body had continued

* Dr. Jortin (vol. i. p. 209) has corrected a mistake of Dr. Middleton, who had attributed to Eusebius an absurd respect for the Erythrean Sibyl—which seems, in fact, to have been entertained by Constantine.

to advance in vigour and magnitude, with the show of health and unity. The Church was strong in the midst of heresy, as well as of oppression—and when he gave her his protection against the latter, he imagined, perhaps reasonably, that she could have nothing to apprehend from the former. But, whether it was, as some suppose, that the evil passions of Christians were inflamed by their present security, or, as we rather believe, that the expression of dissent had been softened by the impunity which attended it during former reigns, it is certain that scarcely ten years from the Edict of Milan had elapsed, before the Christian world beheld the beginning of a convulsion, which continued for some years to increase in violence, and which was not finally composed without a long and desolating struggle.

It had been the vice of the Christians of the third century, to involve themselves in 'certain metaphysical questions, which, if considered in one light, are too sublime to become the subject of human wit; if in another, too trifling to gain the attention of reasonable men.'* The rage for such disputations had been communicated to religion, by the contagion of philosophy; but the manner in which it operated on the one and on the other was essentially different. With the philosopher such questions were objects of the understanding only, subjects of comparatively dispassionate speculation, whereon the versatile ingenuity of a minute mind might employ or waste itself. But with the Christian they were matters of truth or falsehood, of belief or disbelief; and he felt assured that his eternal interests would be influenced, if not decided, by his choice. Hence arose an intense anxiety respecting the result, and thus the passions were awakened, and presently broke loose and proceeded to every excess.

From the moment that the solution of these questions was attempted by any other method than the fair interpretation of the words of Scripture; as soon as the copious language of Greece was vaguely applied to the definition of spiritual things, and the explanation of heavenly mysteries, the field of contention seemed to be removed from earth to air—where the foot found nothing stable to rest upon; where arguments were easily eluded, and where the space to fly and to rally was infinite; so that the contest grew more noisy as it was less decisive, and more angry as it became more prolonged and complicated. Add to this the nature and genius of the disputants; for the origin of these disputes may be traced, without any exception, to the restless imaginations of the East. The violent temperament of orientals, as it was highly adapted to the reception of religious impressions, and admitted them with fervour and earnestness, intermingled so closely passion with piety, as scarcely to conceive them separable. The natural ardour of their feelings was not abated by the natural subtilty of their understanding, which was sharpened in the schools of Egypt; and when this latter began to be occupied by inquiries in which the former were also deeply engaged, and when the nature of those inquiries assumed an indeterminate and impalpable form, it was to be expected that many extravagances would follow. We must also mention the loose and unsettled principles of that age, which had prevailed before the appearance of Christianity, and had been to a certain extent adopted by its professors—those, for instance, which justified the means by the end, and admitted fraud and forgery into the service of religion. From these considerations we perceive, that disputations on such subjects, conducted by minds such as have been described, and on

* Warburton, Post. to 4th ed. of the Alliance of Church and State.

the worst principles, could not possibly hope for moderation, and could not speedily terminate; and it is not useless to have premised them to our account of those controversies, for thus we shall neither attribute them (as some have done) to mistaken causes; nor be so much scandalized by their intemperance, as to take any offence against religion itself, because such evils have been done in its name.

Constantine appears to have enlisted himself very early under the banners of the Church which he had established; very soon after the Edict of Milan, we find him publishing Laws against Heresy, which went so far, in menace at least, as to transfer the property of heretical bishops or ministers to the orthodox. In the list of the proscribed we find the followers of Paul of Samosata, the Unitarians of those days; we find the Montanists, who were the Enthusiasts, the Novatians, who were the Reformers, and two denominations of Gnostics;* but the opinions of the Arians were not yet attacked; perhaps they had not yet assumed a tangible form, or at least were not distinguished and stigmatized by a name.

In the freedom exercised by individual opinion on abstruse mysteries under the early Church, it is possible that many may have held the doctrine afterwards called Arian; but the *controversy* seems to have been awakened about the year 319, by the zeal of a Bishop of the Church, and the scene of its explosion was that hot-bed of heresy and dissension, Alexandria.† Alexander was the Bishop, Arius a Presbyter, in that city; and the former, in an assembly of his clergy, felt it his duty strongly to impress on them his sentiments respecting the nature of the Godhead; maintaining, among other things,‡ that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence with the Father. Arius disputed this doctrine, and this dispute led him to the promulgation of his own opinions: they were these, or nearly these§—that the Son had been created by the Father before all things; but that time had existed before his creation, and that he was therefore not co-eternal with the Father; that he was created out of nothing; that he was not co-essential with the Father; that, though immeasurably superior in power and in glory to the highest created beings, he was still inferior in both to the Father. These opinions

* The Marcionites and Valentinians—See Sozomen, lib. ii. c. 32; and the beginning of Gibbon's 21st chapter—we should rather conclude, however, from Eusebius's account (Vit. Const. l. iii. c. 63—66) that Constantine's Edict against those Heretics was posterior to the Council of Nice. Sozomen asserts (not very accurately) that the effect of the Edict was the destruction of all excepting the Novatians, against whom it was not seriously enforced.

† Even after the Council of Nice we learn from Eusebius (Vit. Const. l. iii. c. 23) that 'while all the rest of the world was disposed to concord, among the Egyptians alone there prevailed immitigable dissension.'—Some anecdotes respecting the character of this people, which had engrafted Greek principles on African character, are given by Jortin. Eccl. Hist., book iii. A. D. 364.

‡ The opinions of Alexander himself have not escaped the charge of heresy—his notions respecting the distinct persons of the Trinity were so imperfect, that Arius accused him, with seeming justice, of inclination to the error of Sabellius. And again, some of his expressions respecting the *nature* of the second person place him upon the very borders of the error subsequently denominated *semi-Arianism*. So difficult was it in those days even for the most pious prelate to discover, and preserve undeviatingly, the precise path of orthodoxy.

§ Mosh. Gen. Hist. c. iv. p. ii. ch. 5. Maimb. Hist. Arian. book i. p. 16. Gibbon, chap. 21. The original materials from which the history of Arianism is chiefly composed, are Eusebius's life of Constantine, the writings of Athanasius (particularly the first volume) and the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. We may also mention the 69th (or 49th) Heresy of Epiphanius.

found many and respectable advocates* in Asia as well as Egypt, among the clergy as well as the laity, and even in the highest ranks of the clergy; and their number was probably increased, when the Bishop, after condemning the tenets of Arius in two Councils held at Alexandria, pronounced against him the sentence of excommunication.

The quarrel now became so violent, that it was judged necessary to invite the interference of the Emperor. Constantine viewed the whole question as trifling and utterly unimportant; † he regretted that the peace of the Church should be so vainly disturbed; he lamented that the harmony of Christians, who were united on so many subjects of infinite weight, should be interrupted by such unprofitable speculations—and in the Epistle containing those sentiments he enjoined peace to both parties. Constantine knew not the nature ‡ of the tempest which was excited, for neither experience nor history had yet presented to him any thing resembling it. However he had adopted the only measure which offered any hope of appeasing it, and had he persisted in his neutrality, it is probable that the Arian controversy, after some noisy debates and angry invectives, would have discharged its passion in words, and the heresy itself would have fallen into dishonour, almost into oblivion, like so many others. § But the firmness of the Emperor was not proof against the importunity of the orthodox prelates, seconded, as some think, by his own theological vanity; a General Council was suggested as the only remedy for the evil, and the Emperor would, of course, preside over its deliberations. Still the matter was some little time in suspense; and *that* was perhaps the most critical moment in ecclesiastical history, in which Constantine determined to convoke the Council of Nice.

In the year 325 A. D. about three hundred and eighteen || Bishops assembled at Nice (Nicaea) in Bithynia, for the purpose of composing the Arian Controversy. ‘Let us consider (says Dr. Jortin) by what various motives these *Council of Nice.*

* Sozomen i. 15. iii. 18.

† Constantine’s epistle appears in Euseb. Vit. Const. l. ii. c. 64—72. In c. 69 the Emperor describes the origin of the controversy, and exposes its dangerous tendency; and in c. 71 he rebukes the parties for disputing *ὕπερ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἑλαχίστων*—‘about trifling, and most truly insignificant matters.’ This account is confirmed by Sozomen, H. E. l. i. c. 15 and 16. Socrates, H. E. lib. i. c. 7.

‡ It would appear indeed from the following passage in his Epistle, that he was very imperfectly informed even respecting the nature of the question controverted. ‘Wherefore, says he, let an unguarded question, and an inconsiderate answer mutually excuse each other—for neither does the cause of your contention regard the chief among the commandments of the law, nor *has any new heresy been introduced* by you respecting the worship of God, but *both of you hold one and the same opinion*—so that there is nothing to prevent your concord and communion.’ Vit. Const. l. ii. c. 70. There was nothing, indeed, to prevent their concord and communion—yet the opinions which they held were widely and essentially different.

§ Jortin has suggested another method in the following very rational passage—(Eccles. Hist. B. iii.) ‘If, when the quarrel between Alexander and Arius was grown to such a height as to want a remedy, the Fathers of the Church had, for the sake of peace, agreed to draw up a Confession of Faith in words of Scripture, and to establish the divinity of Christ on the expressions used by the Apostles, every one might have assented to it, and the Arian party would most certainly have received it. The difference of sentiments, indeed, and of interpretation, would not have ceased, but the controversy would have cooled and dwindled away, after every champion had discharged his zeal upon paper and written to his heart’s content. The Arian notion that the *Son was created in time*, and that *there was a time when he existed not*, would probably have sunk, as not being the language of the New Testament; and the Macedonian notion, that the *Holy Ghost was created in time*, would have sunk with the other for the same reason; at least these opinions would never have been obtruded upon us as Articles of Faith.’

|| ‘Persons not more widely separated and diversified in sentiments, than in person,

various men might be influenced; by reverence to the Emperor, or to his counsellors and favourites, his slaves and eunuchs; by the fear of offending some great prelate, who had it in his power to insult, vex and plague all the Bishops within and without his jurisdiction; by the dread of passing for Heretics, and of being calumniated, reviled, hated, anathematized, excommunicated, imprisoned, banished, fined, beggared, starved, if they refused to submit; by compliance with some active, leading and imperious spirits; by a deference to the majority; by a love of dictating and domineering, of applause and respect; by vanity and ambition; by a total ignorance of the question in debate or a total indifference about it; by private friendship, by enmity and resentment, by old prejudices, by hopes of gain, by an indolent disposition, by good nature, by the fatigue of attending, and a desire to be at home, by the love of peace and quiet, and a hatred of contention, &c. &c.' To these considerations, which comprehend perhaps the usual motives of human action, we should add that among so many assembled, many there must have been of sincere intention and earnest piety, and certainly several well instructed in the learning of that age; and the excellence of these persons doubtless so influenced the general character of the Council, that, though unable to repress the intemperate violence of some of its members, they were sufficient to conduct it to that decision, which has now been followed by the great majority of Christians for fifteen centuries.

The Bishops began by much personal dissension, and presented to the Emperor a variety of written accusations against each other; the Emperor burnt all their libels, and exhorted them to peace and unity. They then proceeded to examine the momentous question proposed to them. It was soon discovered that the differences, which it was intended to reconcile, might in their principle be reduced to one point, and that that point might be expressed by one *word*—and thus the question appears to have been speedily simplified (as indeed was necessary, that so many persons might come to one conclusion on so mysterious a subject) and reduced to this—whether the Son was, or was not, *consubstantial* with the Father. . . . Many of the leading Bishops hesitated, or even held in the first instance the negative opinion, and among them were Eusebius* of Cæsarea, the historian of Constantine, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, from whose hands the Emperor afterwards received baptism. The former proposed to the assembly a Creed, in which the word *consubstantial* † (*Homoousian*) was omitted; but in which he anathematized *every impious heresy*, without particularizing any. His advice was not followed. Then arose subtle dis-

residence and race, here met together; and one City received them all, as it were an ample garland variegated with beautiful flowers.' Such is the light in which this assembly appeared to Eusebius, who was one of its members. Vit. Const. l. iii. cap. 6. Respecting the number of Bishops, Eusebius, as the passage has come down to us, makes it *more than* two hundred-and-fifty. Socrates (lib. i. c. 8.), professing to follow Eusebius, describes it in one place as above three hundred, in another as three hundred and eighteen. And that number is generally received by modern writers, on the additional authority of Athanasius, Hilary, Jerome and Rufinus.

* Jortin (Eccles. Hist. b. iii.) has discussed the religious opinions of Eusebius very reasonably.

† He objected to the term as *unscriptural*—and to the use of such terms, he attributed nearly all the confusion and disorder of the Churches (See Socrates, lib. i. c. viii. near the end.) We may observe that this was the most tenable ground in which the Arians of every denomination entrenched themselves in the course of their subsequent disputes with the Consubstantialists.—See Maim. Hist. Arian. b. iv. (vol. i. p. 223.) The distrust of tradition which they ventured to express even in that early age, was closely connected with it—yet it proved also, that the early tradition of the Church was favourable to the Catholic opinion.

ceptions respecting the meaning of the word, ‘about which some conflicted with each other, dwelling on the term and minutely dissecting it; it was like a battle fought in the dark; for neither party seemed at all to understand on what ground they vilified each other.’* However, the result was perfectly conclusive; they finally decided against the Arian opinions, and established, respecting the two first persons of the Trinity, the doctrine which the Church still professes in the Nicene Creed. †

Their labours being completed, the Bishops dispersed to their respective provinces—besides the solemn declaration of their opinion, on a most important point of doctrine (since it established the equal divinity of the Son), they finally set at rest the question respecting the celebration of Easter, and enacted some profitable regulations relating to Church discipline.‡ Thus far, then, we can have no just reason to condemn the result of their meeting, or to pronounce such assemblies either pernicious or useless. The doctrine of the majority of Christendom was proclaimed by a public act, on a subject hitherto uncontroverted, and henceforward it was reasonably considered the doctrine of the Church. And if matters had rested here, perhaps the dissentients would either have concealed their opinions, or gradually melted away into the mass of the orthodox. But Constantine thought the work of ecclesiastical legislation incomplete, until the spiritual edict was enforced by temporal penalties. Immediate exile was inflicted on those who persisted in error—and the punishment of a Heretic by a Christian Prince was defended by the same plea of rebellious contumacy, which is urged by the apologists of his Pagan predecessors to justify the execution of a Christian. §

* See Socrates, l. i. c. xxiii. This passage has rather reference to the differences on the same subject which continued after the Council; but it well describes the nature of the disputations. *Sit ista in Græcorum levitate perversitas qui maledictis insectantur eos a quibus de veritate dissentiunt.* Cic. Fin. 11.

† Gibbon’s account of this Council does not seem to rest on evidence sufficient to counteract its improbability. He divides the Christian world, as represented at Nice, into three classes or parties, all Heretical—Arians, Sabellians and Tritheists; and then he asserts that the two last (professing opinions diametrically opposite to each other) combined against the Arians. Without affecting to believe, that the majority of the Nicene Bishops would have explained the mystery of the Trinity in the precise language of the Athanasian Creed, we think it very irrational to suppose, that there were none (that there were not many) among them, impressed with notions of the Trinity very far removed either from Sabellianism or Tritheism. Those, who know the pertinacity with which men adhere to their own previous notions on such matters, will not easily believe, that two numerous parties, professing opinions not only contrary but adverse, should immediately waive those opinions, and assume, and persist in, other opinions essentially different from either, and then unite, merely for the sake of outvoting a third party, against which they were not inflamed by any personal animosity. It is possible that there may have been some Sabellians as well as Tritheists among the members of the Council, notwithstanding the repeated condemnations of those heresies by the Church writers; but it is impossible to believe, that the opinions, which were finally sanctioned by the great majority of the Bishops, and were ever afterwards followed as the rule of orthodoxy, were not previously very general among the ministers of the Church.

‡ The three written monuments of this Council were the Rule of Faith—a number of Canons—and the Synodical Epistle which was addressed to the Churches on its dissolution. Socrates, E. Hist. lib. i., c. ix. See Semler, Cent. iv. cap. iii. *De Conciliis.* Mosheim. E. II. Cent. iv. p. ii. c. v.

§ In a formal Edict addressed to the Bishops and People, Constantine compares the blindness of Arius to that of Porphyry, and commands his followers to be designated by the ignominious name of Porphyrians. He then proceeds to consign the books of Arius to the flames, nearly in the following terms:—‘If any man be found to have concealed a copy of those Books, and not to have instantly produced it and thrown it into the fire, he shall be put to death. The moment he is convicted of this he shall be subjected to capital punishment. The Lord continue to preserve you.’ Socrates, Hist. E., lib. i., p. 32.]

In justice, however, to the character of Constantine, we must admit, that he was animated throughout these perplexing dissensions not by any private or sectarian animosity against the Arian party, but by a sincere desire to restore peace to the Church. It was his object to correct and chastise the perversity of the Heretics, and thus to force them into communion with the great body of his Christian subjects; but he had no design or wish for their extermination. And as soon as he discovered that his first severities were ineffectual; that the Arians, under the episcopal guidance of Eusebius of Nicomedia,* lost little strength in Asia and even maintained the contest in Alexandria itself, and that they were not without support in his own Court and Household, he perceived the inutility of his measures, and chose rather to retrace the steps which he had taken, than to advance more deeply into the paths of persecution. He therefore recalled Eusebius in the year 330, and six years afterwards Arius himself, after presenting to the Emperor a modified profession of faith, was released from the sentence of banishment.† That Heresiarch perished soon afterwards by a sudden, but probably a natural, death—and so far from joining in the anathemas, which are commonly heaped upon him, we shall perform a more grateful office in bearing testimony to the purity of his moral life, and the probable sincerity of his religious opinions. Respecting the less important circumstances of his manners and conversation, we shall be contented to adopt the language of a writer who has seldom treated either him or his followers with any show of candour or justice.‡ ‘Arius made use of the advantages he was master of, by art and by nature, to gain the people—for it is certain that he had a great many talents, which rendered him capable of nicely insinuating himself into their good opinion and affections. He was tall of stature and of a very becoming make, grave and serious in his carriage, with a certain air of severity in his looks, which made him pass for a man of great virtue and austerity of life. Yet this severity did not discourage those who accosted him, because it was softened by an extraordinary delicacy in his features that gave lustre to his whole person, and had something in it so sweet and engaging, as was not easily to be resisted. His garb was modest, but withal neat, and such as was usually worn by those who were men of quality as well as learning. His manner of receiving people was very courteous, and very ingratiating, through his agreeable way of entertaining those who came to him upon any occasion. In short, notwithstanding his mighty seriousness, and the severity and strictness of his mien, he perfectly well understood how to soothe and flatter, with all imaginable wit and address, those whom he had a mind to bring over to his opinion, and engage in his party.’

On the death of Constantine in 336 A. D. the Empire was partitioned among his sons. Constantius occupied the eastern throne, and Constantine and Constans divided that of the west. These two Princes (in compliance perhaps with the inclinations of their subjects) supported the

* Philostorgius, the Arian historian, attributes miracles to this Eusebius; and Athanasius (*Orat. 2.*) seems to consider him rather as the master than the disciple of Arius. See Tillemont. *Sur les Ariens. Art. vi.*

† It is another, perhaps a more probable opinion, that Eusebius was recalled in 328, and Arius even sooner; but that the Emperor did not invite Arius to Constantinople until 336. *Mosh. Ecc. Hist., Cent. iv, p. ii. c. v.* See also Tillemont. *loc. cit.*, who dates the real rancour of the contest from the refusal of Athanasius still to communicate with his adversary.

‡ Maimbourg, *Hist. Arian., b. i. Epiphanius, Hæres. 69.*

Nicene faith in their dominions ; but Constantius loudly proclaimed his adhesion to the Arian or Eusebian * doctrine ; and, perceiving that a numerous sect already professed it, he proceeded by every art to impose it upon the body of his people. It is admitted that Constantius possessed ' a vain and feeble mind, alike incapable of being moderated by reason or fixed by faith. † Instead of reconciling the parties by the weight of his authority, he cherished and propagated by verbal disputes the differences which his vain curiosity had excited.' And it is the complaint of Ammianus, a contemporary historian, that the highways were covered, and the establishment of posts almost exhausted, by the troops of Bishops, who were perpetually hurrying from synod to synod. These measures served only to animate dissension ; and the evils and the odium which it produced are more justly charged upon the Prince who inflamed, than upon the parties who blindly waged it.

In the year 350 Constans was assassinated, and soon afterwards Rome and Italy, with a great part of the western Empire, fell into the hands of Constantius. Hitherto the Churches of the West had not been deeply agitated by the controversy, but having willingly embraced, had steadily maintained, the doctrine of Nice ; but the first attention of the Emperor was directed to the disturbance of their repose and their faith.

In the mean time, an adversary, dangerous to the opinions, and not wholly subject even to the power, of the Sovereign, had been raised up in the person of Athanasius. That great *Athanasius*. champion of Catholicism, the most distinguished among the Fathers of the Church, not by his writings only but by his adventures and his sufferings, steadily defended the Nicene doctrine during forty-six years of alternate dignity and persecution. ‡ He succeeded Alexander in the See of Alexandria in the year 326 ; he succeeded also to his enmity against the opinions and person of Arius, and boldly raised his voice against his recall from banishment by Constantine. Some intemperance in his zeal seems soon afterwards to have given a pretext to the Asiatic Bishops, many of whom were still Arian ; and in a Synod held at Tyre, § they pronounced the sentence of degradation and exile, which was enforced by the Emperor. At the end of twenty-eight months, soon after the death of Constantine, he was restored ; but in 341 he was once more exiled by the Synod of Antioch, || acting under the influence of Constantius. The place of his former banishment was France ; that of his second was Italy, and chiefly Rome ; so that he became familiar with the language of the West, with the discipline and Primates of its Church, and

* Eusebius of Nicomedia died in the year 342, after gaining some advantages over his great antagonist Athanasius.

† Gibbon, c. 21.

‡ His character is admirably described by Gibbon (chap. 21), and the history of his constancy and his misfortunes is written with splendour and impartiality, even when Julian becomes his persecutor.

§ It was held in the year 335. The most important of the charges brought against Athanasius were manifestly confuted, and the justice of his sentence is at least very questionable.

|| At this time, or soon afterwards, the Arians drew up a Creed in which they omitted the offensive word *Consubstantial* ; but the terms which they applied to the Son, calling him *ἀτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοιώτων τῆς θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυναμείας καὶ δόξης ἀπαράλλακτον εἶκόνα, καὶ πρωτότοκον πατρὸς κτισίως*—are such as might have been subscribed by the most zealous Catholic. See Le Clerc, ap. Jortin, E. H. b. iii. ; and Tillemont. *Sur les Ariens.*] Article xxxii. Also, Sozomen, l. 3. c. 5 ; and Athanas. de Synodis.

with the Court of its Emperor. He profited by all these advantages, and availed himself so effectually of the last, that Constans* at length prepared to interfere with arms in his favour. Threatened by the horrors of a religious war, Constantius reluctantly consented to his restoration†. In the year 349 he re-occupied his former throne. 'The entrance of the Archbishop into his capital was a triumphal procession; absence and persecution had endeared him to the Alexandrians; his authority, which he exercised with rigour, was more firmly established, and his fame was diffused from Æthiopia to Britain, over the whole extent of the Christian world.'

It was immediately after this event that Constantius succeeded to the Western Empire; and in his zeal for the propagation of Arianism he presently renewed his attacks on Athanasius. He summoned‡ Councils of the Western Bishops; he menaced and caressed and corrupted the Bishops whom he had summoned, and at length (in the year 356) with great difficulty succeeded in deposing for the third time his spiritual adversary.

This struggle must not be passed over with slight notice, since it presents to us an event, of which there had yet been no experience in the history of the Church, or in the history of Rome, or perhaps in the history of man. Hitherto, at least till a very short time previous, the Church had been a despised and seemingly defenceless community, subject, as a Body, to the capricious insults of every tyrant, and liable, in its individual members, to his arbitrary inflictions. Until very lately, the Emperor of the Roman world possessed authority uncontrolled over the liberty and life of his subjects, undisputed by any, except as rebels, or rivals for the throne. And certainly the monstrous evils of despotic government have never been more signally displayed, than during the dreary interval which separated Augustus and Constantine. Still at the end of that period the rules of government remained the same as at the beginning—no civil revolution had assigned limits to the authority of the Prince, or introduced any counteracting power—no political change had given weight to popular opinion or honour to free principles. And yet scarcely forty years from the accession of Constantine had elapsed, when we behold his son and successor reduced to the employment of intrigue and artifice, for the deposition of a Magistrate whom he detested. The singularity of this circumstance is even increased by two other considerations—one of which is, that the Emperor had the cordial support of a considerable portion of his subjects, the Arian party, in this contest—and the other, that his adversary was not sustained by any armed force of soldiers or followers; nor is it probable even that his violent execution would have been followed

* The celebrated Council held at Sardica, in Thrace, in 347, in which the great majority were Catholics, probably encouraged the Emperor of the West to this resolution.

† It was on this occasion, that Constantius requested Athanasius to grant to the Arians one Church at Alexandria. This request the Patriarch answered by another, proposing a similar concession to the Catholics at Antioch. From this Conference we learn not only what high ground was assumed by the Prelate, in his transactions with the Emperor, but also with what different success the measures of the latter had been attended in the Capitals of Syria and of Egypt.

‡ The most numerous Council assembled on this occasion appears to have been that of Milan in 355, which was attended by above 300 Western, as well as many Eastern Bishops. (See Maimb., Hist. Arian., b. iv. vol. i., p. 174., et seq.) In the same year Liberius, Bishop of Rome, was banished for his faithful attachment to the doctrine and cause of Athanasius; but he was presently recalled, through the intercession first of the matrons, and afterwards of the populace, of Rome. Sozom., lib. iv. c. 2. Theod. lib. ii. c. 17.

by any serious insurrection.* Yet Constantius, with a prudent respect both for the spiritual authority of the Bishop and the rights of the Church, proceeded to the accomplishment of his object by indirect and tedious and unworthy methods. Such circumstances become indeed familiar to us in the pages of later history; but we should not for that reason overlook their first occurrence, nor fail to record with pleasure and gratitude the earliest proof we possess of the political effect of Christianity in moderating the despotism with which it was associated.

The third banishment of Athanasius lasted six years, until the death of his persecutor in 362†. They were passed in the deserts of Upper Egypt, in concealment and dependence; and they were consoled by the pious exertions of the exile for the opinions for which he suffered—exertions, which the vigilance of the Imperial police could neither prevent nor neutralize. After his final restoration he enjoyed his See without interruption for eleven years, and at length died in peace and dignity.

In the mean time, as is natural among those who indulge in any laxity of speculation respecting mysteries really inscrutable, the Arians were divided among themselves almost as widely as the *Divisions of the Arians*. The original and pure Arians, following the opinions of their founder, maintained not only that the substance of the Word was different from that of the Father, but that it did not even resemble it; while others, pretending the authority of Eusebius of Nicomedia, denied with equal confidence the Consubstantiality of the two Persons, but at the same time affirmed their *perfect likeness*. These last are commonly called Semiarians; and their doctrine appears to have been first proclaimed at the Synod of Ancyra in Galatia, held by Basil, the Bishop of that place, in the year 358; but the Council of Seleucia, by which their tenets were sanctioned in the following year, holds a more prominent place in ecclesiastical annals‡. They were very numerous during the reign of Constantius, who was their protector and proselyte; but they afterwards yielded in some measure to the pure Arianism of Valens and his Patriarch, Eudoxius. Again the Semiarians were not themselves entirely united; several among them maintained the pre-ternity of the Word; while others believed that, though it had subsisted before all ages, it had once had a beginning; and that party § was not inconsiderable which, admitting a *general likeness* between the Father and the Son, denied that there was any similarity of substance||.

* It is true that some popular commotions did at last attend the execution even of the legal order for the deposition of the Bishop, which were suppressed by force; but they were of very short duration, and entirely confined to Alexandria.

† It is asserted by Tillemont (*Sur les Ariens*, Art. 103) that during the neutrality of Julian, the Catholics gained considerable ground upon their adversaries.

‡ In the fourth century were held thirteen Councils against Arius, fifteen for him, and seventeen for the Semiarians; in all forty-five. Jortin, *Ecc. Hist.*, b. iii.

§ It would appear that Constantius himself belonged to this sect of the Semiarians. See Gibbon, chap. 21.

|| The Consubstantialists are known in history by the Greek term *Homoiouians*; those who asserted the similarity of the substances, by the name of *Homoiouians*; those who denied any sort of resemblance were called *Anomoians*; and, to complete the confusion, the last mentioned Sectarials are sometimes denominated—from the name of one of their most popular teachers—*Eunomians*. The unimportance of the verbal difference might provoke our ridicule, did we not reflect how much the angry application of those terms tended to prolong and embitter the controversy. See Semler, cent. iv. chap. 4., ad finem. The distinction which Tillemont (*Sur les Ariens*, Art. 66) draws between the Arians and Eusebians refers rather to their situation in respect to the Church than to their doctrine.

Athanasius, in his Epistle respecting the Synods of Seleucia and Rimini exposes the great variety of the Arian Creeds, and the subject has been enlarged upon by Catholic Historians, to shew the inevitable perplexities of those who have once permitted themselves to deviate from the established doctrine.

Having succeeded in his attack on the Consubstantialists (and, we might add, on the pure Arians) of the East, Constantius removed the scene of action to the Western Provinces, and *Council of Rimini.* convoked a Council at Rimini in the year 360: by nearly the same arts which he had employed to procure the condemnation of Athanasius*, supported by a moderate, but firm exertion of the civil authority, he succeeded in influencing the members to the subscription of a Creed, containing some expressions capable of heretical interpretation. 'The whole world groaned (says St. Jerome) and wondered to find itself Arian!' But this conversion was neither sincere nor lasting; and however opinions may have been divided in the East—for even there, though the majority of the Bishops † followed the faith of the Emperor, there is reason to believe that many among the people remained Catholic ‡—we may safely infer from the small number of Arian prelates who were found willing to proclaim that doctrine, even under an Arian Emperor, that it had yet made little progress in the Latin Church§. For we should always bear in mind, that any sudden change in the opinions of the vulgar respecting an abstruse mystery must necessarily be *preceded* by the same change in their spiritual directors.

The path of intolerance, which had been pointed out and abandoned by Constantine, but so steadily followed by his heretical successor, was trodden with equal diligence in the Eastern Empire by Valens. That Prince, who is believed to have been converted to Arianism by the influence of his Empress|| Dominica, in the year 367, permitted considerable licence

* By the Arians we mean those who were expelled from the Church by the Council of Nice—by the Eusebians those who remained in communion with the Church, but who bent themselves insidiously to ruin its doctrine, by the invention of new formularies, who endeavoured to expel Athanasius, and who communicated with the original Arians. So that these two formed only one sect in intrigue, and perhaps in belief too—though the one party appeared in the Church, and the other was visibly separated from it.' The word *ἁμοούσιος* is interpreted—habens simul essentiam, i. e. eandem essentiam.

* He directed Taurus, the Governor of the Province, to confine the Bishops, until they should be all of one mind, that is, until they should be all of the Emperor's mind. The conditions of concord on which they at length agreed amounted to this: that the Catholics conceded the offensive term (Consubstantialism), and the Arians to all appearance the doctrine; at least all parties agreed in anathematizing the name of Arius, while they professed, as it would seem, the Semiarian opinions. Sulpic. Sever. lib. ii. Maimb. Hist. Arian., b. iii. Gibbon, chap. 21.

† The throne and principal Churches of Constantinople were occupied by Arian Patriarchs from the year 342 till their restoration to the Catholics by Theodosius nearly forty years afterwards. Semler, Epit. sec. iv.

‡ At Antioch at least the dissent of the people from the established Arianism was strongly and violently expressed, and at Constantinople itself, the very citadel of the heresy, in spite of the savage edicts of Constantius, some very sanguinary tumults still proved the steady perseverance of many Catholics. In one of these 3150 persons were killed.

§ Of the four hundred Bishops assembled at Rimini eighty only were Arians.

|| The Arians had no cause to blush at the obligations which they likewise owed to two preceding Empresses. Constantia protected their infancy and their misfortunes during the reign of Constantine, and Eusebia promoted their prosperity under the sceptre of Constantius. The Catholics could also boast of similar patronage; but Maimbourg (Book vi.) establishes a very broad distinction as to the agency by which such aid was in each case administered; 'as the devil (says that very rigid Catholic) had employed the assistance of Princesses to introduce Arianism into the Court of Constantine, of Constantius and Valens, so God made use of the Empress Ælia Flaccilla in order to prevent it from

against the Catholics to his Patriarch Eudoxius, even during the beginning of his reign, and proceeded, after a few years, to more direct and intemperate measures*. Alexandria, by whose pernicious fertility the controversy was first engendered, remained however, through the influence of Alexander and Athanasius, strongly attached to the Nicene faith. It became the scene of frightful disorder, as soon as the civil authorities added strength to the malignity of the Arians, and proceeded again to expel Peter, the orthodox Patriarch. The calamities thus occasioned were undoubtedly heightened by the zealous interference of the Jews and Pagans, who derived their best argument against Christianity from the furious dissensions of its professors, and who were, on all occasions, anxious from other motives to join in the assault on the stronger and wealthier party. On the other hand, the Monks, a new but numerous Body, continued faithful to the doctrine of Athanasius, and loved it the more because they suffered for it. Peter avoided the tempest by a hasty retreat to Rome, and the success of the Arians does not appear permanently to have increased either their numbers or their popularity. However, there can be no doubt that the profession of Arianism was common, and even general, throughout the East during the reign of Valens, and that in some of the Asiatic Provinces, especially Syria, such may have been the real belief of the majority; but its progress was attended with perpetual tumults, and at the death of Valens in 378 it had reached the highest point of prevalence which it was destined in those regions to attain.

Two years afterwards, Theodosius the Great proclaimed his adhesion to the doctrine of Nice, and immediately prepared to establish it as the Creed of his subjects. 'I will not permit (thus he *Theodosius* addressed certain Arians in the year † 383) throughout my *the Great.* dominions any other religion than that which obliges us to worship the Son of God in unity of essence with the Father and Holy Ghost in the adorable Triunity—as I hold the Empire of Him, and the power which I have to command you, he likewise will give me strength, as he hath given me the will, to make myself obeyed in a point so absolutely necessary to your salvation, and to the peace of my subjects.' The peace of his subjects was not indeed the immediate reward of his violent measures, but, on the contrary, general confusion and much individual suffering was occasioned by them. Still, as he persevered inflexibly, as he was supported even in the East by the more zealous, and, in some places, the more numerous party, and as he was seconded almost by the unanimity of the Western Empire, his severities were attended by general and lasting success, and the doctrine of Arius, if not perfectly extirpated, withered from that moment rapidly and irrecoverably throughout the Provinces of the East.

The work of Theodosius was considerably promoted by the Council which he assembled at Constantinople in the year 381, and which stands in the history of the Church as the Second General Council. Its object, besides the regulation of several points of ecclesiastical discipline, was to confirm the decision of Nice against the Arians, and especially to promulgate the doctrine of the Divinity of the Third Person, against the

creeping into the Court of Theodosius.' In a later page (b. xii. A. D. 590) the same author again alludes to the diabolical agency 'which introduced the Arian heresy into the East by the means of three women,' and which was afterwards compensated by the divine benevolence in raising up three Princesses, Clotilda, Ingondra and Theodelinda for the purification of France, Spain and Italy.

* They are enlarged upon by Tillemont, *Sur les Ariens*, Art. 115.

† See Mamb., *Hist. Arian.*, b. vi.

Macedonian* Heretics. The Doctrine on those fundamental points, which was then established, is the same (if we except the manner of the Holy Procession) which is still professed in our Church: by the Oriental Church it has been unceasingly maintained, without any variation, to the present moment.

We turn to the consideration of the Western Empire. While Valens was disturbing his subjects with fruitless persecution, the Western Empire was administered by his brother Valentinian with justice and moderation. Those, and they were few in number, among the Western Bishops, who had openly deserted to the faith of Constantius, were now concealed in obscurity, or removed by death; Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, was an ardent supporter of the Nicene doctrine, and the Church preserved the general appearance, if it could not quite secure the reality, of concord. At Milan, during the reign of Theodosius, the celebrated St. Ambrose exerted his genius in the same cause, and at the end of the fourth century the proselytes of Arianism formed an inconsiderable and a declining party. Suddenly it received a new and extraordinary impulse from a quarter which could not have been suspected, from accidents which could not be averted, nor immediately controlled; and which prolonged the existence of that heresy beyond the duration which seemed otherwise to have been assigned to it. During the course of the fifth century numerous tribes of Barbarians, Goths, Huns and Vandals, Suevi and Alani and Sali, overran and occupied the provinces of the west. Of these some had been previously converted to Christianity in their native forests, before their emigration to the south, though others for the most part adopted the religion of the vanquished; and while they professed generally the name of Christianity, they followed in its particular tenets the faith of their Prince or leader. Now it so happened that all these tribes, excepting probably the Sali, imbibed in the first instance the notions of Arius. This circumstance is thus accounted for:—The Goths, who were the earliest and most zealous among the converts, were directed in their religious creed by their Bishop Ulphilas, a man of great talents and influence. This prelate, in the course of two missions to Constantinople, during the reigns of Constantius and Valens, accommodated his opinions (whether sincerely or not, is questionable) to those of the Imperial Court, and he returned, at least from his second embassy, the zealous proselyte of Arianism. This doctrine he rapidly propagated among his compatriots, and diffused it through the whole nation. The example of the Goths was respected by the leaders of tribes of subsequent invaders and converts; in embracing the religion of the provinces which they conquered they preferred that form of it which was professed by their predecessors in conquest; and thus the tenets of Arius were disseminated among the barbarian colonists in every province of the western empire. Other means of spreading those tenets were the persecutions of the orthodox Emperors, especially Theodosius: by scattering the followers of the heretic among distant and populous nations they diffused to the same extent the knowledge of his doctrine, and multiplied the number of its professors.

* Macedonius, in common with other Arians (or rather Semiarians), denied the Consubstantiality, and affirmed the likeness of the two first Persons; but he positively asserted that the Holy Ghost was *κτιστόν*, created. He is said to have published this notion twenty years before the General Council which condemned it. Le Clerc, Compend. Hist., ap. Jort., b. iii. Mosh. H. E., Cent. iv., p. ii., ch. v.

Again, those of the barbarian princes who embraced Christianity after their success, when they saw the great controversy by which the Christian world was divided, would be guided also by political motives as to the side they chose in it, and one of these would probably be opposition to the Eastern throne; and, as they were little versed in the arguments by which the question was contested, and probably blind even to its real nature and importance, the mere effect of their ignorance would be to direct them to what might seem the simpler creed. Their soldiers and followers, still blinder than themselves, naturally acquiesced in their belief; and even among the vanquished natives, the many who were indifferent would turn to the same profession. On the other hand, the Church remained firm; the exertions of its most eminent directors were bent almost without exception on the maintenance of the Nicene faith, and with such success, that the great majority of zealous and influential Christians probably retained, even under foreign and Arian rule, their attachment to the established doctrine.

This re-action in favour of Arianism, as it was sudden and somewhat violent, was not of long duration; indeed we may fairly consider the sixth century as having brought about its termination. The conversion of Clovis to the Catholic faith in the year 496, and his subsequent zeal in its favour, are commonly mentioned as having first opened the path to the conclusion of the dispute; and as it is sometimes the pleasure of Divine Providence to select the vilest instruments for the accomplishment of His mysterious designs, so we may believe without astonishment that He deigned to bring about a great good even by the impure and flagitious ministry of Clovis. A more effective agent in the same work was Justinian. That Emperor began his long and active reign in 527, and his rigid orthodoxy was disgraced by the most violent proceedings against every description of heresy. His victories extended his means of extirpation into the West, and before his death he had very generally strengthened, though he had not universally restored, the authority of the Church.

The Arians still retained a very powerful party in Spain, which was not destined to be otherwise extinguished than by the accession of an orthodox monarch. In the year 585 Recared assembled the leaders of the two parties in a conference, which concluded in the triumph of the Catholics; and that Prince pursued his victory both in Spain and Narbonese Gaul, with so much diligence and rigour, that after some sanguinary tumults and barbarous executions*, the great body of his subjects ranged themselves under his doctrine, and never afterwards relapsed into heresy. The celebrated Council of Toledo, which was held by the same King in 589, may be considered as having completed the extirpation of Arianism from the soil of Spain.

In Italy the victories obtained by the Generals of Justinian gave strength and confidence to the Catholic Church, and weakened the opposition of its adversaries; and the *The Lombards*. heresy appears to have been falling into discredit, when it received a fresh but momentary impulse from the invasion and triumphs of the Lombards. Those Arian warriors crossed the Alps in the year 569, and presently became masters of the greater part of the country. Their conquests were attended by unusual circumstances of barbarity, and the necessary horrors of uncivilized warfare were inflamed by sectarian

* Maimb. Hist. Arian., b. xi. The fact is admitted and justified by Mariana, Hist. Hispan., lib. v., ch. xiv. See Bayle's Dict., Arius. The facility with which the Arians yielded to this persecution has given great matter of exultation to Catholic writers.

animosity. But the sufferings of the Catholics were not of long duration; they were speedily and effectually terminated by the conversion of the conquerors. This event is ascribed, in the first instance, to the diligence and fidelity of the orthodox Bishops*, who availed themselves of the first moments of tranquillity to recommend the Nicene doctrine to the conscience of the victors. It is at least probable that their exertions prepared and facilitated the success of a Catholic Queen, Theodelinda, who appears to have completed the overthrow of Arianism even among her Lombard subjects before the conclusion of the sixth century. The triumph of that Princess may be read by the Catholic without a blush, and recorded by the historian without a sigh; since it was accomplished, if not by the process of rational conviction, at least without the savage inflictions by which sudden religious changes are usually effected.

It was thus that this lamentable controversy, after perplexing the faith, and animating the malice, and disturbing the happiness of the Christian world for more than two hundred and fifty years, was at length extinguished; and at this moment the very name of Arius is almost forgotten in the Eastern world; and in the West his opinions are confined to the breasts of a very inconsiderable proportion of the Christian community.

We shall close this account with a few additional observations. The Arians have laid claim to the greater moderation, both in the origin and in the conduct of this controversy, and they moreover assert that their communion was free from many of the superstitious corruptions, which, at that time, were growing up so rapidly in the Catholic church. This latter assertion is, at least, founded in probability; because the principle of their faith, by disparaging the dignity of the Redeemer, removed them farther from religious excess. Their tendency was rather towards too little, than towards too much belief; and we can readily suppose that those who were so averse from the worship of Christ, would certainly refuse any adoration to the Virgin or other created beings. But notwithstanding this, we find that Constantius had a superstitious veneration for relics, and was the first to encourage their transfer from place to place, with the miraculous qualities attached to them; and when that Arian disturbed the (real or supposed) bodies of Timothy, St. Andrew, and St. Luke, and conveyed them to Constantinople, he assuredly introduced into the Church of Christ one of its most degrading corruptions†. But their claims to superior moderation are still more disputable, except, indeed, as far as it might be the fruit of their weakness. In the East, the reign of Constantius was the æra of their triumph, and it was polluted by constant and sanguinary persecution. That of Valens was not less distinguished by the same spirit and principle, and the same oppression; and as the Arian Bishops were then exceedingly numerous and powerful, at least in Asia, it would be unfair to impute the whole criminality to the Emperor. Athanasius, the continual object of their hostility, has the following passage concerning them. ‘Whenever any man differs from them, they have him before the Governor or the General; him whom they cannot subdue by reason and argument, they take upon them to convince by whippings and imprisonments; which is enough to show that their principles are anything rather than religion; for it is the property of religion not to compel, but to persuade.’ On the other hand, Athanasius himself either had not yet learnt,

* Maimbourg (*Hist. Arian.*, b. xii.) is the more to be believed in this point, as he mentions the fact almost incidentally.

† This took place in 356. See Jortin, *Ecl. His.*, vol. iv., p. xii.

or had wholly forgotten, this excellent truth when he appealed to Constantine against the recall of Arius; nor was it generally either practised or acknowledged afterwards by the Catholic Emperors of the East*. Gradually the faith of the prelates submitted itself to the injunctions of those monarchs; the people were, upon the whole, always favourable to Catholicism; and thus before the middle of the sixth century the Nicene doctrine was very firmly established throughout that part of the Empire.

— In the west Arianism would never have taken any deep root, except through the influence of the barbarian conquerors; for the Church was steadily and zealously opposed to it, and so was the most religious, if not the most numerous, part of the conquered. It was probably confined to the courts of the victors, to their armies, and to such of the natives as were in most immediate intercourse with them. In Gaul, in Spain, and in Italy, the Gothic Princes appear seldom to have persecuted their Catholic subjects, except in retaliation for some outrage exercised against the Arians by the Catholic Emperors of Constantinople. But in Africa the Vandal Arians were guilty of horrible excesses during the last half of the fifth century, which were not terminated until their expulsion by Belisarius in the year 530. On the other hand, in all those provinces the Catholic population, whether persecuted or not, seems always to have been equally disposed to rise in favour of a Catholic invader. But we should here recollect that the distinction of Arian and Catholic was in general so closely connected with that of Barbarian and Roman, conqueror and conquered†, that we can scarcely say how much of this we should attribute to religious, how much to national, animosity. Upon the whole, we have little reason to give the praise of moderation, or even humanity, to either party; much depended on the personal character of the Princes on either side, and on the principles or prejudices in which they had been educated. But in as far as the *sectarian* feeling was concerned, we may discover on both sides an equal disposition to give loose to it.

The Arian was more flexible, the Catholic more rigid under persecution ‡; the former finally submitted to conversion; the latter would probably never have yielded to any infliction short of extirpation: and this distinction is attributed by some to the undoubted circumstance, that it is easier to extend the belief of the multitude, than to contract it; a circumstance which proceeds from the false but prevalent notion, that too much belief is at least an error on the safe side, and that Jesus Christ would more readily intercede for those who might have paid Him excessive honour, than for those who had fallen short in their worship. Others imagine, that the Arian always felt in his heart some latent consciousness of error, which undermined his constancy in the hour of trial, and deprived him of that energy of invincible endurance which is inconsistent with the very shadow of insincerity.

* There is one distinction, however, which to a certain extent is true, that the Arians were more lenient in their treatment of other heretics; whereas the Catholics persecuted universally.

† See Maimb., *Hist. Arian.*, b. xi., *passim*. In the mouth of an Arian, the terms Catholic and Roman were synonymous.

‡ Bayle (in his *Life of Arius*) observes this inconsistency in Roman Catholic writers, that they urge generally the obstinate perversity of heretics as a proof of their errors; and yet press their flexibility in particular cases to the same conclusion. Yet the Roman Catholics endeavoured to accommodate their practice to both their suppositions; which, indeed, could only be reconciled by the assumption, that heretics were obstinate *until* they were persecuted, and no longer; and on this ground they erected the Inquisition.

NOTE ON CERTAIN EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

THREE Greek writers, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodorit, take up the annals of the Church about the time of its establishment by Constantine, nearly where the history of Eusebius terminates, and carry them on as far as the reign of Theodosius the younger, through a space of about one hundred and twenty years. It is necessary to give a short account of them.

1. *Socrates* was a native of Constantinople; he was carefully instructed in grammar and rhetoric, and presently assumed the profession of a scholastic or advocate. Much time, however, and very considerable diligence he directed to the compilation of his historical materials, and no scanty judgment is shown in their arrangement and composition. The epistles of Bishops, the acts of Councils, the works of preceding or contemporary ecclesiastics are consulted with care, and seemingly cited with fidelity, and the principal events are chronologically distinguished by olympiads or consulates. His impartiality is so strikingly displayed, as to make his orthodoxy questionable to Baronius, the celebrated Roman Catholic historian; but Valesius in his life has clearly shown that there is no reason for such suspicion. We may mention another principle, which he has followed, which in the mind of Baronius may have tended to confirm the notion of his heterodoxy—that he is invariably adverse to every form of persecution on account of religious opinions—‘*διωγμὸν δὲ λέγω τὸ ὀπωσοῦν ταραττεῖν τοὺς ἡσυχάζοντας*—and I call it persecution to offer any description of molestation to those who are quiet.’ Some credulity respecting miraculous stories is his principal failing.

2. *Hermias Sozomen* was also an advocate, resident at Constantinople; but he was a native of Palestine, born near Gaza, and was educated in a monastery in that country. In his writings we perceive a great ardour for the monastic life, and a concomitant tendency to superstitious extravagance. Superior in style to his contemporary, he is below him in judgment and discrimination; still his work contains much valuable matter; though some of it is probably borrowed from that of Socrates, which seems to have been published some little earlier.

3. *Theodorit*, like Sozomen, received a monastic education; but he entered into the ecclesiastical profession, and became Bishop of Cyrus, in Syria. He was remarkable, not only for his learning and piety, but for his absolute and voluntary poverty. ‘I was ordained Bishop against my will; for twenty-five years (says he, in an epistle still extant) I have so lived in that station, as never to be at variance, never to prosecute any one at law or to be prosecuted. The same I can say of all the pious clergy who are under my inspection, none of whom was ever seen in any court of justice. Neither I nor my domestics ever received the smallest present from any person, not even a loaf or an egg. My patrimony I gave long ago to the poor, and I have made no new acquisitions. I have neither house, nor land, nor money, nor a sepulchre where my friends may lay my body when I die. I am possessor of nothing save the poor raiment which I wear.’ As a writer, however, he is inferior to his two fellow-labourers, both in judgment and moderation; he is more violent against schism and heresy, more bigoted, and more absurdly credulous. Yet he did not himself escape the charge of heresy, and was certainly attached to the party, probably to the opinions, of Nestorius. His style is pronounced by Photius to be clear and lofty without redundancy.

To this list we may venture to regret that we cannot add the name of *Philostorgius*. This writer was an Arian; his history extended from the

year 300 to 425, and he had witnessed much of what he described. But of his works nothing remains, except an epitome by Photius, and some fragments. Photius assures us that he betrayed great partiality for the sect to which he belonged, and this may have been so; yet such is the narrative which we would willingly confront with the probable misrepresentations of his adversaries.

We have also referred to the authorities of Epiphanius, Hilary, and Rufinus, but have been very sparing in our use of them. *Epiphanius* was bred a monk, and became Bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus. He was the author of a voluminous book against all the heresies which had hitherto arisen. But his work is disfigured by so many marks of levity and ignorance, that we can follow him with no general confidence. *Hilary* was Bishop of Poitiers, for the most part a copyist of Tertullian and Origen, but celebrated for 'Twelve Books concerning the Trinity,' written against the Arians. *Rufinus* was a Presbyter of Aquileia, a translator, and not always a faithful one, of Origen and other Greek writers. He was engaged in a violent contest with St. Jerome, and was assailed by the virulence of that intemperate writer; and he had the additional misfortune of being excommunicated by Anastasius, the Bishop of Rome, for his attachment to the opinions of Origen. These three writers belong to the fourth century. Jortin, H. E., b. ii., p. 96.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Decline and Fall of Paganism.

Condition of the two Religions on the accession of Constantine—Progress of Christianity during his reign—His successive measures against Paganism—Remarks on them—Proceedings of his sons—Accession of Julian—Reasons given for his Apostacy—His enthusiasm for Paganism—his character compared with that of M. Antoninus—his policy contrasted with that of Constantine—his successive measures against Christianity—His attempts to reform Paganism—directed to three points—his attack on the truth of Christianity—in the attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem—defeated—by what means—whether miraculous or not—examination of a late opinion—His death. Rapid decline of Paganism—Valentinian I.—Gratian.—Theodosius I.—his edict against Paganism—extremely effectual. Imperfect faith of many of the Converts—corruptions introduced from Paganism. Synesius. Arcadius and Honorius—abolition of Gladiatorial Games. Theodosius II.—subversion of Paganism—in the East—in the West. Note on certain Pagan writers.

FROM the dissensions of Christians, and the calamities occasioned by them, we turn to a more pleasing subject—the final triumph of the Faith over the superstition which had heretofore prevailed throughout the Roman empire; and in proceeding to this investigation, that which first strikes us as most remarkable is, that the very period during which the Christian world was most widely and angrily divided by the Arian controversy, the middle and conclusion of the fourth century, was that precisely during which the Religion, as if invigorated by internal agitation, overthrew her most powerful adversary—a circumstance which is the more to be remarked, as strongly indicative of her own heavenly energy, because the spectacle of Christian dissension has afforded to infidels in every age, as it does at this moment, the most plausible argument for unbelief. Let us endeavour then to trace the measures by which this extraordinary revolution was brought about.

At the accession of Constantine, the Christians, though very numerous, formed no doubt the smaller portion of his subjects, since the multitude,

who were, in fact, of no religion, were accounted among the votaries of paganism; and among the lower classes, the parade of a splendid superstition was more attractive than the simplicity of the true worship, to persons both ignorant and incurious about the truth of either; while in many others, a latent inclination towards the new religion would be repressed by the sight of the worldly afflictions which so frequently pursued it. The conversion of the Emperor was naturally followed by a great increase in the number of nominal* Christians; the faith of many, who were nearly indifferent, would be decided by that event; and many also, of more serious minds, would thus be led to examine with respect the nature of the religion which in its adversity they had contemptuously neglected. Honour and emoluments were annexed to the dignities of the Church, which were thus made objects of ambition to the noble and the learned; and since many, through the exercise of the religion, would gradually imbibe those sentiments and principles of piety, which they had not perhaps carried into it, we may believe that, while the name of Christianity was rapidly extended over the Roman world, its essential doctrines and moral influence made a considerable, though by no means an equal, progress.

Constantine's first measure was the famous edict of universal toleration, which established Christianity without molesting any other religion, and as late as the year 321 he published a proclamation favourable to the maintenance of one of the grossest impostures of paganism, the art of divination. Until this period, and perhaps for some few years longer, he held with tolerably equal hand the balance of the two religions †, and in the rivalry thus established between them Christianity was daily gaining some weight at the expense of its opponent. This crisis was, indeed, of short duration, and the attentive eye of the Emperor immediately perceived to which side the victory was inclining. It was then that he threw into the preponderating scale the decisive addition of his civil authority. In the year 333 he began ‡ to overthrow the temples and idols of the Gentiles, and to invade their property; he suppressed some of the writings most hostile to Christianity, and proclaimed his opposition to the sacred rites of paganism. He condemned them as detrimental to the State; and whatever may have been the sincerity of his faith, he was at least convinced that forms of worship so contrary to each other in all their principles could not long co-exist in the same empire, and he gave his support to that which most conduced to the virtue and happiness of his subjects.

The sons of Constantine followed their father's footsteps. During the Arian rule of Constantius the severity of the laws against Paganism was rather increased than relaxed, and sacrifice, together with idolatrous worship, was visited by capital punishment. This system lasted until his

* See a note on Dr. Arnold's seventh Sermon, p. 88.

† In book iii. of Eusebius's Life of Constantine, the 44th and 45th chapters mention some prohibitions against sacrifice and idol-worship, addressed first to Pagan Magistrates, and then to the people; but in his prayer, or doxology, published in the 55th and following chapters, he accords alike 'both to believers and those in error the enjoyment of peace and tranquillity; as such friendly communion has most tendency to lead men into the straight path.'

‡ Semler, tab. sec. quarti, on author. of Julian, Orat. 7. Mosheim (cent. iv., p. i., c. i.) dates the exertions of Constantine from the overthrow of Licinius. See Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. iv. c. 23, 25, &c. Fleury (lib. xi., sect. 33) assigns the destruction of the Temples of Venus, in Syria, and of Æsculapius and Apollo, in Cilicia, to the year which followed the Council of Nice. See Euseb. Vit. Const., lib. iii., chap. 54; and Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., lib. ii., c. 5.

death; so that, for a space of about thirty years, the antient superstition was restrained by perpetual discouragement, and afflicted with frequent persecution. The number of its followers was thus considerably reduced: but the triumph was not yet complete, and many were there still in every province of the empire, who hailed the accession of Julian.

Julian, who is commonly mentioned in history by the name of Apostate, was the nephew of the great Constantine; he abandoned in early youth the faith in which he had been educated, and betook himself *Julian.* with great zeal to the practice of paganism. The motive to which this change is usually attributed, is the hatred which he indulged towards the name and sons of Constantine, owing to the cruelties which they had inflicted on his family; hatred which a young and impetuous disposition might easily extend to their religion. Another reason alleged is, that when he saw the dissensions of the Christians, and their rancour against each other, his faith was perplexed; he found it hard to distinguish the excellence of the religion from the vices of those who professed it, and was unable to prevent his judgment from being blinded by his indignation. Both of them may be true; for it is clear from some parts of his subsequent conduct, that his enmity to Christianity was founded on passion more than on reason, and his hatred of the faith is more prominent than his disbelief of it*. Hence it is, that, having renounced one religion, he flew with ardour to the exercise of the other, and sought its aid and alliance against the common adversary. This enthusiasm for paganism carried him into some ridiculous excesses. It is true that the affection which he professed for processions and ceremony, and the profuse splendour of his sacrifices, may have proceeded from a wish to seduce and allure the vulgar; but his private devotion to magical rites and the practice of divination, in which his sincerity is not doubted, has no such excuse, and could only have proceeded from an irregular and superstitious mind. And yet to this weakness he united many extraordinary qualities—'he was eloquent and liberal, artful, insinuating and indefatigable; which, joined to a severe temperance, an affected love of justice†, and a courage superior to all trials, first gained him the affections, and soon after the peaceable possession of the whole empire.' A strong attachment to literature distinguished his character, and may have tended to nourish his heathen prejudices; and the passion for glory which sometimes misled him was probably the strongest among his passions, and his leading motive of action.

If we compare the character of Julian with that of the other great enemy of the religion, Marcus Antoninus, we shall find all the advantages of a thoughtful, consistent, and sober understanding on the side of the latter. His conduct was invariably guided by his principles, and his principles were the best which heathen philosophy could suggest to him. His knowledge of Christianity was too partial, and the power of its professors too inconsiderable, to command his belief or respect; and he was too deeply sensible of the absurdities of paganism to feel any regard for that worship; so that he was contented rigorously, but not intemperately, to maintain that which happened to be the established religion. But Julian had more of passion than philosophy in his constitution and in his principles; and even his philosophy (that of the new Academy) tended

* See note at the end of the chapter.

† The passage is quoted from Warburton; but we have no reason to question the sincerity of that principle in Julian, though it was sometimes overpowered by his religious antipathy.

much more to speculation than to practice. Indifference, to which his temperament would never have led him, was precluded by the situation of the empire. Impetuous, and restless, and fearless, he converted into love for the one religion that which at first was only hatred for the other, and he proceeded daringly to accomplish what he ardently projected; yet his daring was tempered by so much address and knowledge, that it was not far removed from consummate prudence.

But if we had space for such disquisitions, a more interesting and perhaps more profitable contrast might be drawn between the situation and conduct of Julian and of Constantine. Both arrived at the possession of unlimited power, through great difficulties, chiefly by means of their personal talents and popularity; both, on arriving at the throne, found the religion of the state different from their own, and followed by the majority of their subjects; and both determined to substitute that which himself professed. The grand difference was this—the religion of Constantine (we may be permitted for one moment to treat the subject merely politically) was young and progressive; it stood on principles which proved its excellence, and ensured its durability; the only weakness which it acknowledged was that of immaturity. The religion of Julian had long been held in derision by all reasonable men; its energy had long passed away from it, and its feebleness was the decrepitude of old age. So that the one led on to certain victory an aspiring assailant; the other endeavoured to rally a shattered, undisciplined, dispirited fugitive.

Let us next examine the manner in which Julian proceeded to the accomplishment of his hopeless enterprise. His first step was in direct imitation of the first act of Constantine. He published edicts which established the religion of the Emperor as that of the state, and which tolerated every other. By such decrees he placed Christianity in a very similar situation to that in which, about fifty years before, his uncle had placed paganism; and he further increased this resemblance by inviting the most eminent philosophers to his court, admitting them to his confidence, and raising them to the highest dignities and offices in their religion. His second step was the natural consequence of the first; he took away the immunities, honours, and revenues, which had been bestowed on the Christian clergy, and transferred them to the service of the established religion—and though great individual injustice was thus perpetrated, no one can reasonably complain of the *principle* of this transfer, since such advantages are necessarily conferred by the state on those who profess the religion of the state. His first edicts, while they restored to Pagans their civil rights, do not appear to have violated those of the Christians: but by a subsequent regulation he disqualified the Christian laity from office in the state. This measure was attended by another, founded on a deeper principle, and of much more dangerous consequence—*he forbade any Christian to lecture in the public schools of science or literature*; and this prohibition not only obliged the Christian youth to have recourse to Pagan instructors, but also deprived them of one of the greatest encouragements to proficiency. Julian was sufficiently instructed in the nature of his project, to perceive that it would be of little avail to oppress the dissentients by vexatious restraints, unless at the same time he could degrade them by ignorance*. His last measure (for which we have the

* A contemporary Christian writer (Gregory Nazianzen) tells us of another method adopted by Julian in order to bring the religion into disrepute, which proves how low his unity was contented to descend, for the sake of inflicting one additional and ignoble

authority of the historian Socrates) was the direct imposition of a tax on all who refused to sacrifice to the Gods of the Empire.

Considering that the reign of Julian lasted not two years, we must admit that, while he developed a perfect knowledge of the theory of persecution, he made very rapid progress in the practice of it; and had he been suffered by Providence much longer to persist in his aggression, with proportionate increase of severity, it is probable that the final triumph of Christianity would not otherwise have been achieved than by the means of a religious war. But the provinces of the civilized world were saved from that severest infliction by the death of the Emperor.

As Julian was either too sincere a religionist, or at least too wise a politician, to wish to deprive his subjects of all religion, he accompanied his labours for the subversion of Christianity by some judicious attempts to render paganism more durable; but this scheme could scarcely have hoped for any great success, even had it been undertaken at an earlier period, when the vices of that religion had been less openly exposed and acknowledged; when its shrines were less generally deserted; and when the mere moral superiority of its rival was less manifestly and notoriously exhibited. He appears to have directed his exertions to three points,—viz.: 1. To conceal or disguise the absurdity of its origin and nature by moral and philosophical allegories; 2. To establish ecclesiastical discipline and policy on the model of the Christian church; 3. To correct the morals of the priesthood.

For the first of these purposes he found materials already provided by the philosophers of his own sect, the Platonists; who had been employed, especially since the appearance of Christianity, in refining the theology of paganism. In pursuance of the second, he planned an establishment for readers in that theology; for the order and parts of the divine office; for a regular and formal service, with days and hours of worship; and with respect to the third, he enjoined to the priesthood, (whom he seemingly would have established as a separate order,) as well as to their household, great severity of personal behaviour, and strictly to withhold themselves from all vulgar amusements and ignoble professions. While he imitated the discipline of the Church he was willing also to emulate her moral excellencies; and therefore he decreed the foundation of hospitals and other charitable institutions, and particularly recommended to the ministers of religion the virtues of charity and benevolence. He did not live to complete, or probably to mature, these designs; but the above sketch is sufficient to prove the extent of the beneficial influence which Christianity had already exerted, even over those who were not persuaded of its truth; and to show that the only art by which its formidable adversary could affect to supplant it, was by an ungraceful endeavour to resemble it.

But Julian, with all his authority and address, could scarcely hope to substitute that which was known to be a shadow, for that which was believed to be real and substantial. It therefore became necessary for his design to overthrow the foundations on which Christianity rested, or at least to disclose their weakness. One of the most important and influential of these was the accomplishment of so many ancient prophecies, tending, as it were, to a common centre, to the establish-

*Attempt to rebuild
the Temple of
Jerusalem.*

wound. He commanded by edict (*νομοθεσίῃς*) that Christians should no longer be called Christians, but Galileans. There was some art in this attack; for the value of a name, which is every where of some influence, has especial importance among orientals.

ment of its truth. Among those prophecies, there was no one which excited such general admiration, and so strangely perplexed the unbelieving, as that which related to the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem; not only as it had been once and signally fulfilled by the arms of Titus, but as the consequent dispersion of the nation and abolition of the law had already continued for nearly three hundred years to be a subject of appeal and triumphant argument with the defenders of Revelation. Julian doubtless perceived that if he could remove that ground of faith, many would be persuaded that the ancient Books of the Christians had no better title to divine inspiration than the Homeric rhapsodies, or the Orphic hymns; and that the exclusive claim to TRUTH, which distinguished the religion from every superstition, had in fact no solid foundation. We can scarcely be mistaken in considering this to have been his leading object, when, in the year 363, he undertook to rebuild the Temple.

This was indeed to attack Christianity on the only ground on which any lasting advantage could be obtained, or on which its overthrow could possibly have been effected. The persecution of its professors was certain to terminate in a re-action favourable to them; the reform and adornment of paganism was only a ridiculous and contemptible mockery; but the falsification of one prophecy would have reduced the worship of Christ, as far as its origin was concerned, to a level with that of Jove: so that we need not wonder at the ardour with which its adversaries engaged in this attempt, at the suspicion with which some wavering Christians beheld it, at the joy of anticipated triumph which it excited in true believers*.

The historical facts are simply these:—the work was undertaken with some parade, under the superintendence of Alypius, an officer of rank and reputation, a pagan, and a personal friend of the Emperor; and the workmen were proceeding to clear away the ruins, and lay bare the old foundations, when an earthquake and tempest, accompanied by fire from below, and a strange appearance in the heavens, tore the foundations asunder, destroyed or dispersed those engaged in the labour, and consumed the materials; and this, it clearly appears, not once only, but on repeated attempts. Many of those who survived bore about with them lasting marks of fire, and the work was immediately suspended, and never afterwards renewed. These facts are the result of the combined evidence of four contemporary authors,† one of whom, Ammianus Marcellinus, was a

* Twice previously, during the reigns of Adrian and Constantine, the Jews had expressed a disposition to rebuild the Temple with their own hands; but the Imperial permission was withheld from political causes in the first instance, and from religious, or from both, in the second.

† Ammian. Marc., lib. xxiii., c. i. Ambrose, Epist. xi., t. ii. Chrysostom adv. Jud. et Gentiles. Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. iv. adv. Julian. The passage of Ammianus at least requires insertion; and we should observe, that *alone* it does not go to the full extent of the account which we have given. ‘*Diligentiam ubique dividens imperique sui memoriam magnitudine operum gestiens propagare, ambitiosum quoddam apud Hierosolymam Templum, quod post multa et interneciva certamina obsidente Vespasiano posteaque Tito agrè est expugnatum, instaurare sumptibus cogitabat immodicis; negotiumque maturandum Alypio dedit Antiochensi, qui olim Britannias curaverat pro præfectis. Cum itaque rei idem fortiter instaret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ Rector, metuendi globi flammarum propè fundamenta crebris adsultibus erumpentes fecere locum exustis aliquoties operantibus inaccessum; hocque modo elemento destinatus repellente cessavit inceptum.*’ The epistle of Ambrose is addressed to the Emperor Theodosius, and Chrysostom was not far distant from the spot when the event took place. Both these writers speak of it with brevity as notorious, and undisputed. But Gregory enters into more detail; and, besides the circumstances mentioned in the text, relates a miraculous closing of the doors of a church in

pagan, a zealous admirer of the Emperor, and resident with his master at Antioch when the event took place. To the circumstances above narrated others of a more extraordinary nature were at different periods* appended, some of which are indeed consistent with physical probability, but others are manifestly the superstitious exaggerations of later ages. The truth of the outline which we have given cannot reasonably be contested, nor is it at all affected by some variations in the details, implying diversity, but no contradiction.

But, though the facts be undisputed, the question has still been moved and argued with much ingenuity, whether the convulsion in question was a phenomenon merely natural, or occasioned by divine interposition; and as that question is usually proposed, the fairest method of stating it appears to be this. In a very critical period of the history of Christianity, the highest earthly authority, having declared against it, proceeded to apply the severest test, not only to the constancy of its professors, but to the truth of the faith itself; (and in this respect the attempt of Julian differs in character from those of any preceding persecutor.) The trial was made in the most public manner, in the very birth-place of the religion, in the eyes of the whole civilized world; and as the world was still divided (and perhaps not very unequally divided) between the rival religions, the result would be necessarily expected with attentive anxiety by the votaries of both. Under these circumstances Julian undertook to falsify the prophecies of God, and thus most assuredly to overthrow the belief which rested on them. Again, the mountain on which the Temple of Jerusalem had stood was not so constituted, as either from its frame or situation to be probably the scene of a natural eruption; history speaks but of one other commotion, confined particularly to that hill, which took place at another critical conjuncture, the moment of the Crucifixion; and from the days of Julian to this time, the convulsion has not ever been repeated. It remains then for us to consider, whether it be less improbable, that God should have interposed for the confirmation of his religion at the moment when its truth was put to a most public and insulting proof; than, that a mountain hitherto quiescent, and ever since so, should have undergone a natural convulsion, and thrown forth destructive fire from physical causes, at that very crisis (and at that crisis only) when the test was applied, and the insult offered; that the eruption should have been confined to the particular spot in question; that it should have continued as long as the attempts were repeated; and that it should have ceased, when they ceased, when its seeming purpose was effected, for ever: and thus we might fairly leave it to any unprejudiced mind to decide, whether such a concurrence of fortuitous circumstances *at such a conjuncture* were more or less credible than a miracle.

But the question is not yet exhausted; a very plausible explanation of the phenomenon has been recently published, and received with an attention, of which, perhaps, it is not undeserving†. The greater part of the city of Jerusalem was undermined by very extensive subterranean vaults

which the workmen would have taken refuge, and the impression of the figure of the Cross on the dress and persons of those present. This last phenomenon is very ingeniously, and even probably explained by Warburton,

* The miracle is related about half a century afterwards, with the addition of various particulars, by Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodorit.

† It appears to have been first proposed by Michaelis, quoted by Guizot in his translation of Gibbon's History. It is very reasonably treated by the judicious writer in the Encyclop. Metropol. (Life of Julianus,) and still more lately has been adopted, with too little hesitation or comment, by the author of 'The History of the Jews.'

and passages*, which were used as cisterns, or magazines, or places of refuge, or sepulchres, according to political circumstances, or their own form and situation. We learn that the cisterns alone furnished water during the siege to the eleven hundred thousand inhabitants, for whom the fountain of Siloa was insufficient; and we find, that when resistance became hopeless, the most active among the insurgents formed the project of secreting themselves in those recesses until the Romans should have evacuated the city. Some remains of such excavations may still be observed both in the city and in the adjacent mountains. Now it may reasonably be supposed, that during the long period of desolation which intervened between Titus and Julian, those vast caverns, being obstructed by rubbish and ruins, would remain untenanted, and probably unexplored; and thus the workmen of Alypius, when they proceeded with torches to examine and penetrate the gloomy labyrinths, might be terrified, and expelled by frequent explosions of inflammable air. On a spot singularly congenial to superstitious apprehensions, under circumstances peculiarly calculated to awaken and encourage them, such natural detonations might readily be ascribed, even by some of those who witnessed them, to extraordinary interposition; and certainly the multitude of the Christians who heard the story, being as familiar with miraculous tales as they were ignorant of the mysteries of nature, would receive it unhesitatingly, as an especial proof of divine protection. Such might naturally be the case; and suspicious as we should always be of any attempt to substitute plausible conjecture for facts historically proved, how marvellous soever their character, we are not prepared to reject the above explanation, though by no means impatient to embrace it. At least we should observe, that, if it satisfies the description of Ammianus, it is not applicable to some of the circumstances mentioned by the Christian authorities; so that these must be condemned and sacrificed to it, and our belief entirely confined to the pagan account; and even then it will remain with many a matter of wonder, that Alypius, a dignified and enlightened pagan, assisted by the presence of the Governor of the province, and acting almost under the eyes of the Emperor himself, should have finally abandoned a project esteemed by his master of immense importance, through a fortuitous impediment, of which the cause could scarcely be concealed from him, or the facility of overcoming it. And after all, it will remain at least questionable, whether the gases generated in those caverns were not of a nature more likely to extinguish, than to produce, combustion.

A few months after this event Julian was killed in battle; and the succession of Christian Emperors was then restored, and never afterwards disturbed. Henceforward the advance of religion upon the receding ranks of paganism encountered little resistance, and was conducted with singular rapidity; still we do not observe in the religious policy of the immediate successors of Julian any violent disposition to direct the pursuit.

Valentinian I. placed his pride in the most impartial and universal toleration. We may have observed indeed that some of the pagan Emperors commenced with the same professions a reign which ended in persecution; and we have seen that both Constantine and Julian hastened to deviate from the generous principles which they first proclaimed. But Valentinian is scarcely, if at all, liable to this reproach; and though in other matters he was guilty of some passionate exertions of unnecessary severity, and though he neglected to restrain the Arian intolerance of his brother Valens, which afflicted the Catholics in the East, he appears himself to have main-

* See Tacit. v. 12. Dio, 66, p. 747, Josephus, Bell. Jud. vii. 2., and Antiq. Jud. xv. c. xi, sect. 7.

tained throughout the whole Western empire a perfect civil equality, as well between the religions which divided it, as among the sects of each religion*.

The short reign of Gratian, which likewise commenced with great professions of moderation, was rather remarkable for some laws against heretics, than for any deliberate attack on paganism. Nevertheless that worship was unable to survive the political patronage by which alone it had so long subsisted; it seemed to have lost its only principle of existence as soon as it ceased to form a part of the system of Government†; left to its own energies it discovered the secret of its decrepitude, and so easy and uninterrupted was the process of its dissolution, that it seemed patiently to await the final blow from any hand disposed to inflict it.

Theodosius I. is the Emperor to whom that achievement is usually, and, if to any individual, justly, attributed. He ascended the throne in the year 379, but he does not appear to have published his famous law until thirteen years afterwards. It was to this effect—‘that no one, of whatever rank or dignity or fortune, whether hereditary or acquired, high or humble, in what place or city soever he may dwell, shall either slay a victim to senseless images; or, while he addresses in private expiation the Lar, the Genius and the Penates, with fire, or wine, or odours, light torches, or burn incense, or suspend garlands in their honour; but if any one shall immolate a victim in sacrifice, or consult the panting entrails, that any man may become his informer, until he receive competent punishment, &c. &c.’ The execution of this law, and of others to the same effect, was no doubt much facilitated by the zeal of Christian informers; and there could be few who would suffer martyrdom for a religion‡, which, as it rested on no evidence, could offer no certainty of recompense; and, therefore, the consequence of the Edict of Theodosius was a vast diminution in the number of professed Polytheists. This change was most immediately perceptible in the principal cities of the empire, throughout which the superstition for the most part disappeared; thenceforward it was chiefly confined to the small towns and villages (or *pagi*); and about that time it was that the name *Pagan* (or Rustic, Villager) was first adopted to designate those who adhered to Polytheism.

The prohibitions contained in the above edict are impartially levelled against every condition of heathen; yet their weight and efficacy must clearly have fallen upon the lower classes: for among the higher and better informed, though there might be many who had not yet embraced Chris-

* ‘Inclaruit hoc moderamine principatus quod inter religionum diversitates medius stetit, nec quenquam inquietavit, neque ut hoc coleretur imperavit, aut illud; nec interdictis minacibus subjectorum cervicem ad id quod ipse coluit inclinabat, sed intemeratas reliquit has partes, ut reperit.’—Ammianus Marcellinus. Was there any Emperor of those days (if we except the short rule of Jovian) who can share this honour with Valentinian?

† We may remark that by some of the earliest laws against paganism Divination was permitted, while Magic was forbidden; because the former was a public ceremony, instrumental for political purposes, while the latter was the private and individual exercise of a similar description of art. The object of both was superstitious deception, but the Government would not permit the people to be deceived except by itself.

‡ The bold resistance of an officer of high rank and character, named Genadius, to a very impolitic edict of Honorius, has been produced as a solitary instance even of the disposition to suffer in the cause of paganism. Honorius had forbidden any except Christians to wear a girdle or sash at court, and Genadius in consequence declined to present himself there. The Emperor then expressed himself willing to make a particular exception in favour of an officer who was at the moment necessary to him, but Genadius refused that distinction, and persevered in his opposition so resolutely, that the Emperor finally repealed the invidious law. See Zosimus, lib. v.

tianity, there could at that time have been extremely few, who either felt or affected any ardent attachment to a worship which professed no moral principles, and offered no temporal advantages*. The vulgar persevered in it somewhat longer, from habit, from prejudice, and from ignorance; but these motives were not sufficient long to sustain them against the laws of the empire, and the authority of their superiors, and the example of their neighbours, all combining to propagate a more excellent and more reasonable faith.

But we are not to imagine that the number of real converts to Christianity was at all in proportion to that of the seceders from paganism; for persons who are forced out of any sort of faith will not readily throw themselves into the arms of that whence the compulsion has proceeded. However, time and patience might have remedied this disinclination, and led those converts (or at least the succeeding generation) to a sincere affection for a pure religion, if the purity of that religion had not been already corrupted by the intemperate zeal of its own professors.

We have noticed indeed certain abuses which had already shewn themselves even in the iron days of Christianity, and there are others yet unnoticed by us, of which the earliest vestiges and indications may probably be discovered in the practice of the ante-Nicene Church, or in the writings of its Fathers; but among these idolatry certainly is not one. The ancient Christians continued to shun with a pious horror, which persecution exasperated, and which time did not mitigate, every approach to that abomination; and while they truly considered it essentially and distinctively pagan, the reluctance which they felt to bow before any image was aggravated by the firm belief, that the images of the Pagans represented the implacable adversaries of man and God. So definite and so broad was the space which in this point at least separated the two religions, that it seemed impossible that either of them should overstep it, or that any compromise could ever be effected between principles so fundamentally hostile. Yet the contrary result took place: and a reconciliation, which in the beginning of the fourth century could not easily have been imagined, was virtually accomplished before its termination.

Let us trace the progress of this extraordinary revolution. On the first establishment of their religion, it was natural that
Veneration for Christians should look back from a condition of unexpected
Martyrs. security on the sufferings of their immediate predecessors, with the most vivid sentiments of sympathy and admiration. They had beheld those sufferings, they had beheld the constancy with which they were endured; the same terror had been suspended over themselves, and their own preservation they attributed, under the especial protection of divine Providence, to the perseverance of those who had perished. The gratitude and veneration thus fervently excited were loudly and passionately expressed; and the honours which were due to the virtues of the departed were profusely bestowed on their names and their memory. Enthusiasm easily passed into superstition, and those who had sealed a Christian's faith by a martyr's death were exalted above the condition of men, and enthroned among superior beings. Superstition

* A celebrated pagan, Libanius, published even in this age an apology for his religion. His work was not suppressed, nor himself removed from one of the most important offices in the state, which he then held. While the Emperor was engaged in destroying the practice of paganism, he might easily accord to a favourite subject the innocent indulgence of writing its defence; for he knew that it was not by reason but by habit that the worship would subsist, if it could possibly subsist at all.

gave birth to credulity, and those who sat among the Powers of heaven might sustain, by miraculous assistance, their votaries on earth; and credulity increased the food on which it fed, by encouraging the detested practice of forgery and imposture. Under these dangerous circumstances it became the duty of the fathers and the leading ministers of the Church to moderate the violence of popular feeling, and to restrain any tendency towards vicious excess. But, unhappily for the integrity of the Catholic faith, the instructors were themselves carried away by the current, or, we should rather say, united their exertions to swell and corrupt it. The people we may excuse and compassionate: but we blush when we discover the most distinguished writers of the fourth century, Athanasius, Eusebius the historian, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustin, engaged in shameful conspiracy against their religion, while they exaggerate the merit of the martyrs, assert or insinuate their immediate sanctification, and claim for them a sort of reverence which could not easily be distinguished from worship. In this age, and from this cause, arose the stupid veneration for bones and relics; it was inculcated and believed that prayer was never so surely efficacious as when offered at the tomb of some saint or holy person; the number of such tombs was then multiplied; at all of them miracles, and prophecies, and prodigies, and visions, were exhibited or recorded; and the spirit of the Gospel was forgotten in the practice of forbidden ceremonies, and the belief of impious fables.

Such were the first unworthy advances which were made by Christianity, and encouraged by her leading ministers, with the view to reconcile at least her external differences with paganism*; and, no doubt, they were very effectual in alluring those easy Polytheists, whose piety was satisfied with numerous festivals in celebration of the exploits of mortals deified; for with them the change was only in the name of the deity, not in the principles of the religion. And by this shameful compromise † the Church was filled by numerous converts, who believed, and who were probably taught to believe, that the worship which they had deserted was by no means essentially dissimilar from that which they had embraced, and who continued, after their admission, to perpetuate and exaggerate those corruptions by which alone the resemblance was created.

Here then we discover the root of several of the abuses of Papacy; they were concessions made during this critical period to the genius of paganism, in order to delude its votaries into more speedy apostacy, and to accelerate the dissolution of the one religion into the other. The immediate object was accomplished—to diminish the numerical display of Polytheism, and prematurely to crowd the churches and processions with

* In the year 410, Synesius, a Platonic philosopher of Cyrene, was ordained Bishop of Ptolemais by Theophilus of Alexandria. Synesius remonstrated against this election, declared himself to be a Platonist, and specified several points in which his speculative opinions differed from those of the Christians. But as he was an agreeable orator, and had much influence in the province, his objections were overlooked, and after receiving baptism he entered upon his episcopal functions. This is far from being the only instance of the pliancy of the early Church, at a period too when it had no excuse from fear or persecution.

† It must be observed that the Pagans on their side made the concession of sacrifice, or at least of immolation, which was the centre of their whole system. They were indulged with a sort of Polytheism of saints and martyrs; and even sensible objects of worship were not withheld from them. But these Beings and Images were to be approached only with prayer and supplication; and if it was presently found expedient to permit offerings to be made to them, their shrines were never contaminated by the blood of victims.

nominal Christians; and this was merely to anticipate the tardy but certain operation of irresistible causes, and to effect that in appearance, which in the next generation would have been surely consummated. But the lasting result has been to darken and disfigure the features of Christianity, not in one race only, or for one age, but through a period, of which fourteen centuries have already been accomplished, and of which we cannot yet foresee the termination.

Arcadius and Honorius succeeded respectively to the thrones of the East and West, and they followed the steps of Theodosius in his warfare against heresy as well as paganism. Arcadius was more distinguished in the former contest, though he proceeded to some extremities against the

Abolition of Gladiatorial Games.

temples and idols of Phœnicia. Honorius is more honourably celebrated by the law which abolished the Gladiatorial Games. This institution, the most barbarous that ever disgraced a civilized nation, was the genuine offspring of the character and morals of pagan antiquity; and it was supported through the extinction of human feeling, and the contempt of human life. It was not suppressed until the year 404, or about ninety years after the first establishment of Christianity—so slow is the influence of the most perfect moral system to undermine any practice which time and use have consecrated. But at length it sank before the gradual prevalence of happier and more natural principles; and while we record its subversion, as marking an important epoch in the history of human civilization, we readily assign to it a corresponding rank in the annals of Christianity.

Theodosius the younger succeeded Arcadius in the empire of the East; and we may consider him as having completed, as far as the limits of his authority extended, the task transmitted to him by his father, and his grandfather. And whether from greater moderation of temper, or because extreme rigour was judged no longer necessary against a fallen adversary, he somewhat mitigated the severity of the existing laws; and was satisfied with inflicting upon the few, who still persisted 'in their accursed sacrifices to dæmons,' the milder punishments of confiscation and exile, 'though the crime was justly capital*.' From the flexible character of Polytheism, and the rare mention of heathen martyrs, we are perhaps justified in drawing the consoling conclusion, that those oppressive laws were seldom enforced to the last penalty. Yet we cannot doubt that many less direct, but not less effectual, modes of persecution were diligently exercised; we are assured that numbers must have suffered in their persons or property for a blind but conscientious adherence to the worship of their fathers; and we should have celebrated with greater satisfaction the final success of our religion, if it had been brought about by less questionable measures.

In the West, the expiring struggles of paganism continued perhaps a little longer. Though the exhibition of gladiators had been abolished, the games of the Circus, and the contests of wild beasts were still permitted; and though the essence of the pagan religion was virtually extinguished, when the act of *Immolation*, in which in truth it consisted, was finally abolished, yet those spectacles were so closely associated with its exercise, if they were not rather a part of it, that they served at least to keep the minds of the converts suspended, by seeming to reconcile with

* The Theodosian code is a Collection of the Constitutions of the Emperors from Constantine to Theodosius II., published by the latter in 438.

the principles of Christianity the barbarous relics of the old superstition. And thus, though the number who professed that worship was now exceedingly small, yet its practice in some measure survived its profession, and it continued to linger in the recollections, and usages, and prejudices, of men for some time after its name was disclaimed and repudiated; still, from the historical survey of this subject, it is manifest that the mortal wound was inflicted by Theodosius I.; and whatever fleeting vestiges we may discover in succeeding reigns, the superstition was in fact extinct from the moment that the Emperor called upon the Senate of Rome to make their election between that and Christianity. This celebrated assembly was convened in the year 388; Christianity was established by the voice, and probably by the conscience of a very large majority; and the religion of Julian did not in reality survive its enthusiastic votary and reformer for more than twenty-five years.

NOTE ON CERTAIN PAGAN WRITERS.

I.—The first whom we propose to mention (first in time and personal distinction rather than in literary merit) is *Julian*. His ‘Lives of the Emperors,’ his predecessors, in which we find many pointed remarks and illustrations of their several characters, and especially of their defects, though possessing neither the fulness nor impartiality of history, must nevertheless be considered his most important work. That next in celebrity bears the singular name of the Misopogon or Beardhater. The imperial satirist seems to have been excited to this composition by the appearance of certain anapæsts, published in ridicule of his personal rusticity, among his lively subjects of Antioch or Daphne. He admits the justice of their ridicule, he affects even to exaggerate the cause of it, and condescends to visit his own shaggy exterior with much humorous severity. But through the levity of his self-condemnation some traces of suppressed asperity are occasionally discernible; and the wit which had dared to trifle with an Emperor was not recommended to Julian by the general belief that it had proceeded from the pen of a Christian. Besides these two works, several epistles and rescripts are extant which are of greater historical importance.

That Julian’s feeling towards the Christians was not the contempt of a philosopher, but the angry malevolence of a pagan and a rival, appears from several passages in his works, and from those especially which are directed against Athanasius. In his epistle to Eclicius, Eparch of the Egyptians, we find these passionate expressions,—‘I swear by the great Serapis that unless Athanasius, the enemy of the Gods, shall be wholly expelled from Egypt before the calends of December, I will impose a fine of a hundred pounds of gold on the troops under your command; and you know that if I am slow to condemn, I am still more so to relax the sentence; for it does exceedingly afflict me, that all the Gods should be contemned through his means; nor is there anything that I would so willingly behold or hear of as accomplished by you, as the expulsion of Athanasius from the regions of Egypt; the scoundrel who has dared, and in my reign too, to persecute some distinguished Grecian ladies, till they submitted to baptism.’ Again, in a decree addressed to the Alexandrians, the Emperor declares, ‘that he had recalled the Galilæans, who had been banished by Constantius,* not to their churches, but

* In a very kind epistle to Ætius, a celebrated Arian Bishop, and formerly his friend, Julian mentions the same fact.

only to their countries; while I understand (he adds) that Athanasius, with the extreme insolence and audacity which is characteristic of him, has taken possession of what they call the episcopal throne.' He then decrees his exile. In a subsequent letter, (Edit. Par. p. 330.) addressed to the same people, he expresses his hatred both of the persons and doctrines of the Galilæans in the most powerful and passionate language. On the other hand he acknowledges, in more than one passage, the charitable attention which those same Galilæans bestowed upon the poor, and ascribes much of their success to that virtue; and the general spirit of his instructions respecting their treatment, while it enjoins a preference to the worshippers of the Gods,* decidedly discourages unprovoked † severities against the persons of 'the Atheists.'

A passage in the Misopogon proves either the abject superstitiousness of the author, or his impudent and prejudiced hypocrisy; and though we believe the former to be the more probable charge, we are willing to leave the decision to his most devoted admirers. The story is well known of the religious disappointment which he experienced at Daphne; how he entered the Temple with extraordinary parade and solemnity, for the purpose of presiding at a public and splendid sacrifice, and how he was reduced by the universal desertion of the votaries of the Gods to the performance of an imperfect, and almost solitary act of devotion. In his relation of this story, in which his angry embarrassment is almost ludicrously depicted, he unreservedly asserts, and invokes the Sun to attest his veracity, that at the moment of his entrance into the Temple the statue of the God indicated to him what was to take place ‡.

His celebrated Epistle respecting the reformation of Paganism is addressed to Arcadius, the chief priest of Galatia; it is the most remarkable monument of the religious policy of Julian, and it is also an evidence of the great and general influence which Christian principles had acquired even over the conduct of unbelievers. The progress of 'impiety or Atheism' is ascribed by the Emperor chiefly to three causes: to the charitable or hospitable philanthropy of its professors; to their provident care respecting the sepulture of the dead; to their parade and affectation of a holy life; and he enjoins the votaries of the ancient worship to imitate the first of these pretensions, and to realize the last. On the priests especially, as well as their families and their servants, he imposes a rigid attention to their religious duties, and he forbids them at the same time the amusement of the theatre, the conviviality of the tavern, and the exercise of every vulgar profession; the disobedient are to be removed from the ministry. The Emperor then proceeds to order the foundation of numerous establishments (*Ξενοδοχεία*) in every city, for the humane purpose of hospitality and charity: 'for it is shameful to us, that no beggar should be found among the Jews, and that the impious Galilæans should support not only *their own poor, but ours also*; while these last appear destitute of all assistance from ourselves;' and that pagan authority may not be thought wanting to

* Προτιμᾶσθαι μιν τοὺς θεοσεβεῖς καὶ πανόφημι δειν. Epistle to Astabius.

† He seems however very readily to have availed himself of the offences of the Christians, in order to plunder them, and that too with great religious impartiality. In an epistle to Ecebolus he complains that the Arians of Edessa, exulting in their opulence, had made an assault upon the Valentinians; and he adds, 'that with a view to assist them in effectuating the instructions of their own admirable law, and that they might more easily travel to the kingdom of Heaven, he had ordered all the possessions to be taken away from the Church of Edessa; distributing the money among the soldiers, and confiscating the fixed property.'

‡ Επιστήμην μοι εἰσελθόντι πρώτον τὸ ἄγαλμα, p. 112. Ed. Paris.

justify his philanthropy, he cites a passage from Homer in praise of hospitality. He concludes with some instructions to regulate the intercourse and define the respective dignities of the religious and civil authorities.

2. The name of *Ammianus Marcellinus* deserves even at the hands of the ecclesiastical historian more elaborate mention than can here be bestowed upon it. A native of Antioch, of noble family, he devoted his youth to military service, and attended Julian, his patron and friend, in his fatal expedition against the Persians. During the reign of Valentinian and Valens he appears to have withdrawn to studious repose in his native city, and under Theodosius he finally fixed his residence at Rome. It was here that he composed his history in the Latin language, and published it with the general applause of a people among whom the admiration of literary merit had survived its possession. The work consisted of thirty-one books, comprising the affairs of the empire from the beginning of the reign of Nerva to the end of that of Valens. The thirteen first are lost, and those remaining have escaped to us as from a shipwreck, torn and mutilated*. Respecting the religion of the author, there can be no serious doubt that he adhered to paganism; though the impartiality with which he commonly treats the deeds and character of Christians has led some writers to suspect his attachment to their faith. The suspicion is at least honourable to the historian, and a more faithful imitation of his example would have removed many stains from the pages of ecclesiastical annalists, and spared much perplexity to those who search them for information and truth.

3. The History of *Zosimus* extends from the time of Augustus to the second siege of Rome by Alaric: it consists of five books, and the fragment of a sixth, into the first of which the reigns of the predecessors of Constantine are compressed. *Zosimus* was a prejudiced, and, as some miraculous descriptions attest, a superstitious pagan; and he treats with severity, perhaps with injustice, the character of some of the Christian Emperors †; but as by far the greatest proportion of his attention is bestowed on the details of military enterprise, it is not often that he crosses the more peaceful path of the ecclesiastical historian.

CHAPTER IX.

From the Fall of Paganism to the Death of Justinian. (348 . . . 567.)

Conversion of the Goths—of Clovis and the Franks—of other Barbarians—causes of its facility—Miraculous interpositions—Internal condition of the Church—Symeon and the Stylites—Pope Leo the Great—Papal aggrandisement—private confession—Justinian, his orthodoxy, intolerance, and heresy—Literature—its decay not attributable to Christianity—three periods of its decline—Religious corruptions—Barbarian conquests—Seven liberal arts—Justinian closes the Schools of Athens—early connection of Philosophy with Religion—Morality—of the Clergy—of the People—general misery—Note on certain Fathers of the fourth and fifth Centuries.

THAT we may treat with some perspicuity the long period over which the two following chapters are extended, we shall separate in each of them

* See the life of *Ammianus Marcellinus* by *Valesius*, which we have chiefly followed in this account.

† Julian is his great hero, and Constantine the principal object of his censure. Respecting the latter, it has been observed, that we may safely believe any evil that has escaped from *Eusebius*, and any good that has been extorted from *Zosimus*. But these combined would furnish very scanty materials for the delineation of a great character. We must believe much more than these; and in this matter the panegyrics of the Christian are not, perhaps, more liable to suspicion than the aspersions of the pagan writer.

the external progress and reverses of Christianity from the internal conduct and condition of the Church, and the character of those who ruled and influenced it.

I. Christianity had scarcely completed its triumph over an ancient superstition, refined and embellished by the utmost human ingenuity, when it was called upon to dispute the possession of the world with a wild and savage adversary.

Conversion of the Barbarians. Almost at the very moment when Julian was labouring for the re-establishment of paganism, Ulphilas*, who is commonly called the apostle of the Goths, was diffusing the knowledge of the Gospel with great rapidity among that young and powerful people: so that the first invaders of the empire had previously learnt in their own land to profess, or at least to respect, the religion of the empire. The Goths then were early and easy proselytes to Christianity; and the example of their conversion, as well as of their invasion, was followed by the various hordes of barbarians who presently overran and occupied the West. The Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and others, as they successively possessed themselves of the Roman provinces, during the fifth and sixth centuries, successively adopted the religion of the conquered; and if Rome, in her days of warlike triumph, received from vanquished Greece some taste in arts, and attainment in science, and skill in philosophical disputation, she repaid her private obligation with more solid and extensive generosity in her days of decline, when she instructed her own conquerors in those lessons of religious truth and moral knowledge, of which the principles can never change, nor the application ever be limited.

It is impossible to trace with any certainty the exact moment and circumstances of the conversion of so many tribes. That of Clovis, King of the Franks, has obtained the greatest historical celebrity, and many of the particulars respecting it wear great appearance of probability†. In the year 493 Clovis espoused Clotilda, niece of the King of the Burgundians, a Christian and a Catholic. He tolerated the religion of his bride, and shewed respect to its professors, especially to St. Remi, Archbishop of Rheims; but he steadily refused to abandon his hereditary idols on the importunity either of the prelate or Queen. At length he found himself in a situation of danger; in the heat of an unsuccessful battle, while his Franks were flying before the Alemanni, Clovis is related to have raised his weeping eyes to heaven, and exclaimed, 'Jesus Christ! thou whom Clotilda asserts to be the Son of the living God, I implore thy succour. If thou wilt give me the victory, I will believe in thee, and be

* Ulphilas is believed to have been the descendant of a Cappadocian family carried into captivity by the Goths, in the reign of Gallienus. His conversion to Arianism is referred to his embassy to the court of Valens in 378, and on his return home he diligently diffused that heresy. It would appear, however, that his method of seduction was to assure the Goths, that the disputes between the Catholics and Arians were merely verbal, not at all affecting the substance of faith—so that his success was gradual, and at first imperfect: thus, for instance, in the time of Theodoret, the Goths avowed their belief, that the Father was greater than the Son; but they were not yet prepared to affirm that the Son was created—though they continued to communicate with those who held that opinion. Fleury, H. E. liv. xvii. sect. 36. Tillem. (Sur les Ariens, Art. 132, 133) pronounces an eulogy upon his virtues, in spite of his heresy; and yet he adds, 'Voilà comment un homme entraîna dans l'enfer ce nombre infini des Septentrionaux, qui avec lui et après lui ont embrassé l'Arianisme.'

† Those which we select, together with many others, are related on the authority of Gregory of Tours, and Hincm. Vita San. Remigii. See Fleury, liv. xxx. sect. 46.

baptized in thy name.' At that moment the King of the Alemanni was slain; his soldiers immediately fled, and abandoned the field to Clovis. The victor was not unmindful of the God of his adversity. On the conclusion of his expedition he caused himself to be publicly baptized; about three thousand of his soldiers attended him to the holy font with joy and acclamation, and the rest of his subjects followed without any hesitation the faith of their Prince. The conversion of Clovis took place in 496; and though it had not the effect of amending the brutal character of the proselyte, it made a great addition to the physical strength of Christianity;* and it was attended by a peculiar circumstance which places it among the important events of ecclesiastical history. The numerous barbarian conquerors who then ruled the Western Empire had embraced, without any exception,† the heresy of Arius; Clovis alone adopted the Catholic faith; and this accident (we are taught to attribute it to the orthodoxy of his wife) was probably the earliest cause of that close connection between the court of Burgundy and the See of Rome, of which some traces may be discerned even thus early, and which, in a later age, was confirmed by Pepin and established by Charlemagne.

The success of the Roman arms during the reign of Justinian, which began about thirty years after the baptism of Clovis, does not appear to have disinclined the barbarians to the religion of their enemies; it might even naturally produce the contrary effect; and we do not read of any of their tribes which, after settling in a conquered province, were disposed long to resist the influence of the Gospel.

Respecting the *natural* causes which facilitated this powerful accession to the body of Christianity from a quarter whence the darkest danger was portended, it is proper to suggest a few brief observations, that we may be enabled calmly to consider, whether or not they are sufficient to account for the phenomenon without the intervention of miraculous assistance. The wild and warlike polytheists of the north, who estimated excellence by power, and power by the extent of military sway, and who ignorantly applied to the gods the rules by which they judged of men, approached with respectful predisposition the Deity of the Roman empire.‡ And if it be true that their own successes gradually tended to abate this respect, yet is it not possible that they could fail to observe, or observe without some sense of reverence and humiliation, the superiority in arts and sciences, the high intellectual pre-eminence of the people whom their mere sword had overthrown; nor would they hesitate to infer, from such sensible indications, both the wisdom and beneficence of the protecting Divinity! Again—The form of idolatry which they professed was most peculiarly charac-

* Clovis, immediately after his baptism, made some considerable donations of land to St. Remi, who applied them to the use of divers churches, and the foundation of the Bishopric of Laon. Fleury, H. E. liv. xxx., sect. 46.

† Thrasamond, King of the Vandals, in Africa; Theodoric, of the Ostrogoths, in Italy; Alaric, of the Visigoths, in Spain; Gondebaud, of the Burgundians, were all Arians; and, as if to complete the heterodoxy of the princes of Christendom, even Anastasius, the Emperor of the East, was involved in the Eutychian heresy.

‡ The conversion of the Burgundians, early in the fifth century, is thus related, with no improbability. Harassed by the continual incursions of the Huns, and incapable of self-defence, they resolved to place themselves under the protection of some God; and considering that the God of the Romans most powerfully befriended those who served him, they determined, on public deliberation, to believe in Jesus Christ. They therefore went to a city in Gaul, and entreated the Bishop to baptize them. Immediately after that ceremony they gained a battle against their enemies; and if (as is also asserted) they afterwards lived in peace and innocence, they reaped, in that respect at least, the natural fruits of their conversion. Socrat. vii., chap. 30. Fleury, H. E. liv. xxiii., sect. 5.

terised by a superstitious veneration for their priesthood;—it had no written law, nor any fixed principles, nor any very attractive immemorial solemnities. In a foreign country, in the licence of a military expedition, the reverence for their native, and for the most part absent ministers, would gradually abate in fervency and fidelity; and then (such is the nature of superstition) it would change its object, and swell into devout respect for the ministers of the unknown religion, by whose more imposing rites they were now surrounded and dazzled. By this process being insensibly weaned from an ancient worship, chiefly perhaps endeared to them by its association with that home which they had now deserted for ever, they would join in the splendid processions, and bend in the stately temples of the Christians. Of such advantages as these the clergy were not slow to avail themselves; and their own great superiority in penetration and learning, joined with a zealous and interested activity*, enabled them to convert the mass of the invaders; while the Prince, as illiterate as his subjects, was often influenced by the address, and often by the piety, of the prelates who had access to his court. The same work was still further facilitated by the example of the Goths, who had opened the gates of Christianity to succeeding conquerors. Nor should we by any means pass over the exertions of the missionaries, who had previously introduced into the native forests of the invaders a favourable opinion, and even a partial profession, of the religion of the empire which they were destined to subvert.

These reasons are probably sufficient to account for the facility with which the various invaders of the western provinces adopted the religion which they found established there, even without any deep examination into its merits or its truth; but the histories of those times are so abundant in preternatural tales of extraordinary conversions everywhere wrought by the continual interposition of Providence, that we must not quite overlook this consideration. However, we can here entertain little doubt, or feel any strong hesitation to affirm, that the very great proportion of those miraculous stories is wholly and unquestionably fabulous†. But we must be careful that our indignation at the impiety which fabricated so many wicked impostures, and the diligent mendacity which has retained them, do not so far prevail as to hurry us into an entire disbelief of *any* divine intervention in those ages. To pronounce so sweeping a sentence, in the confusion of contemporary evidence, in our necessary ignorance of the dispositions of Providence, would approach too near

* At a Council held at Brague, or Braccara, in Portugal, in the year 412, on the irruption of an idolatrous or Arian host of Alani, Suevi and Vandals, the Bishops prepared themselves to resist at every risk the destructive torrent. For this purpose they appear to have adopted two measures, which, in their union at least, are strongly indicative of the state of religion in that age and country. The first was to publish an abbreviation of the Creed of the Catholic church; the second, to conceal in the securest recesses and caverns the invaluable relics of their saints. Fleury, H. E. lib. xxiii., sect. 6.

† Unbelievers and heretics were closely associated in the language and opinion of the Catholics of those days, and were consequently subjected to the same mode of cure. In the fourth century even the great St. Ambrose condescended to adopt the miraculous method of argument for the conversion of the Arians. He used, in his disputes with those heretics, to produce men possessed with devils, who, on the approach of certain Catholic relics, were obliged by preternatural compulsion to acknowledge with loud cries that the doctrine of the Council of Nice was true, and that of the Arians both false and of most dangerous consequence. This testimony of the Prince of darkness was regarded by St. Ambrose as unquestionable and conclusive (Mosh. c. iv., p. 2. c. 3.), nor was it easily answered by adversaries who made less profession of influence in the other world.

to presumption; and we shall, therefore, do better to leave this⁷ subject where the judicious moderation of Mosheim * has placed it:—

‘ How far these conversions (he says) were due to real miracles attending the ministry of those early preachers is a matter extremely difficult to be determined. For, though I am persuaded that those pious men who, in the midst of many dangers, and in the face of obstacles seemingly invincible, endeavoured to spread the light of Christianity through the barbarous nations, were sometimes accompanied by the more peculiar favour and succour of the Most High; yet I am equally convinced, that the greatest part of the prodigies recorded in the histories of this age are liable to the strongest suspicions of falsehood or imposture. The simplicity and ignorance of the generality in those times furnished the most favourable occasion for the exercise of fraud; and the impudence of impostors in contriving false miracles was artfully proportioned to the credulity of the vulgar, while the sagacious and the wise, who perceived these cheats, were obliged to silence, by the danger which threatened their lives and their fortunes, if they detected the artifice. Thus does it generally happen in human life, that when the discovery and profession of the truth is attended with danger, the prudent are silent, the multitude believe, and the impostors triumph.’

II. While the profession of Christianity was thus extending itself among so many nations, the changes which were gradually taking place within the Church were by no means favourable to its purity. We have already mentioned the copious transfusion of heathen ceremonies into the Christian worship which had taken place before the end of the fourth century, and, to a certain extent, paganized (if we may so express it) the outward form and aspect of religion; those ceremonies became more general and more numerous, and, so far as the calamities of the times would permit, more splendid in the age which followed. To console the convert for the loss of his favourite festival, others, of a different name, but similar description, were introduced; and the simple and serious occupation of spiritual devotion was beginning to degenerate into a worship of parade and demonstration, or a mere scene of riotous festivity. But, various were the forms assumed, and numerous the excesses occasioned, by religious corruption; which was by no other circumstance more plainly evidenced, or more effectually promoted, than by the growing prevalence of the monastic spirit.

It is contrary to our general purpose to call much attention to instances of the passing fanaticism of the day—those transient eruptions of superstition which have left no deep traces behind them in history or moral consequences; nevertheless, we cannot forbear to record one very extraordinary shape which the phrensy of those times* assumed. About the year 427, one Symeon, at first a shepherd, afterwards a monk, of Syria, invented a new method of penitential devotion. Dissatisfied with the insufficient austerities which were practised in his convent, he retired to a mountain in the neighbourhood of Antioch, where, by solitary self-inflictions and extreme abstinence, he obtained great provincial celebrity; but his piety or his ambition were not thus easily contented, and accordingly he devised an original and more difficult path to sanctity. He caused a pillar to be erected, of which the height was gradually increased from nine to sixty feet; thereon he established his resi-

*Symeon the
Stylite.*

* Cent. v., p. 1., c. 1.

dence. His ordinary occupation was prayer; and habit and exercise enabled him to take, without risk or difficulty, the different postures of devotion. Sometimes, especially on great solemnities, he assumed an erect attitude, with his arms outstretched; sometimes he bent forward his body, attenuated by continual fasting, till the forehead touched the feet; and he repeated those inclinations with marvellous flexibility*. He passed the whole night and a part of the morning in worship; one slender meal in the course of a week sufficed for his sustenance, and a coarse vestment of skin, which wrapt his whole body, was his only covering: in this situation he endured the returning inclemencies of thirty seasons, and at length died, without descending from his column.

It is no matter of reasonable astonishment that the passionate enthusiasts of the east thronged eagerly round the pillar of Symeon from the most remote provinces, and regarded the self-devoted martyr with feelings partaking of adoration. Nor are we, in any degree, surprised to read, that he converted to Christianity the inhabitants of Libanus and Antilibanus, and an entire tribe of Arabs, together with several Jews and heretics, by miraculous aid and operation. Nor, perhaps, have we cause to think it strange that this popular fanaticism was rather encouraged than disclaimed by the Church†; and that it has descended to posterity without any ecclesiastical stigma of schism or heresy. But our amazement is reasonably excited, when we learn that Theodosius II. seriously consulted Symeon the Stylite on the most important concerns of Church and State‡; and that the Emperor Leo particularly solicited his advice respecting the Council of Chalcedon—whether those princes really shared the popular madness, and considered him as a soothsayer or prophet, to whom bodily mortification, and a loftier residence had disclosed a nearer prospect of the secrets of futurity; or whether they were only willing to gain credit with the silliest among their subjects by encouraging their most absurd superstition. However this may be, Symeon became the founder of a sect of fanatics called ‘Stylites’ (or Pillar-men); who, under the names of ‘Holy Birds’ and ‘Aërial Martyrs,’ peopled the columns of the east; and, after imitating (so far as their physical powers permitted them) the ascetic gesticulations of their master, have escaped, in more fortunate oblivion, the sinister celebrity which still attends his name.

We have now traced the history of the Roman See to the middle of the fifth century, and our attention has not hitherto been arrested by the genius or the fortune of any individual who has occupied it. We have no cause

* ‘A curious spectator (says Gibbon), after numbering 1244 repetitions, at length desisted from the endless account.’ Theodorit, who had frequently seen and conversed with him, wrote an account of his life during its continuance. That author himself entertained some doubts as to the credibility of his narration: ‘although (says he) I have for my witnesses, if I may so express myself, every man in existence, yet I fear that to posterity my account may appear a groundless fable; for what is passing here is above humanity, and men are wont to proportion their belief to the powers of nature, and all which surpasses those boundaries appears falsehood to such as are not familiar with things divine.’ See Fleury, liv. xxix., sect. 9.

† It is true that when Symeon first ascended his pillar some opposition was made to the *innovation* by some monasteries both of Syria and Egypt; but as their objections were confined to the novelty of the scheme, and did not proceed from its absurdity, they speedily disappeared, and Symeon was restored with unanimity to the bosom of the Catholic church.

‡ Gibbon, chap. xxxvii. Fleury, liv. xxix., sect. 9. The Emperor Marcian is also said to have indulged his curiosity by a secret visit to the Holy Pillar, in the throng of his miserable subjects.

to lament this circumstance. The truly episcopal duties of devotion and charity are usually performed in silent unobtrusiveness; and the highest interests, and the truest happiness of the human race, have commonly been best promoted by those of whom Fame has made least mention. But this long period of comparative obscurity was at length terminated by the name of Leo, surnamed the Great. That prelate ascended the chair of St. Peter in the year 440, and occupied it for one and twenty years. At his accession, he found the Eastern Church still agitated by the receding tempest of the Nestorian controversy; and the heresy of Eutyches, which immediately succeeded, introduced fresh disorders, which continued to disturb his long pontificate. In the West, the success of the barbarians in Africa and Gaul presented a new and extensive field for ecclesiastical exertion; while we are taught, at the same time, to believe that the internal lustre of his Church was darkened and endangered by the prevalence of the Manichæan heresy. The zeal of St. Leo was directed to all these points; and, perhaps, if he had evinced less eagerness in the discovery* and pursuit of his domestic adversaries, the very circumstance of their existence might never have been known to us. But, in justice, we are equally bound to praise his firm co-operation with the Eastern Church for the peaceful repression (had such been possible) of the perverse notions which perplexed and divided it; nor are there wanting many salutary expositions of doctrine and reasonable rules of discipline, scattered throughout his numerous writings †.

The circumstances of the times were favourable to another object, which, with Leo, indeed, may possibly have been secondary, though it occupied the foremost place in the attention of so many of his successors—the aggrandisement of the Roman See. In the East, it happened about that time that the Patriarch of Constantinople, by the assumption of some additional power ‡, had alienated the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and that these last appealed to Rome for succour and justice. Of course, the authority which such appeal might seem to imply was at no time recognised by the Patriarch—it was even decided, during this very pontificate, by the twenty-ninth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon §,

* Baronius (chiefly ad ann. 443) gives several proofs, from the Chronicon of Prosper and St. Leo's own writings, of the diligence of that Prelate in tearing those heretics from their hiding-places, and publishing their infamy. It also appears that until that period it had been usual for all Christians to direct their prayers to the East; but as this form was with the Manichæans essential, with the orthodox only matter of ceremony, he directed the latter to discontinue the practice, in order that the perverse might be distinguished and detected by their perseverance. There is also a passage (in his 95th epistle) in which he advocates the unsheathing of the temporal sword in vindication of the doctrines of the Church. ‘Profuit diu *ista districtio* ecclesiasticæ lenitati, quæ, etsi sacerdotali contenta iudicio cruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spirituale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale supplicium.’

† One hundred and forty-one Epistles and ninety-six Sermons still remain to us, though several of both are lost. Upon the whole they indicate great talents, and an improved and exercised mind. Respecting their genuineness, see Dupin, t. iii. p. 2.

‡ Mosh. cent. v., p. ii., c. ii.

§ Held in 451. The substance of the enactment is as follows:—‘That the Fathers did reasonably accord its privileges to Antient Rome, because it was the imperial city; and for the same reason the hundred and fifty Bishops here assembled have decided that New Rome, which is honoured with the empire and the senate, shall have the same advantages with Antient Rome in the ecclesiastical constitution, and be the second after it’—meaning, obviously, that the two Sees were to be independent in power and equal in privilege; but that in rank and precedence the superiority was due to the more ancient. This Canon has given birth to the most voluminous contentions. Fløary, liv. xxviii. sect. 30. Baron, ann. 451. Sect. 148.

that the ' See of New Rome should have the same advantages with that of Antient Rome in the ecclesiastical constitution ;' but, nevertheless, the influence of the latter was extended, for the moment at least, among the subjects of the former, by the dissensions which severed them from their Head. And, again, the accidents which placed the Bishop of Rome in familiar and almost independent correspondence * with the Emperor, could not fail to exalt his name and elevate his dignity. In the western provinces, the increase of Papal authority was owing to other causes ; the declining power, the indolence and the absence of the Emperors, left little civil control over the authority of the Bishop who presided in the imperial city ; and the incursions and triumphs of the barbarians rather contributed to advance than to restrain his rising dominion. For the chiefs of the invaders, whose principal solicitude was to give stability to their government, when they perceived the great deference paid by the multitude to the hierarchy, while they courted the inferior members of that body, naturally offered the most obsequious respect to the highest in rank. From these and similar causes a variety of advantages spontaneously flowed, and they were seized and perpetuated by the genius and ambition of Leo.

One innovation in the discipline of the Church was introduced by that Pontiff, which deserves more attentive notice than is usually directed to it. It had been the custom for the more grievous offenders to make the confession of their sins publicly, in the face of the congregation ; or at least for the ministers occasionally to proclaim before the whole assembly the nature of the confessions which they had received. Leo strongly discouraged that practice ; and permitted, and even enjoined with some earnestness, that confession should rather be private, and confided to the priest alone. The evil most obviously proceeding from this relaxation was the general increase, or, at least, the more indecent practice, of the mortal sins, and especially (as Mosheim † has observed) of that of incontinence ; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that the original publicity of confession was abandoned, from its being no longer practicable in a numerous body and a corrupt age. But another consequence which certainly flowed from this measure, and which, in the eye of an ambitious Churchman, might counterbalance its demoralizing effect, was the vast addition of influence which it gave to the clergy. When he delivered over the conscience of the people into the hands of the priests,—when he consigned the most secret acts and thoughts of individual imperfection to the torture of private inquisition and scrutiny,—Leo the Great had indeed the glory of laying the first and corner-stone of the Papal edifice—that on which it rose and rested, and without which the industry of his successors would have been vainly exerted, or (as is more probable) their boldest projects would never have been formed.

From the name of St. Leo we may proceed without interruption to that of Justinian ‡ ; who ascended the throne of Constantinople in the year 527, and occupied it for nearly forty years. This Emperor is most honourably known

* Some Epistles are still extant, addressed by St. Leo to the Emperor Theodosius, on the subject of the Eastern controversies.

† Cent. v. p. 2. ch. iv. The epistle containing this ordinance is the 136th, addressed (on March 6, 459) to the Bishop of the March of Ancona and Abruzzo. Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.* tom. iii. par. ii.

‡ Of the jurisdiction of the clergy, which was the most acknowledged exercise of their power, and the most direct cause of their influence, it will be better to defer all mention until we come to treat of the acts of Charlemagne.

by his legislative labours, and the digest of a code of laws, which, in a later age, obtained general and durable reception throughout Europe, and which are not in all places obsolete at this moment. A different and secondary description of celebrity is reflected on him by the success of his generals, Belisarius and Narses, against the invaders of the West; but, for our own part, we are not disposed to think, that he would have made any addition to the extent, or improvement in the nature, in his reputation, had he deserted the pacific duties for which he was well qualified, to place himself at the head of armies * without disposition or experience for command. He deputed to his soldiers the sanguinary task of conquest, and confined his own talents to those offices which he justly considered to be more truly imperial. Among the first and favourite of these he placed the regulation of the religious affairs of his subjects. His own faith was distinguished by the most rigid orthodoxy; and his theological studies had at least conducted him to sound doctrinal conclusions. But he had studied with more success the tenets, than the history, of his religion; or he would have learnt from the sad experience of two centuries, that neither the canons of councils, nor the oppression of civil power, are sufficient to restrain the wanderings of human opinion. He devoted a large portion of his long reign to the extinction of heresy; he waged war with equal fury † against the remnant of the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians; he expelled them from their churches, which he transferred, together with their public possessions, to the Catholics; and, finally, he descended to individual persecution, and confiscated the private property of many. Whatever ambiguous excuses may be found for his other proceedings, the guilt of this last robbery is usually attributed to his sordid avarice. In spite of those measures (shall we not rather say, in consequence of them?), the fifth General Council (assembled at Constantinople during his reign) conferred upon him the title of 'The Most Christian Emperor,' not foreseeing that, by one of those strange dispositions of Providence which seem to mock at human calculation and consistency, the very monarch whom they had exalted by that glorious distinction—due, indeed, to the purity of his faith, but forfeited by his intemperance and bigotry,—was destined to die a heretic ‡ A foolish dispute had been raised at that time, whether the body of Christ on earth was or was not liable to corruption; and this divided Oriental Christians into the two sects of Corruptibles and Incorruptibles. The latter were obviously involved in the heresy of the Phantastics; and yet Justinian, in the blindness of old age, adopted that opinion; and it is even believed, that he was preparing to persecute all who differed from him, when he fell sick and died.

Our censures on the religious policy of Justinian, though at variance

* The trumpet of Gibbon (upon the whole a humane historian) is too often and too loudly sounded in celebration of military prowess, and the pomp of camps, and the virtues of heroes—the favourite themes of vulgar minds, and the easiest incentives to vulgar enthusiasm.

† He appears to have taken pains to search for them—a detestable exaggeration of persecution. He assailed with the same ardour both pagans and astrologers; and his severities against the Samaritans, who had obtained a place in the long list of heretics, excited and justified their rebellion; and it was not suppressed without horrible carnage. On the other hand, he exerted with equal vigour against various forms of impiety and immorality (Fleury, liv. xxxii. sect. 27.); and was no less zealous in the conversion of the Heruli and other barbarian tribes to the belief in the Gospel, than in oppressing all who did not interpret that Gospel as he did.

‡ The history of Henry VIII. of England furnishes an instance at first sight very similar to this.

with the usual language of ecclesiastical historians, require no justification—but it is proper to clear that Emperor from the more odious imputation of having created the system, which he so zealously administered. The sentence of banishment pronounced by Constantine against Arius and his followers, however speedily regretted and revoked, was the grand and authoritative precedent to which every Catholic persecutor of after-times appealed with pride and confidence. That which was an experiment—an injudicious and fruitless experiment, with Constantine, became a principle or a habit with most of his successors, each of whom enacted such penalties as seemed suited to repress the errors of the day; but it was reserved to Theodosius II. to complete the work, and to confirm and embody the scattered edicts of bigotry and despotism. There is no space here to enumerate the severe laws against heretics, which may be found in the Theodosian Code*; it may suffice to say, that they extended to almost every denomination of dissent, and menaced the contumacious with confiscation, interstition, exile, as the ordinary punishments—while ‘the last and inexpiable penalty’ was suspended over the most formidable innovators. More than this—that Emperor actually appointed *Inquisitors* for the detection of certain specified offenders, and enjoined the most diligent and penetrating search† for the purpose of unmasking them. It has been observed, that Pope Leo the Great adopted this method for the extinction of the Manichæans; and it is some excuse for the eagerness of the Bishop that the mighty footsteps of the Emperor lay traced before him. It would not be just to attach to his name very deeply the guilt of intolerance; nor would we defraud even Justinian himself of such plea as may be found for him in the penal system previously established, in the spirit of the times, in the practice of his predecessors. Yet should we distinguish—a

* The following are extracts:—*Quid sensibus excæcatos Judæos, Samaritas, Paganos, et cætera hæreticorum genera portentorum audere cognoscimus? Quod si ad sanitatem mentis egregio legum edicto revocare conemur, severitatis culpam ipsi præstabunt; qui duræ frontis obstinato piaculo locum veniæ non relinquunt. Quamobrem, cum sententia veteri desperatis morbis nulla sit abhibenda curatio, tandem, ne ferales sectæ in vitam, immemores nostri sæculi velut indiscreta confusione, licentius evagentur, hac victura in omne ævum lege sancimus—Neminem Judæum, neminem Samaritam, neutra lege constantem, ad honores et dignitates accedere; nulli administrationem patere civilis obsequii, nec defensoris fungi saltem officio. Nefas quippe credimus, ut supernæ majestati et Romanis legibus inimici, ultoresque etiam nostrarum legum surreptivæ jurisdictionis habeantur obtentu et acquisitæ dignitatis auctoritate muniti adversum Christianos, et ipsos plerumque sacræ Religionis Antistites, velut insultantes fidei nostræ judicandi vel pronuntiandi quid velint, habeant potestatem, &c. Again:—Hinc prospicit nostra Clementia Paganorum quoque et gentilium immanitates vigiliam nostram debere sortiri, qui naturali vesania et licentia pertinaci religionis tramite dissidentes nefarios sacrificiorum ritus occultis exercere quodammodo solitudinibus designantur—quos non promulgatarum legum mille terrores, non denuntiati exitii pœna compescant, ut si emendari non possint mole saltem criminum et illuvie victimarum discerent abstinere. Sed prorsus ea furoris peccatur audacia, &c. &c. Leg. Novell. Div. Theod. A. Lib. These enactments of the first, confirmed by the second Theodosius, are in every sense barbarous.*

† ‘Summa exploratione rimetur, ut, quicunque in unum Paschæ diem non obsequenti religione convenirent, tales indubitanter, quales hac lege damnamus, habeantur.’ This seems to have been levelled against the remains of the Quartadecimans. The Eucratites, Saccophori, and Hydroparastatæ, are the names which are threatened ‘summo supplicio et inexpiabili pœna.’ A law was also enacted to prevent the meetings of the Tascodragitæ—a denomination of persons ‘who made their prayers inwardly and silently, compressing their noses and lips with their hands, lest any sound should transpire.’ Basnage, iii. 82. Jortin, vol. iv. ad ann. 381. That any danger either to Church or State could for an instant have been apprehended from such abject and pitiful enthusiasm might have been pronounced impossible, if the history of persecution in every age, howsoever modified and disguised by time and circumstance, did not incessantly attest it to be both credible and probable.

churchman may be more leniently censured if he enforce the laws already enacted for the protection of his Church, and calculated, as he may ignorantly imagine, for that purpose. But a legislator should look more deeply into the records of history and the constitution of human nature; and if, among the venerable statutes of his ancestors he observes one which is founded in manifest injustice, which in its immediate operation occasions confusion and misery, and which in its general efficacy has been proved by long experience to miss the end proposed—to re-enact and perpetuate that statute is not error, but deep and inexcusable crime.

III. We shall conclude this Chapter with a few remarks respecting the literature and morality of the period on which we are employed: for though it may seem impossible to treat so extensive a subject in such contracted limits with adequate fulness, or even with profitable precision, there would be still greater ground of reproach were we to neglect it altogether.

The decline of Roman literature between the age of Augustus and that of the Antonines, in chasteness and delicacy of thought and expression, and even the decay of the language itself, are *Decline of Literature.* instantly perceptible to the classical reader; yet was it still animated by some of the fire of ancient genius: it had availed itself of the progress of science and the increased knowledge of man, and it applied that knowledge with immortal success to history as well as philosophy; but from the reign of Antoninus to that of Diocletian the fall was sudden and precipitate. In the barren records of the third century we find no names of good, few even of indifferent writers; and if the works of the ancients were more generally diffused and studied than formerly (which seems uncertain), they were at least much less diligently imitated, and not an effort was made to surpass them. It is of importance to remark this fact; because there have been some so unjust in their hostility to revelation, or so perverse in their estimation of history, as to attribute the decay of literature to the prevalence and influence of the Christian religion. This charge is very far removed from truth—indeed it is easy to show that literature had already fallen into deep and irretrievable ruin, before Christianity began to exercise any control over the refinements of society. At the beginning of the third century, during the parting struggles of learning, the Christians, numerous as they were, and irresistible in strength, were principally confined to the lower and middle ranks; and even at the beginning of the last persecution, though they held some high offices in the court of Justinian, it will scarcely be asserted that they formed a sufficient proportion of the higher and educated classes to affect in any great degree the literary character of the empire*. A very general *moral* improvement they had undoubtedly introduced among the lower orders: some influence on the civilization of the people, and even on the policy of the government, they may also have exercised; but complete revolutions in national literature do not originate in those quarters; and even had it been otherwise, we have seen, that more than a century before that period, the downfall of taste and learning had been irrevocably decreed.

While they speculate on the secondary causes of singular phænomena,

* The effect which Christianity may have produced on the literature of the Roman Empire in the third century, bears some resemblance in character (though it was far inferior in degree) to that exerted by Puritanism on the literature of our own country. And if it be true, that the immediate influence of both was, to a certain extent, hostile, their ultimate operation was certainly to invigorate and renovate. Some of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries write better than any profane author after Tacitus,

historians are sometimes too prone to neglect such as are plain and obvious. In the present instance these were certainly no other than the prolongation of unmitigated despotism, and the civil confusion, which, in addition to its customary attendants, it so commonly introduced regarding the succession to the throne. It is unnecessary to search after remote reasons for the degradation of any people which has been subjected for three centuries to the abuse of arbitrary rule; and though it be true that Trajan and the Antonines for a moment arrested the torrent of corruption, they were but accidental blessings; and if their personal excellence partially remedied the monstrous depravity of the system, their influence lasted not beyond their life. Presently the tide resumed its downward course, and its natural and necessary progress was scarcely accelerated either by the crimes of Severus or the calamities of Decius. Whether, then, it be reasonable to consider the first period of the decline of literature as closing with the reign of the Antonines, or whether we shall extend it over the barren period which intervened between the death of Marcus and the establishment of Christianity, it is clear that it proceeded from causes quite independent of that religion. The second line we may venture perhaps to draw after the fourth Council of Carthage, and the third at the expulsion of the Athenian philosophers by Justinian.

During the *second* period, Constantine, Julian and Theodosius successively proposed encouragements to learning, and bestowed personal honours on those possessing it. If Julian confined his rewards to Pagan, and Constantine to Christian, literature, the greater effect (owing to the longer duration of his reign) was produced by the latter—the same is true of the exertions of Theodosius; consequently, during the last half of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, the Church abounded with prelates of splendid talents, and laborious industry, and such learning as was then thought most necessary. The Christian writings of this period, to whatsoever objections they may be liable, constitute the best part of its literature. And in so far as they are censured (and justly censured) for the occasional display of vain speculation about things not determinable, of unfair representation, of perverse disputatiousness, of absurd or unworthy arguments, it is a question, whether the lucubrations of the schoolmen and rhetoricians of Rome or Greece give less ground for the same reproaches: for in a mere literary point of view, it matters little, whether it be the inscrutable in nature or in revelation on which the wayward imagination wastes itself; and as these latter investigations are more likely to deviate into a moral character, so is there a better prospect of their utility. And in justice to most of the Fathers of this period we should add, that there are many splendid illustrations of scripture, and many generous bursts of moral exhortation, which enrich and ennoble their works, and which surpass the ardour, if they do not rival the elegance, of profane philosophy.

A canon of the Council held at Carthage* in the year 398 forbade the study of secular books by Bishops; and we have therefore selected this as a crisis in the history of *Christian* literature. Assuredly a deplorable dearth of learning very soon followed this crisis, and our *third* period is distinguished by scarcely two or three names respectable for talents or

* The celebrated Canon in question appears in the midst of several others, generally respecting the episcopal office and duties: their substance is as follows—'the Bishop should have a small residence near the church; his furniture should be of small price, and his table poorly supplied; he should sustain his dignity by his faith and his holy

acquirements. However we do not at all intend to attribute this rapid defection to the injudicious ordinance in question; since its authority was not universal, and since injunctions of that description are seldom obeyed, except by such as are previously disposed to receive them. It was an index rather than a cause of the altering spirit of the Church, and as such we record it. The real reasons of that sudden defection, and of the darkness which followed it, are two: the first of these, which alone perhaps might gradually have completed the extinction of sound learning, was the internal corruption of Christianity, and the spreading disease of monachism. An age of prodigies and relics and Stylites was not proper for the growth of genius or the cultivation of knowledge; and the little of either which survived in the East may have owed its existence to the dissensions of the Christians, as much as to their virtues. The second reason was the frequent irruption and final settlement of the barbarian conquerors. This cause was indeed confined almost entirely to the provinces of the West; but the wounds which it inflicted there were deeper and of more extensive influence than might at first have been apprehended. It afforded a fearful prospect that those hordes of colonists were wholly un-instructed in literary acquirements, and even generally prejudiced against them. Theodoric himself, the wisest, as well as the best, among their Princes, while he respected the superior civilization of the vanquished, despised and disclaimed *that* art which seemed to be employed for no other end, than to inflame and perpetuate religious controversy. He could never be prevailed upon to learn to read. But the cause which increased and prolonged that mischief, and created many others, was the superstitious disposition which the invaders brought with them. They had learnt, as the rudiments of their own religion, a subservient reverence for their priesthood, and this principle accompanied them into the Christian church; the priesthood received without reluctance the unbounded homage which was offered to them; their authority grew with that obsequiousness, and their ambition swelled with their authority; and when they found how easily this could be maintained and extended over a credulous people, and how certainly credulity is the offspring of ignorance, they became interested in perpetuating blindness and prejudice.

Some schools indeed still subsisted, and the youth were instructed in what were called the *Seven Liberal Arts**; but these, as we learn from Augustin's account of them, consisted only in a number of subtile and useless precepts; and were consequently more adapted to perplex the memory than to strengthen the judgment. The arts in question were grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy; and those were very rare among the scholars whose studies extended beyond the three first. Moral exhortations began now to be commonly confined to the public reading of 'Books of Martyrs' and 'Lives of Saints,' by which the passions of the vulgar were excited, and their imaginations prepared for the belief of any imposture which it might be expedient to practise upon them. Such were the materials of Christian

life; *he shall read no profane books, nor those of the heretics, unless by necessity. He shall take no concern in the execution of wills, nor any care of his domestic affairs, nor plead for any temporal interests. He shall not himself take charge either of the widows, orphans, or strangers, but commit that office to the chief priest—he shall have no other occupation than reading, prayer and preaching. He shall perform no ordinations without the counsel of his clergy, and the consent of the people.* See Fleury, liv. xx., sect. xxxii. We are not to suppose that the above canons were everywhere received, or perhaps strictly enforced any where.

* Mosh., cent. v., p. xi, c. i.

literature during the fifth and sixth centuries, and such they continued with very little alteration until the eleventh.

Some remnants of the philosophy of ancient Greece still lingered at Athens; and a few degenerate descendants of Plato, Aristotle or Zeno, still exhibited in their half deserted schools the shadow of the lore of former ages. Those teachers had been encouraged by M. Antoninus and Julian, and tolerated by the Christian Emperors, and they may have constituted the wisest, and probably the most virtuous portion of the Pagan population; but they had gradually dwindled away into obscurity and insignificance. Nevertheless, Justinian considered their existence as inconsistent with the principles of his government, and consequently issued (in the year 529) that celebrated edict which closed the schools of Athens for ever. The historian of the Church of Christ need not fear to celebrate *any* judicious exertions to enlighten and dignify mankind. And in so far as the genius of philosophy has been employed in the discovery of moral truth, and in effectual exhortations to virtue and magnanimity; in so far as it has taught the science of government on sound and practical principles; in so far as its researches have had no other object than truth, and truth which was convertible to the service and improvement of society—so far we respect its exertions and honour its name, and disdain the narrow policy which completed its extinction. But we are bound to admit, that, long before the period in question, the abuse of reason had so far supplanted its proper exercise, and perverted its noble character and purposes, that it constituted in fact the most active portion of the systems then called philosophical—just as the abuses of religion were then beginning to form the most conspicuous part of the Catholic system. To the connexion of Christianity with philosophy several of those abuses may be attributed; for at the first moment of their contact, while religion was yet pure, philosophy was already deeply and vitally corrupted; and the infection of bad principles, whether of reasoning or morality, was too easily communicated. And thus religion, which is indeed the friend of that true and useful philosophy whose object is the advancement of society and the happiness of man, became stained and degraded by its alliance with controversial sophistry. There is also another reflection which lessens the indignation so naturally excited in every generous mind by the edict of Justinian. The philosophers had declared war against Christianity at an early period; to their malignity the last and severest persecution may be partly attributed, and the more dangerous aggressions of Julian were conducted by their spirit, if not by their counsel; so that, if we cannot excuse the severe retaliation, which Christianity, in her time of triumph, more effectually inflicted, at least our compassion for the sufferer is diminished by the recollection of its hostility and its vices. The exiled philosophers (seven in number) at first took refuge at the court of Persia; but finding none of the moral advantages which they professed to expect under a different form of government and worship, they were presently contented to return, on certain stipulations, and terminate their days under a Christian monarch.

We can scarcely believe that the character of Christian literature was so deeply affected by that act of Justinian, as some imagine. Mosheim* appears to consider it as having occasioned particularly the extinction of the New Academy, (the descendant of the Platonic school,) and the substi-

* Cent. vi., p. ii., c. i. In another place he seems inclined to attribute the same result (and perhaps with rather more probability) to the decision of the fifth General Council, by which some of the opinions of Origen, who was a New Platonician, were condemned.

tution of the system of Aristotle. It is, indeed, well known that about this period the latter philosophy was gradually gaining ground upon the former in the Christian schools, probably because it was better suited to the contentious spirit of the age; and whatever evils had heretofore been occasioned in the Church by too great reverence for the authority of Plato, and by the boldness of his followers, much more extensive and more durable calamities were afterwards inflicted upon the Christian world by the universal submission of the human mind to the name of Aristotle. But we are not persuaded that this change was brought about violently: or that the edict, which silenced a few obscure Pagan philosophers, at all generally influenced the learning of Christians; or that any act of legislation could suddenly have effected so general an alteration in the studies and intellectual pursuits of an extensive empire. These mighty changes usually result from the patient operation of general principles upon the morals and habits of a people—the caprice of a monarch has no power to create them; and, perhaps, it is the commonest mistake of historians to attribute too much to the edicts of Sovereigns, and too little to the unceasing movement and agitation of civilized society.

Respecting the condition of morals during this period it is impossible to speak with equal definiteness; some indeed do not hesitate to describe them as exceedingly depraved, and as *Morality* being in no respect better upheld by the clergy than by the laity*: and true it is, that certain laws were enacted, with the specific object of securing the morality, and even of punishing the offences, of the priesthood; indeed when we consider the sort of immunity from civil tribunals which that body in those times enjoyed, we are not surprised that too great general indulgence led to the imposition of occasional and particular restraints. But these by no means prove its universal corruption.

The increased wealth of the Church is mentioned as another and a necessary reason of its increased degradation. But we should not be too indiscriminate in our inference of evil from that cause; the ill effects of ecclesiastical wealth, which is generally diffused among the clergy with very great inequality, would be chiefly confined to the more elevated and ambitious members of the hierarchy, and would scarcely extend to the lower and more numerous ranks of the ministry; besides which we should recollect that it is at least as common an effect of wealth to enlarge and exalt, as to debase, the character of its possessor. Even were this not so, the Church, in the sixth century, had certainly not arrived at any dangerous degree of opulence, since the sources, which in after ages so profusely supplied it, were scarcely yet opened. At the same time, the steady progress of religion, the general conversion of the barbarian conquerors, and the devotion of the converts to their priesthood, are scarcely consistent with the gross immorality, and even total contempt of decency, with which Mosheim charges that order †. And therefore,

* Mosheim, cent. vi., p. ii., c. ii.

† 'Whence so many laws to restrain the vices and preserve the morals of the ecclesiastical orders, if they had fulfilled even the obligations of external decency, or shown, in the general tenor of their conduct, a certain degree of respect for religion or virtue. Be that as it will, the effects of all these laws and edicts were so inconsiderable as to be hardly perceived; for so high was the veneration paid at this time to the clergy, that their most flagitious crimes were corrected by the slightest and gentlest punishments: an unhappy circumstance, which added to their presumption, and rendered them more daring and audacious in iniquity.' These are Mosheim's words; and some will think that they carry their own confutation with them. At least we may safely believe, that the flagrant offences of a few notorious individuals have been darkly reflected upon the whole body; and such has been the misfortune of the Christian priesthood in every age.

without advocating its perfect moral purity, which again would have been strangely at variance with the superstitious spirit which already vitiated the faith, we need not hesitate to believe, that the great majority of its members continued with zeal, though in silence, to execute their offices of piety, and that, though stained by individual transgression and scandal, the body was very far removed from general degradation, either in the Eastern or Western empire.

Hitherto we have spoken of the clergy only, and the general morality of the age would to a great extent be regulated by the conduct of that body. But the political prostration of the Western provinces, overrun by so many savage tribes—the rapid dissolution of the old governments without any stability in those which succeeded them—the subversion of legal security, the substitution of military and barbarous licence—these and other circumstances, aggravating the usual miseries of conquest, occasioned, wheresoever they extended, more absolute wretchedness, both individual and national, than had hitherto been recorded in the history of man; insomuch, that among those who beheld and shared those inflictions, there were many who regarded them as special demonstrations of divine wrath. And as men are ever prone to attribute such chastisements to the most striking revolution of their own day, and as the subversion of the temples of their ancestors was still recent in their memory, some there were who ascribed the anger of the Gods to the establishment and prevalence of Christianity. Since the appearance of that impiety (they said) the Roman power has incessantly declined. The Gods, the founders and protectors of that empire, have withdrawn their succour, as their service has been neglected; and now that it has been entirely repressed, now that their sanctuaries are closed, and their sacrifices, auguries and other propitiations rigorously prohibited, they have at length abandoned us wholly, and left the once victorious Rome to be a prey to barbarians*. This foolish delusion was immediately and successfully combated by the eloquence of St. Augustin. In his noble composition, ‘The City of God†,’ he confuted the error by irrefragable arguments, and conclusive appeals to the evidence of profane history; and inculcated the more reasonable opinion, that the temporal afflictions which God permitted to devastate the empire were chastisements ‡ inflicted by a just Providence for the

* Fleury, H. E., liv. xxiii., sect. vii.

† The work was published in 426, after thirteen years had been employed in its composition. It consists of twenty-two books, of which the ten first are devoted to the confutation of the various errors of Paganism, and among others of that which we have now mentioned; while the twelve last establish the truth of Christianity.

‡ Thirteen years afterwards Carthage was sacked by the Vandals; and Salvian, a presbyter of Marseilles, a contemporary author, also considers that event as a signal example of divine justice; and he enlarges with great fervour on the exceeding corruption of that great city. ‘It seemed as if the inhabitants had entirely taken leave of reason—the streets were filled with drunkards crowned with flowers and perfumes, and infested with every possible snare against chastity; adulteries, and the most abominable impurities were the commonest of all things, and they were publicly practised with the extreme of impudence. The orphans and widows were oppressed, and the poor were tortured to such despair, that they *prayed God to deliver the city to the barbarians*. Blasphemies, too, and impiety reigned there; many, though professedly Christians, were at heart Pagans, and worshipped the celestial Goddess with entire devotion. Besides which (he adds), the people had an extreme contempt and aversion for the Monks, however holy they might be.’ The description is probably exaggerated—yet ecclesiastical historians almost universally admit the corruption of Christians to have been the cause of their chastisement. Baronius adds another reason—the prevalence of heresy. At the year 412, he asserts—*Barbari prævalent ubi. hæreses vigent*; and in other places (ann. 410, 428) declares, that the former might easily have been subdued, if the latter could have been expelled; and

correction, not for the destruction, of his creatures. The error was indeed confuted, and presently died away; but the general dislocation of society which occasioned it must have suspended for a time the moral energies of man, and the period of his severest suffering may also have been that of his deepest depravity.

NOTE ON CERTAIN ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES.

1. It is probable that LACTANTIUS was a native of Africa, since his first lessons were received from Arnobius, whose school was at Sicca, in that country; but the truth is not undoubtedly known, nor the year of his birth. It is only certain, that he witnessed and survived the persecution of Diocletian, and was selected, in his old age, as preceptor to Crispus, the son of Constantine. He was the most learned Christian of his time; and the record of his necessitous and voluntary poverty may at least persuade us, that his habits were influenced by the spirit of Christian philosophy which adorns his writings.

The 'Divine Institutions,' his most important work, contain a powerful confutation of Paganism, in a style not uninspired with the genius of antiquity. 'Lactantius (says St. Jerome *) is as a stream of Ciceronian eloquence; and I would that he had been as successful in confirming our own doctrine as in overthrowing that of others.' He was liable indeed to that reproach, and he shared it with all the apologists who had preceded him; his arguments are often feeble, his assumptions sometimes false, and his conclusions not always sound: but his style deserves great praise; and if his diction occasionally rivals the elegant exuberance of Cicero, (and he is commonly compared, and sometimes preferred, to that orator,) the Christian has reached, through the more elevated nature of his subject, a sublimer range of thought and expression, in the field of moral as well as divine philosophy. A nobler conception of the Deity, and a deeper knowledge of his works and dispensations, have occasionally exalted, above the Roman's boldest flights, a genius clearly inferior both in nature and cultivation.

There is another work still extant, called 'The Death of the Persecutors,' first printed in 1679, and by many attributed (though probably not with truth) to Lactantius. It is of undisputed antiquity†, and contains some valuable facts not elsewhere recorded; but it is still more remarkable for an attempt to vindicate the temporal retribution of Providence, by asserting

ad ann. 406, 407, he more specifically affirms, that Providence sent the invaders into Gaul for the express purpose of destroying the heresy of Vigilantius, and that the greatest devastations were committed in the districts where those errors were most deeply rooted. By an opposite, but not less extravagant, error, Theodosius, legislating nearly at the same time, attributed even the unseasonable severities of the skies to the prolonged existence of Paganism. 'An diutius perferimus mutari temporum vices irata cœli temperie; quæ Paganorum exacerbata perfidia, nescit naturæ libramenta servare. Unde enim ver solitam gratiam abjuravit? Unde æstas messe jejuna laboriosum agricolam in spe destituit aristarum? Unde intemperata ferocitas ubertatem terrarum penetrabili frigore sterilitatis læsione damnavit—nisi quod ad impietatis vindictam transit lege sua naturæ decretum? Quod ne posthac sustinere cogamur, pacifica ultione, ut diximus, pianda est supremi numinis veneranda majestas.'

* Epist. 13, addressed to Paulinus, Bishop of Nola. See Dupin, Nouvelle Biblioth. Vie de Lactance. The Institutions were dedicated to Constantine, probably during the conclusion of the last persecution (between 306 and 311), and may possibly have influenced his religious opinions.

† Probably published about 315.

the violent ends of the various persecutors. But an endeavour to pervert, with whatsoever promise of temporary profit, the eternal truths of history, can produce no other lasting effect, than to stain the character of the author, and to throw discredit on the cause which is advocated by falsehood.

2. *Gregory*, son of the Bishop of *Nazianzus*, was born about 320. He was animated by a strong natural love for literary and religious seclusion, and a disinclination to ecclesiastical dignities, of which we are compelled to acknowledge the sincerity, though it so happened that he occupied, in succession, the sees of *Sasimi*, of *Nazianzus**, and *Constantinople*. His learning, his eloquence, and his religious zeal preserved him from obscurity, and raised him, in his own despatch, from independence and privacy. On a visit to *Constantinople*, about the year 376, he found the Churches, with only one exception, in the possession of the *Arians*. In the adversity and humiliation of the Church, he raised his voice against the predominant heresy with boldness and success. Several are believed to have been converted by his arguments; and he continued to instruct and govern the Catholic party, until the accession of the orthodox *Theodosius*. He was then raised by the command of the Emperor and the affection of the people to a dignity which he neither coveted, nor long retained. Some discontents which followed gave him a pretext for resignation, and he died in 389 in the retirement of his native city.

There remain to us about fifty of his Discourses and Sermons, of which the language and sentiments alike argue a moderate temper and a cultivated mind. The most celebrated among them are the third and fourth, which are directed against the Emperor *Julian*. In the seventeenth discourse, delivered on the occasion of some seditious disturbances at *Nazianzus*, in presenting himself as a mediator between the people and the civil officer, he exalts the authority of the Church in very lofty language. He thus addresses the Governor of the city: 'the law of Christ subjects you to my power and to my pulpit; for ours is the authority—an authority greater and more excellent than that which you possess, unless, indeed, spirit is to be subject unto flesh, and heaven unto earth †: you command with Jesus Christ; it is He with whom you exercise your authority; it is He who has given you the sword which you wear, not so much for the chastisement of crime, as for its prevention by terror and by menace.' It is curious to reflect, that these principles were thus publicly promulgated (in the year 372) within sixty years from the establishment of Christianity, and within nine from the death of *Julian*. Yet the character of *Gregory* was mild and forbearing; his twenty-sixth discourse contains some temperate injunctions respecting the treatment of heretics; and both in that and in other places, while he laments the distractions of the Church, and while he proclaims his own attachment to the Catholic doctrine, he is never so unjust as to ascribe the whole evil to the opposite party, nor so partial as to conceal or to spare the vices and scandals which disgraced his own ‡.

Gregory is celebrated for his friendship with *St. Basil*, the founder of oriental monachism; and the brother of *St. Basil* was another *Gregory*, Bishop of *Nyssa*, in *Cappadocia*. This last was the author of five orations

* He was raised to a share of this See, as a kind of *Coadjutor* to his father, and on his death fled from the city, lest the undivided responsibility should then be forced upon him.

† *Dupin*, a liberal Catholic, throws into his translation of this passage the words *Church* and *Princes*, neither of which came from the lips of *Gregory*.

‡ It should be observed, that in his sixth Discourse (delivered before *Gregory* of *Nyssa*) he exalts the honour of the martyrs, and even attributes to them the office of mediators.

on the Lord's Prayer, besides various Commentaries on Scripture, and discourses on the mysteries and moral treatises. But the work by which he is most known is his oration on the life of St. Gregory, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, or the wonder-worker. That renowned prelate (he was Bishop of *Neocæsarea*) flourished about one hundred and twenty years before his namesake of *Nyssa*; so that the stupendous miracles which are so diligently recorded of him by his credulous panegyrist can have no claim on our serious consideration.

3. *St. Ambrose* was born in Gaul, about the year 340, of Roman and noble parents*; he was educated in Italy, and his talents and conduct early raised him to a high civil appointment. In 374, on the vacancy of the See of Milan, a violent dissension arose between the Catholic and the Arians; the Bishops of both parties assembled in great numbers, and the tumultuous divisions of the people not only violated the unity of the Church, but seriously threatened the repose of the State. Ambrose was then Governor-General of the province, and he proceeded in person to compose the disorders. The people were assembled in the principal church, and there he addressed them at length on their civil duties—on social order and public tranquillity. His eloquent harangue produced a very different effect from that which had been (at least professedly) proposed by it, for it was followed by the unanimous acclamatory shout—'We will have Ambrose for our Bishop.'

Ambrose was *not yet baptized*†—what religious instruction he may have received in the schools of the Catechumens is uncertain, and it appears to have been exceedingly slight; but he had not yet been admitted to the communion of the faithful. Yet no difficulty seems to have arisen from this obstacle. But the consent of the Emperor was necessary for his translation from a civil to an ecclesiastical office. That consent was granted with immediate alacrity. Still there remained one unforeseen impediment to be overcome—the persevering repugnance of Ambrose to the proposed elevation. But the perseverance of the people was not less obstinate. It was in vain that the Bishop elect, in order to disqualify himself in their eyes for a sacred office, publicly committed some acts of judicial cruelty and flagrant immorality. The people exclaimed—'Thy offence be upon our heads.' It was in vain that he escaped from the city and concealed himself at the residence of a faithful friend; he was discovered and conducted in triumph to Milan. At length, conceiving that the will of God was thus irresistibly declared against him, he submitted to assume the ungrateful dignity.

After having passed through the necessary ecclesiastical gradations he was ordained Bishop on the 8th day after his baptism, at the age of 34. His first act was to make over the whole of his property to the Church or the poor; and it should be remarked, that the same charitable disposition continued afterwards to distinguish him. He immediately declared in favour of the Catholic against the Arian doctrine; and though the fury with which the contest was at that time conducted reached and infected him, we cannot justly accuse him of having wantonly inflamed it. The Empress *Justinia*, the widow of *Valentinian*, was an Arian, together with

* Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. Vie St. Ambrose*. While the infant was one day sleeping in his father's palace, a swarm of bees surrounded his cradle, and after reposing on his lips, suddenly ascended high into the air, and disappeared. Ambrose had been anticipated by Plato—yet the Roman Church has shown no disinclination to adopt the profane miracle.

† See *Fleury*, liv. xvii., sect. xxi., &c.

her soldiers and her court; the great body of the people were on the side of Ambrose; and in the year 385 some violent disputes arose, in which the Bishop maintained his spiritual privileges with a courage and a confidence which would not have dishonoured the brightest ages of papacy*. From a contest with a passionate woman, he advanced to measure his strength with a wise and powerful Emperor. Theodosius the Great had very barbarously avenged the murder of some Imperial officers at Thessalonica by the massacre of the inhabitants; and as the Bishop of Milan had previously interfered in their favour, he boldly condemned the sanguinary execution. Theodosius pleaded in his defence the example of David, 'Since then you have imitated his offence (rejoined the Prelate) imitate also his penitence.' It appears, that for the period of eight months the Emperor was denied all access to the holy offices of the Church—the consolation which was afforded to the lowest of his subjects was refused (as he complained†) to himself. Finally, after some public humiliation, to remind him of the essential distinctions between the Priest and the Prince‡, and the spiritual inferiority of the latter, he consented to the performance of public penance, as the condition of reconciliation with the Church. This extraordinary event took place in 390§; and if we have already remarked upon the boldness with which Gregory Nazianzen proclaimed (about eighteen years earlier) the ghostly supremacy of the Church, we must not here omit to observe, that from the conclusion of Diocletian's persecution fourscore years had not yet elapsed, ere a successor of that unrestrained and lawless despot was compelled by the mere influence of opinion to humble himself before the unarmed minister of that religion which his predecessor had designed to exterminate.

Many works of St. Ambrose remain, which exhibit no great indications of literary genius; but they abound in useful moral lessons, which are plentifully interspersed with exhortations to fasting and celibacy, and the other superstitions of the day. It is also recorded, that he performed many astonishing miracles; stories that throw disgrace on an elevated character, which really needed not the aid of imposture to secure respect, or even popularity. He died in 397; and after enjoying universal celebrity during his life, throughout the whole extent of Christendom, he has deserved from succeeding generations the equivocal praise, that he was the first effectual assertor of those exalted ecclesiastical pretensions, so essential to the existence of the Romish system, and so dear to the ambitious ministers of every Church.

4. *St. John*, surnamed from his eloquence, *Chrysostom*, (*i. e.* the Golden

* The great influence which Ambrose is shown to have possessed over the populace, not to excite only but to compose its tumults, attests the vigour of his character more certainly, than it proves either his virtues or even his eloquence—though we have no reason to doubt either.

† See Fleury, liv. xix., sect. xxi. The power 'to bind and to loose,' as delegated by Christ to his ministers on earth is a favourite theme with St. Ambrose, and asserted by him in a sufficiently extensive sense.

‡ See Theodorit, book v., c. xviii.

§ Six years earlier (according to Fleury) St. Ambrose addressed to Valentinian a letter, in which he strenuously opposed the restoration of the altar of victory at Rome, so warmly pressed by Symmachus. It contains these bold expressions—'What answer will you make, then, when a Bishop shall say to you, The Church cannot receive the offerings of him, who has given ornaments to the temples of the Gods; we cannot present on the altar of Jesus Christ the gifts of him who has made an offering to idols. The edict signed by your hand convicts you of that act. The honour which you offer to Christ, how can it be acceptable to him, since at the same instant you offer adoration to idols? No—you cannot serve two masters, &c.' Epistle 17.

Mouthed), was a native of Antioch, of a noble and opulent family. ' In the year 374, while he was still young, he had acquired such distinction, that the neighbouring Prelates elected him to a vacant See ; but it is generally affirmed that he refused that dignity, and fled to an adjacent mountain, where he passed four years in the society of an ancient solitary ; thence he changed his residence to a frightful cavern, which witnessed for the two following years his rigid austerities. Having completed this preparatory discipline, he entered upon the offices of the ministry ; and after edifying his native city for eighteen years by the most animating instructions, he was at once exalted, without solicitation, and even against his professed wish, to the See of Constantinople. Chrysostom carried with him to that dangerous eminence not only the fervour of Christian eloquence, but the severity of monastic virtue ; and he thought it little to move the affections and raise the admiration of his audience, unless he could reach their practice and quell their vices. Had he confined his exhortations to the mass of the people, he would have produced less effect perhaps, but he would have excited no odium—but the intrepid and earnest orator rose in his vehement denunciations from the people to the clergy, and from the clergy to the court, without excepting even the Empress herself from his reproaches*. To the keenness of his censures he added the weight of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and both were zealously employed against episcopal licentiousness†, no less than against the vices and scandals imputed to the priesthood, and especially to the monastic orders. But in the tedious and delicate office of ecclesiastical reform, that zeal which is not tempered with moderation, and qualified by due regard for existing circumstances, will commonly ruin the advocate, without benefiting the cause. The disposition of Chrysostom was naturally choleric and impatient, and his noblest intentions were frustrated by his passionate imprudence. Two powerful parties united for his overthrow ; and though their first triumph was instantly reversed by an insurrection of the populace, whom his ardent eloquence, the beneficence of his charitable habits and institutions, the austerity of his morals, and the very bitterness of his rebukes, had bound and devoted to him, yet a subsequent condemnation was more effectual‡ ; and after a tumultuous rule of six years, Chrysostom was dismissed into exile to a desolate town named Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taurus. In that remote residence he passed three years, the last, perhaps the most glorious, of his life—for his virtues were more eagerly acknowledged in his absence, and his genius was endeared, and his errors were obliterated, by his misfortunes. About thirteen years afterwards his relics were removed to Constantinople, and his name assumed an eminent place among the saints of the Church ; and it is proper to add, that the justice, which was so abundantly bestowed on the memory of Chrysostom, should in a great measure be attributed to the perseverance of the Bishop of Rome ; whose sympathy had consoled him

* Eudoxia, after failing in her first attempt to displace Chrysostom, renewed her hostilities ; and it was then that the Bishop delivered the sermon (if indeed he did at all deliver it) beginning with the celebrated words—' Herodias is again furious ; Herodias again dances ; she once again requires the head of St. John.' ' An insolent allusion, (says Gibbon), which, as a woman and a Sovereign, it was equally impossible for her to forgive.' Chap. xxxii. The whole account of St. Chrysostom is written with learning, eloquence and fairness.

† In his visitation through the Asiatic provinces he deposed thirteen Bishops of Lydia and Phrygia, and passed a very severe censure upon the whole order.

‡ Still his expulsion was not effected without popular commotions, which led to the conflagration of the principal church and the adjoining palace.

in his adversity, and whose influence, had his life been much prolonged, might eventually have restored him to his dignity*.

The works that remain of St. Chrysostom are for the most part Sermons and Homilies, and are nearly a thousand in number. Their style is not recommended by that emulation of Attic purity which adorns the writings of Basilius, or Gregory Nazianzen; but it is elevated and unconstrained, pregnant with natural thoughts and easy expressions, enriched with metaphors and analogies, and dignified by boldness and grandeur. And, what is more important, the matter of his discourses, while it declines the affectation of subtlety, and avoids the barren fields of theological speculation, is directly addressed to the common feelings, and principles, and duties of mankind. The heart is penetrated, the latent vice is discovered, and exposed in the most frightful colours to the detestation of Christians. Such was the character of that eloquence which, by captivating the people and scandalizing the great, occasioned such tumultuous disorder in the metropolis of the East. Yet the historian finds much more to admire in the bold and impetuous enthusiasm of the orator, than to censure in his indiscretion. One object alone filled his mind and animated his efforts—and that the noblest object to which the genius of man can be directed—to warn the religion, to purify the morals, and to advance the virtue and happiness of those whom he influenced.

At the same time, it is not asserted that St. Chrysostom was exempt from the errors and abuses of his day; he exalted the merit of celibacy; he strongly inculcated the duty of fasting, and the sanctity of a solitary and ascetic life; he encouraged the veneration for saints and martyrs; but the practical nature of his piety sometimes shone through the mists of his superstitious delusion. If any, for instance, engaged in a pilgrimage to the holy places, he assured them that their principal motive should be the relief of the poor—if any were bent on the offering up prayers for the dead, he exhorted them to give alms for the dead also†.

With respect to his doctrine, the three points which have been most warmly disputed are, his opinions on the Eucharist, on Grace and Original Sin, and on Confession. Regarding the first of these, his expressions are both vague and contradictory; since some of them would lead us to believe, that he very nearly approached, if he did not actually reach, the belief now held by the Roman Catholic Church; while in another passage, where he affirms the real presence, he also (and incidentally) asserts that the nature of the bread is not changed. Upon the whole, it is clear that he held very elevated notions respecting the Sacrament, and it is probable that his deliberate opinion was in favour of that which we call Consubstantiation. But regarding the nature of penitence, it is quite plain, in spite of some seeming inconsistencies which Roman Catholic writers have detected, or imagined, that his direct assertions inculcate the sufficiency of penitential

* A letter from Chrysostom to Innocent, written in 406, is still extant, in which, with many expressions of gratitude, he exhorts that Pope to continue his exertions to succour him, without being discouraged by the want of success.

† See Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.* Art. St. Jean Chrysostom. The latter part of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth, from the death of Julian, for instance, to the conquest of Africa by the Vandals, is a very important and a deeply interesting period of Christian history; and there is no method perhaps by which its peculiarities could be so distinctly painted, as by detailed accounts of St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustin—accounts, which should reject all that is fabulous and absurd in the records respecting those fathers, while they embraced the most characteristic and striking particulars of their private, as well as public, conversation, their writings and their doctrine.

confession to God in prayer, without any necessity for the mediation of his ministers. As to the second point, we shall perhaps refer to the probable opinion of this father, when we shall arrive at the description of the Pelagian controversy.

5. *St. Jerome* was born at the city of Strigna or Stridona, on the confines of Pannonia and Dalmatia, about the year 345. His family was honourable, his fortune abundant, and his youthful studies, under the celebrated Donatus*, had improved and fortified his literary taste. But the deep religious feeling†, which took early possession of his soul, led him to consecrate his labours and his learning to that which he deemed the service of Christ. An excessive admiration of monastic excellence, and ardour for the habits which conferred it, constituted the ruling principle of his life; and whether it was, that the solitudes of Europe were not yet sufficiently sanctified to satisfy his passion for holy seclusion, or that the celebrity attending on ascetic privations was still chiefly confined to the Eastern world, he bade adieu to his native hills, to his hereditary property, to pontifical Rome herself, and transferred his library, his diligence, and his enthusiasm, to a convent at Bethlehem. In a retreat so well qualified to nourish religious emotion even in the most torpid heart, the zeal of Jerome did not slumber, but rather seemed to catch fresh fire from the objects and the recollections which surrounded him. From that wild and awful abode he poured forth the torrent of his lawless eloquence, and thundered with indiscriminate wrath against the enemies and the reformers of his religion. And if in that peaceful, and perhaps sinless solitude, it was excusable that he should exaggerate the merits of mortification, and fasting, and celibacy, and pilgrimage, and disparage the substantial virtues, which he could rarely witness, and which he could never practise; on the other hand it was some aggravation of his intemperance, that in the birth-place of Christ, at the very fountain of humility and peace, he vented, even against his Christian adversaries, a malignant and calumnious rancour. Rufinus, Jovinian and Vigilantius, successively sustained the fullness of his indignation; and lastly, towards the close of his life, the opinions of Pelagius again excited that violence, which even old age‡ had been unable to moderate§.

But while we censure both the superstitious and contentious spirit of *St. Jerome*, we must also recollect how great a compensation he made for evils thus occasioned, by his great work, the Latin translation of the Old Testament. And we must add, that a considerable knowledge of Hebrew, much general learning, and long application, qualified him, far

* The commentator on Virgil and Terence.

† In his twenty-second letter, in order to divert his correspondent (Eustochium) from the study of profane authors, *St. Jerome* recounts, that formerly, during the access of a violent fever, he had been dragged in spirit to the tribunal of Jesus Christ, where, after receiving severe chastisement for his attachment to those authors (Cicero and Plautus are specified), he had been forbidden to read them more. Moreover, he assures Eustochium, that that story is no dream, and invokes the heavenly tribunal before which he had appeared, to attest his veracity. See Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.*, vie *S. Jerome*.

‡ *St. Jerome* died in the year 420.

§ In the mean time *St. Jerome* was not himself exempt from error, and such too as called for the reprehension even of *St. Augustin*. The former somewhere expresses an opinion, that the difference between *St. Paul* and *St. Peter*, described in the Acts, was not real, but only feigned—for pious purposes; an opinion which the Bishop of Hippo most justly condemns as of very dangerous consequence. *St. Jerome* also ventured a prophecy respecting the Millennium—but this indeed was a safer field of speculation, since his prediction was not the object of conclusive reasoning; and thus it continued in honour for about six hundred years, until the patience of time at length falsified it.

above any contemporary, for the most important undertaking hitherto accomplished by any father of the Roman church.

And here let us pause, to observe for one moment the *immediate* effect of his various labours. His theological philippics were hailed by the body of the Church with triumphant acclamation; his exhortations to seclusion and celibacy peopled the desert places with monks and hermits; but his translation of the Bible was ill received by the Church; 'it was considered as a rash and dangerous innovation*,' even St. Augustin disapproved, and held that it was more prudent to abide by the text of the Septuagint, than to risk the confusion and scandal which a new version might create. This senseless clamour was sufficient, even in those days, to prevent the immediate diffusion of the work; and almost two hundred years afterwards, we learn, that it only divided with its rival the diligence of St. Gregory; in later times it spread into wider circulation, and finally obtained very general possession of the Latin church†.

As the name of Athanasius more properly belongs to the Arian controversy, so that of *Augustin* is closely connected with the history of the Donatists and Pelagians, and that of *Basil* with the rise of Monasticism. Those who may desire more extensive information respecting the lives and countless writings of the fathers here mentioned, and of the more numerous and obscure associates whom we have no space to notice, may apply, though with different degrees of confidence, to the compilations of Lardner, Dupin, Cave, and Tillemont.

CHAPTER X.

From the Death of Justinian to that of Charlemagne.

567 to 814.

I. The External fortunes of Christianity—its Restoration in England by St. Austin—its progress in Germany—among the Tartars—Its reverses—Mahomet and his successors—their conquests in Asia—in Egypt—facilitated by Christian dissensions—in Africa—Carthage—in Spain—in France—their defeat by Charles Martel—Treatment of Christian subjects by the Saracens—Charlemagne—forcible conversion of the Saxons and Pannonians.—II. The internal condition of Christianity—method of this History—Pope Gregory the Great—his character and conduct—worship of Images—Purgatory—Relics—Ceremonies—the Gregorian Canon—Gregory the creator of the Papal system—Title of Œcumenic Bishop—Power of the Keys—Apocrisiarii and Defensores—Changes in the seventh and eighth centuries—Orders of the Clergy—The Tonsure—Unity of the Church—Councils—Metropolitans—Increase and abuse of Episcopal power—Pope Zachary consulted as to the deposition of Childeric—his conduct how far blameable—the Lombards—the Donation of Pepin—confirmed by Charlemagne—His liberality to the Church, and the motives of it—His endeavours to reform the Church.

CHRISTIANITY had obtained early and perhaps general reception in Britain, when it was suddenly swept away, with the language itself, by the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons in 452, and almost entirely obliterated. Towards the end of the sixth century some circumstances occurred favourable to its restitution. Ethelbert, King of Kent, the most considerable of the Anglo-Saxon princes, married Bertha, daughter of the King of Paris, a Christian. Some clergy appear to have followed her to England, and to have softened the pagan prejudices of the King. Gregory the Great, who was then Bishop

* Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, loc. cit.

† Of all the works of St. Jerome, his 'Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers' is that which is now most frequently referred to.

of Rome, availed himself of this circumstance, and in the year 596, he sent over forty Benedictine monks, under the conduct of Augustin (commonly called St. Austin), prior of a monastery of that order. The King was converted, and most of the inhabitants of Kent followed his example; the missionary then received episcopal ordination from the primate of Arles, and was invested, as Archbishop of Canterbury, with power over the British Church. The religion, thus established, spread with great rapidity; six other Anglo-Saxon Kings embraced the faith of Augustin and Ethelbert; and it was very generally propagated throughout the whole island before the conclusion of the seventh century.

The miraculous assistance by which this work was accomplished is acknowledged in a letter addressed by the Pope himself to his missionary. 'I know that God has performed through you great miracles among that people; but let us remember that, when the disciples said with joy to their divine master, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name," he answered them—"Rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." While God thus employs your agency without, remember, my dear brother, to judge yourself severely within, and to know well what you are. If you have offended God in word or deed, preserve those offences in your thoughts, to repress the vain glory of your heart, and consider, that the gift of miracles is not granted to you for yourself, but for those whose salvation you are labouring to procure.' An increased acquaintance with the character of Gregory, which we shall presently acquire, will diminish the weight of his testimony on this matter; which many indeed will be strongly predisposed to doubt, from the circumstance, that the apostle of England was never supernaturally gifted with any knowledge of the language of the country, but was obliged, in addressing the people, to avail himself of the imperfect service of an interpreter. But (little as those stories may be entitled to credit) it is certain, that God vouchsafed one heavenly blessing on the mission of St. Austin, though displayed in a manner less popular with Roman Catholic historians—the work of conversion was accomplished without violence or compulsion; the sword of the spirit was found sufficient for the holy purpose, and the ruins of our Saxon idolatry were not stained by the blood of one martyr.

It is not pretended, that the religion thus hastily introduced was a pure form of Christianity, or even that it differed very widely, in its first appearance or operation, from the superstition which it succeeded. There even exists an Epistle from Gregory in which he permits the ceremonies of the former worship to be associated with the profession of the Gospel; nor is it possible, even for the most perfect law at once to change the habits and correct the morals of a savage people. But the consent of history assures us, that, during the century following, the nation gradually emerged from the rudest barbarism into a condition of comparative civilization, and that the principles and motives of Christianity extended their salutary influence over the succeeding generations.

Many historians affirm, that St. Austin neglected the lessons of humility which he had received from his master, and proceeded to assert with great insolence the spiritual supremacy of Rome, not only over his own converts, but also over that faithful portion who still maintained among the Cambrian mountains the doctrine and practice transmitted from their forefathers. It appears indeed that those simple believers having been long severed from the body of Christendom, ignorantly preserved the original oriental rite in the celebration of Easter, which had been so long proclaimed

schismatic; they were still involved in the error of the Quartadecimans; and they continued to persevere both in that and in the rejection of papal authority, even after they had been enlightened by the exhortations of St. Austin. It is recorded, and is probable, that they were deterred by the imperious conduct of that prelate from uniting with his Church; and thus far we need not hesitate to condemn him; but some more serious charges which have been brought against him stand on very slight foundation*.

It is next our duty to record and celebrate the labours of Succathus, a Scotsman, to whom is usually given the glory of having converted the Irish, and established among them the Episcopal Church; and also of Columban, an Irish monk and missionary, who diffused the religion among the Gauls and various Teutonic tribes, about the end of the sixth century. It is not easy, at this distance of time, to calculate the precise effect of mere individual exertion in so difficult an enterprise, or to separate what is fabulous in such records from that which may reasonably be received. But the progress of St. Austin is much more intelligible—since he was aided by the immediate support of Pope Gregory, and since one of the earliest among his proselytes was a King.

It appears probable, that at the beginning of the eighth century Christianity had made very little progress in Germany; at least its reception had been confined to provinces immediately bordering on the Roman empire†. In the year 715, Winfrid‡, a noble Englishman, who was afterwards known by the name of Boniface, undertook the labours of a missionary. His first attempt was fruitless; but presently returning, under the auspices and by the authority of Pope Gregory II., he preached among the Frieslanders and Hessians, with considerable success§. In 723 he was consecrated a Bishop, and being joined by many pious Christians, from France as well as England, he established numerous churches throughout the country. His immediate recompense was advancement to the archiepiscopal See of Mayence, and to the Primacy of Germany and Belgium. To posterity he is more generally and more gloriously known as the *Apostle of the Germans*. And the additional title of *Saint* was

* Jortin (Ecc. Hist.; vol. iv., p. 417) says, 'The Christianity which this pretended apostle and sanctified ruffian taught us, seemed to consist principally in two things, in keeping Easter upon a proper day, and to be slaves to our Sovereign Lord God, the Pope, and to Austin, his deputy and vicegerent. Such were the boasted blessings and benefits which we received from the mission and ministry of this most audacious and insolent monk.' This is passionate and unjust abuse. St. Austin was indeed the missionary of a Pope—but his conversion of the mass of the inhabitants of this island was perfectly independent of his endeavours to bring over to the Church of Rome the few and obscure schismatics of Wales; and let us recollect that his exertions, in both cases, were directed only to *persuade*. The evidence respecting the massacre of the twelve hundred monks of Bangor is very fairly stated by Fuller; and it seems upon the whole probable, that the event took place after the death of St. Austin. But at any rate the crime was committed in the heat of battle, apparently without design or premeditation—so that it is absurd to charge it upon a person, who, even if he was living, was certainly not present at the scene.

† Fleury (l. xxxviii., sect. lviii.) mentions three monasteries as having been founded at Tournay and Ghent about the middle of the seventh century.

‡ We are not to confound this missionary with St. Wilfrid, another Englishman, who also gained some reputation both in France and at Rome, from about 660 to 710. The vast quantity of relics which he brought home from his first expedition to the Continent is mentioned by Fleury, liv. xxx., sect. xxxv.

§ Mosheim, Cent. viii., p. i., c. i. Milner takes great pains to exculpate Boniface from the various charges of violence, arrogance, fraud, &c., which Mosheim very liberally heaps upon him, and to prove him, from his own correspondence, to have been a mere pious, unambitious missionary. There is *some* reason in the defence; and Mosheim may very probably have been prejudiced against Boniface by that absolute devotion to the Holy See which he professed, and by which he profited. See also Fleury, end of liv. xli., &c.

due not only to his zeal, but also to his martyrdom—for, returning in his old age to Frieseland*, that he might terminate his labours where he had begun them, he was massacred by the savage inhabitants, together with fifty ecclesiastics who attended him. (A. D. 755.)

To the eighth century we may also refer the introduction of Christianity among the Tartars, the inhabitants of those regions which now constitute the southern Asiatic provinces of the Russian empire. This spiritual conquest was achieved under the auspices of an heretical Bishop, Timotheus the Nestorian, about the year 790. On the other hand, for the chastisement of a corrupt Church and a sinful people, the extensive tracts of central and southern Asia had been already overwhelmed by the fiercest enemies who have ever been raised against the Christian name, the fanatic followers of Mahomet; and to their mention we cannot proceed perhaps with a better augury, than after recording that obscure fact, which planted the banner of Christianity in a Russian province.

During the fourth century of our history we were occupied in observing the destruction of the ancient paganism of Greece and Rome; during the fifth and sixth we marked the success of Christianity in supplanting the rude superstitions of the Celtic invaders of the empire, and subduing those savage aggressors to the law, or at least to the name, of Christ. But the seventh century was marked by the birth of a new and resolute adversary, who began his career with the most stupendous triumphs, who has torn from us the possession of half the world, and who retains his conquests even to this moment. Mahomet was born *about* the year 575; we are ignorant of the precise period of the nativity of that man who wrought the most extraordinary revolution in the affairs of this globe, which the agency of any being merely human has ever yet accomplished. His pretended mission did not commence till he was about forty years old, and the date of his celebrated flight from Mecca, the Hedjirah, or era of Mahometan nations, is 622, A. D. The remainder of his life was spent in establishing his religion and his authority in his native land, Arabia; and the sword with which he finally completed that purpose, he bequeathed, for the universal propagation of both, to his followers. His commission was zealously executed; and, in less than a century after his death, his faith was uninterruptedly extended by a chain of nations from India to the Atlantic.

*Mahometan
Conquests.*

The fate of Persia was decided by the battle of Cadesia, in 636. In Syria, Damascus had already fallen, and after the sanguinary conflict of Yermuk, where the Saracens for the first time encountered and overthrew a Christian enemy, the conquerors instantly proceeded to the reduction of Jerusalem; that grand religious triumph they obtained in 637. In the

* That country was for some years the scene of the successive exertions of St. Wilfrid, St. Vulfran, St. Villebrod, and lastly St. Boniface. It was the second of those missionaries whose injudicious answer to Radbod, the King of the Frieselanders, retarded the progress of the new religion. That Prince was standing at the baptismal font, prepared for the ceremony—only one point remained, respecting which his curiosity was still unsatisfied—‘Tell me,’ said he to the Holy Bishop, ‘where is now the greater number of the Kings and Princes of the nation of the Frieselanders—are they in the Paradise which you promise me, or in the Hell with which you menace me?’ ‘Do not deceive yourself,’ replied St. Vulfran; ‘the Princes, your predecessors, who have died without baptism, are most assuredly damned; but whosoever shall believe henceforward, and be baptised, shall be in joy eternal with Christ Jesus.’ Upon this Radbod withdrew his foot from the font and said—‘I cannot resolve to relinquish the society of the Kings, my predecessors, in order to live with a few poor people in the kingdom of heaven. I cannot believe these novelties, and I will rather adhere to the ancient usages of my nation.’ It was not until after the death of this Prince that St. Boniface gained any footing in the country. Fleury, l. xlix., s. 35.

year following Aleppo and Antioch fell into their hands, which completed the conquest of Syria. Thence they proceeded northward as far as the shores of the Euxine and the neighbourhood of Constantinople.

The invasion of Egypt took place in 638, and within the space of three years, the whole of that populous province was in the possession of the infidels. Alexandria was the last city which fell; and in somewhat more than a century after the expulsion of philosophy from Europe by a Christian legislator, the schools of Africa were closed in their turn by the arms of an unlettered Mahometan.

The success of the Saracens was not inconsiderably promoted by the religious dissensions of their Christian adversaries. A vast number of heretics who had been oppressed and stigmatized by Edicts and Councils were scattered over the surface of Asia; and these were contented to receive a foreign master, of whose principles they were still ignorant, in the place of a tyrant whose injustice they had experienced. But in Egypt, especially, the whole mass of the native population was unfortunately involved in the Jacobite heresy; and few at that time were found, except the resident Greeks, who adhered to the doctrine of the Church. The followers of Eutyches formed an immediate alliance with the soldiers of Mahomet against a Catholic Prince; and they considered that there was nothing unnatural in that act, since they hoped to secure for themselves, under a Mahometan, the toleration which had been refused by an orthodox government. We should remark, however, that this hope, the pretext of their desertion, was with many the suggestion of their malice: that besides the recollection of wrongs, and the desire to escape or revenge them, they were inflamed as furiously as their persecutors by that narrow sectarian spirit, which is commonly excited most keenly where the differences are most trifling; and which, while it exaggerated the lines that separated them from their fellow Christians, blinded them to the broad gulph which divided all alike from the infidel.

From Egypt the conquerors rushed along the northern shore of Africa; and though their progress in that direction was interrupted by the domestic dissensions of the Prophet's family, even more than by the occasional vigour of the Christians, they were in possession of Carthage before the end of the seventh century. Thence they proceeded westward, and after encountering some opposition from the native Moors, little either from the Greek or Vandal masters of the country, they completed their conquest in the year 709.

Hitherto the Mahometans had gained no footing in Europe; and it may seem strange that the most western of its provinces should have been that which was first exposed to their occupation. But the vicinity of Spain to their latest conquests, and the factious dissensions of its nobility, gave them an early opportunity to attempt the subjugation of that country. Their success was almost unusually rapid. In 711 they overthrew the Gothic monarchy by the victory of Xeres; and the two following years were sufficient to secure their dominion over the greatest part of the peninsula.

The waters of this torrent were destined to proceed still a little farther. Ten years after the battle of Xeres, the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees and overran with little opposition the south-western provinces of France—the vineyards of Gascony and the city of Bourdeaux were possessed by the Sovereign of Damascus and Samarcand; and the south of France, from the mouth of the Garonne to that of the Rhone, assumed the

manners and religion of Arabia*.' Still dissatisfied with those ample limits, or impatient of any limit, these children of the desert again marched forward into the centre of the kingdom. They were encamped between Tours and Poitiers, when Charles Martel, the Mayor or Duke of the Franks, encountered them. It is too much to assert that the fate of Christianity depended upon the result of the battle which followed; but if victory had declared for the Saracens, it would probably have secured to them in France the same extent, perhaps the same duration, of authority which they possessed in Spain. Next they would have carried the horrors of war and Islamism into Germany or Britain; but there other fields must have been fought, against nations of warriors as brave as the Franks, by an invader who was becoming less powerful, and even less enthusiastic, as he advanced farther from the head of his resources and his faith. Indeed, if we had space to speculate more deeply on the probabilities of this question, we should rather be led to consider this effort against France as the last wave of the deluge now exhausted, and about to recede within more reasonable boundaries.

The final struggle of the Saracens was scarcely worthy of their former triumphs. During six days of desultory combat the horsemen and archers of the East maintained indeed an indecisive advantage; but in the closer onset of the seventh day, the Germans, more eminently powerful in limb, and strong in heart as well as hand, instantly extinguished the Arabs with iron arm and overbearing chest†. The chief of the Saracens fell in the conflict; the survivors fled to their encampment, and after a night passed in the dissension usual to the vanquished, they dispersed, and evacuated the country. This battle was fought in the year 732; the advantages were slowly but resolutely pursued by the conqueror, and presently ended in the final expulsion of the invader from the soil of France.

In less than one century from the preaching of Mahomet, his disciples had obtained military possession of Persia, Syria, and the greater part of central and western Asia, of Egypt, and the long extent of the northern coast of Africa; and lastly of the kingdom of Spain. The propagation of their religion furnished to all the pretext, and to many the sincere motive, of aggression; and as the most violent means were not forbidden by their law, and as religious wars are seldom distinguished by mildness and humanity, we may believe that many revolting cruelties were occasionally perpetrated by them. However upon the whole they found it more politic to tolerate than to exterminate; with the heretics of the East they formed early and friendly relations through a common enmity; and in Africa and Spain they generally proffered the alternative of the Koran or tribute‡; so that Christianity was not immediately extirpated from any of the conquered countries, and even at this moment it continues to linger, however degraded by adversity and oppression, in almost all of them.

* Gibbon has not composed a more eloquent, or a less philosophical chapter, than his fiftieth. As if he were blinded by the splendour of the Mahometan conquests, he overlooks, not only the misery immediately occasioned by them, but their fatal influence on the progressive and permanent improvement of man. History is philosophy teaching by example; and the lessons of history are then, indeed, noble and profitable, and then only, when philosophy casts away her pride and her pedantry, and condescends to rise into philanthropy.

† Gibbon, c. lii. Roderic Toletan. c. xiv., Gens Austriæ membrorum pre-eminentia valida, et gens Germana corde et corpore præstantissima, quasi in ictu oculi manu ferrea et pectore arduo Arabes extinxerunt.

‡ The Mahometans drew a broad distinction between those infidels who had a *Book* of faith, and those who had none. Among the former they placed the disciples of Zoroaster, and therefore showed them great *mercy*—but they had no *compassion* on the Pagan.

The country in which it suffered the most immediate and perfect prostration was the northern coast of Africa; and those two fruitful nurseries of religion and religious men, Alexandria and Carthage, which fill so eminent a station in the early Catholic Church—names which are so closely associated with all the various fortunes of rising Christianity, with its most honourable and holy triumphs, with its afflictions and reverses, with the zeal, the genius, and the eloquence of its professors, with their dissensions and intolerance—those two powerful Churches were from that time forward obliterated from history. It is true, indeed, that the former still preserved a title, but it was without power; and a dignity, but it was without independence: she lost her learning and her industry, and all her excellence and energy departed with them. But at Carthage the actual extinction of Christianity very speedily followed the success of the Mahometans, and the labours of Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Augustin and so many others were spurned and execrated, if indeed their very names were not rather forgotten, by a faithless and blaspheming posterity.

The victory of Charles Martel was soon followed by the re-establishment of a more effective government in France; and precisely forty years after the battle of Tours, we find Charlemagne engaged in a sanguinary war against the Saxons, for the purpose of converting them to the Christian religion. It seemed, indeed, as if that zealous Prince was for a season possessed by the spirit of the Arabian, and that he imitated the fury of his armed apostles; and, as if Christianity had not already sufficiently suffered by adopting the vices of other systems, he dragged into its service the most savage principle of Islamism. After eight years of resistance and misfortune the Saxons were compelled to take refuge in the profession of the Gospel*; and the Huns of Pannonia were soon afterwards driven by the same victorious compulsion to the same necessity.

When we behold the limits of Christendom extended by the writings of its ministers, or the eloquence of its missionaries, we record such conquests with pure and grateful satisfaction; when we observe a mass of Pagans, or other unbelievers, suddenly, but peacefully, melting into the bosom of the Church, we question their motives, we lament the stain which they may bring with them, and we censure any unworthy compromise which has been made to conciliate them; yet we are consoled to reflect that no immediate misery has been occasioned by a change which is pregnant at least with future improvement. But when we see the sword employed to propagate a religion of which the very essence is peace, we are at once disgusted and revolted by the cruel and impious mockery.

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN TO THAT OF CHARLEMAGNE.

IN an endeavour to compress into a few short chapters the ever-varying records of fifteen centuries, it might, perhaps, be thought sufficient to exhibit a mere chronological series of events and names; but we consider

* Charlemagne was occasionally troubled by the *contumacy* of his converts, even to the end of his reign; and in the civil wars among his grandsons, we find Lothaire proclaiming *liberty of conscience* to the Saxons of the succeeding generation (in 841). Many of them eagerly cast away the mask of Christianity, and flew to his standard. Compulsion has filled the world with hypocrites, but it has never made a true convert to any faith or any form of faith. See Millot, *Hist. France*.

it a more profitable, as it is certainly a more attractive employment, to select and illustrate what is material and consequential, and to pass, as it were, from eminence to eminence, dwelling for some short space on each, and delineating its features with some exactness, though we may thus be compelled to treat with little minuteness the periods intervening; but it is certain that there are many secondary names, and many occurrences of mere temporary importance, which may be consigned to silence without any danger to the integrity and usefulness of history. On this principle we shall proceed, without delay, from the death of Justinian to the accession of Gregory the First to the pontifical chair. That prelate presided over the Church of Rome from the year 590 to 604; and he illustrated that short period by so many splendid qualities, and pursued his various purposes with such bold and successful exertion, that he has acquired, and perhaps deserved, the deep and faithful veneration of the Catholic Church. At least it has been found so difficult to estimate his character with moderation, and we observe so much intemperance, both in the eulogies and the insults* which are offered to it, that its mere strength and energy, which are thus sufficiently proved, assert its claim to a more considerate and impartial examination.

Two prominent vices overshadowed and counteracted the numerous excellencies of Gregory—superstition and ambition. For the former of these some excuse may be found in the spirit and principles of the age in which he lived; the latter was the produce of the same vigorous nature which gave birth to his virtues; and it was urged in him to an excess, which it would not have reached in a feebler mind. His virtues were his own, and those of his religion; and if we should discredit, as affected, that humility which preferred the cloister to the chair of St. Peter, and so long rejected the proffered mitre, at least we must praise the generosity which led him, in early life, to bestow his large possessions on the Church, and we must admire his ardent piety, and sincere, though often misdirected, devotion. The extreme severity of his moral practice has not been contested, nor his honest endeavours to enforce the same practice in every rank and order of his clergy. Circumstances, political as well as religious, had introduced abuses into the system of ecclesiastical discipline, which a weak and narrow mind might have thought it expedient to protect, but which Gregory knew that it was wiser to reform. Indeed we may observe, that the best friends of every Church in every age, and those whose services are most gratefully acknowledged by posterity, however ungraciously they may be accepted by interested contemporaries, are men who dare to distinguish between the system and its corruptions, and to administer those vigorous measures of renovation which are necessary for its health and perpetuity. And thus would it have been still happier for the fame of that Pope had he taken a still bolder view of the imperfections of his Church, and applied to the cure of

Gregory the Great.

* 'Pope Gregory the Great, called St. Gregory, was remarkable for many things; for exalting his own authority, for running down human learning and polite literature, for burning classic authors, for patronizing ignorance and stupidity, for persecuting heretics, for flattering the most execrable princes, and for relating a multitude of absurd, monstrous and ridiculous lies, called miracles. He was an ambitious, insolent Prelate, under the mask of humility.' Jortin, Remarks, vol. iv., p. 403. Most, though by no means all, of the above charges are true; but the counterpoise of good and powerful qualities is left almost entirely unnoticed by their author.

† Baron, ann. 590, sect. vii. &c. &c.

its deeper and spiritual diseases the remedial attention which he confined to its discipline and its ceremonies.

The character of Gregory was distinguished by the fervour of his charity; the virtue which surrounded his palace with crowds of sufferers of every rank and profession, and distributed for their relief* the funds, which with little scandal might have been lavished on selfish purposes, has never been disputed, and ought never to have been disparaged. Nor was he contented to exercise this alone, but strove, on the contrary, to extend its practice by powerful exhortations among his episcopal brethren—‘Let not the Bishop think that reading and preaching alone suffice, or studiously to maintain himself in retirement, while the hand which enriches and fructifies is closed. But let his hand be bountiful; let him make advances to those who are in necessity; let him consider the wants of others as his own; for without these qualities the name of Bishop is a vain and empty title.’ We should also remark, that this Pope exerted himself on more than one occasion to redeem Christian prisoners from captivity, and to alleviate their sufferings during it.

He was diligent in his efforts to propagate the Catholic faith. His most important spiritual conquest was that of England; and if it be a reproach to him that he there permitted the first converts to retain, under other names, the substance of some of their superstitious practices‡, in France, where the longer and more general diffusion of the religion left less excuse for such a concession, he zealously endeavoured to extirpate the remains of idolatry§. The conversion of the Jews|| was another favourite object with him; and in one respect he adopted the most promising means for that purpose, by treating them with mildness and humanity; in another he insulted their principles, while he disgraced his own, by the direct offer of gain, as the reward of their apostasy. His zeal for the unity of the Church is a very ambiguous excellence; but it was warmly, and (as Roman Catholic historians assert) successfully exerted, both against the remnant of the Donatists, and against certain schismatics who had seceded from the Church on the controversy respecting the Three Chapters¶. We may add to this, that his activity in ennobling the services of religion, and adding splendour to its ceremonies, however unworthy a method of recommending a spiritual religion, found some excuse in the degenerate principles of the sixth century.

Through the disturbed condition of Italy, the aggressions of the Lombard invaders, and the weakness of the Imperial power, the direction of

* See Baronius, ann. 591, sect. iii. xxiv. &c.; ann. 592, sect. ii.; ann. 596, sect. viii. Fleury, l. xxxv. sect. xvi. Gibbon, chap. xlv.

† Lib. v., Epist. 29, apud Baron. ann. 592, sect. xvi.

‡ *Altaria destruuntur, reliquiae ponantur.* He allows even sacrifices on *Saints* days—substituting, however, a convivial, for a superstitious, motive—*nec diabolo tam animalia immolent, sed ad laudem Dei in esu suo animalia occidunt, &c.* Baron. ann. 601. xxii.

§ Fleury, H. E., lib. xxxv., sect. xxi. He complains of immolations to idols, worship of trees, sacrifices of the heads of animals, &c.—*Quia pervenit ad nos quod multi Christianorum et ad Ecclesias occurrant, et (quod dici nefas est) a culturis dæmonum non discedant.* See Baron. ann. 597, xviii.

|| Baron. ann. 594, sect. viii. ann. 598, sect. xiv.

¶ The subject of the fifth General Council. One of these schismatics, named Stephanus, came to Rome, and offered to Gregory to return to the Church, if the Bishop would take upon himself the risk of his soul, and intercede with God as his sponsor and fidejussor, that his return to the Catholic Church should be sanctioned in Heaven; which Gregory undertook without any hesitation—*quod Gregorius minimè facere cunctatus est.* Baronius, ann. 590, sect. xxvi.

the political interests of Rome devolved for the most part upon Gregory. It appears not that he sought that charge, so eagerly grasped by many of his successors, but rather that he entered with reluctance upon duties which, if not at direct variance, were at least little in accordance with a spiritual office. But, having once undertaken them, he discharged them with the ability and in the spirit which became his character and his profession; he presented himself as a mediator and pacificator, and by his faithful ministry to the God of peace*, he succeeded in averting the arms of his enemies, and in preserving his country from servitude.

He professed to reject from the service of religion that profane learning of which his writings prove him to have been ignorant; and hence probably proceeded the charge so commonly believed, though insufficiently† supported, that he burnt the Palatine Library, and destroyed some of the most valuable remains of classical antiquity. But it is admitted, that he was inferior to none in the learning of his own age‡; and his diligence and energy are abundantly attested by the voluminous and even vigorous compositions which he has left behind him§.

We shall proceed to point out some instances in which] Gregory deviated even farther than his predecessors from that ancient faith and practice of which his See, since it now claimed exclusively the denomination of Apostolical, professed a peculiar *Use of Images.* observance. Before the end of the sixth century, the dangerous usage which had originated in the fourth||, of exposing images of saints, of the virgin, and even of Christ, in places consecrated to worship, had taken deep root, as well in the Western as in the Eastern Church. Serenus, the Bishop of Marseilles, caused some of them to be removed, and complaint was made to Gregory. The Pope at once, and very explicitly, declared, that images should on no account be approached as *objects* of worship, and strongly exhorted the Bishop to press that consideration on all who might possibly mistake their use—which was, when truly understood, to impart knowledge to the ignorant, and learning to the illiterate. At the same time, such being their professed end and purpose, he strenuously opposed their removal. By this determination, he impressed upon a popular corruption that sanction and authority which alone was wanting to make it permanent and universal.

The belief in the fire of Purgatory was seriously inculcated by the same

* The following is his boast to Sabinianus, his Apocrisiarius or Envoy at Constantinople. 'Unum est quod breviter suggeras serenissimis Dominis nostris: quia (that) si ego servus eorum in mortem Longobardorum me miscere voluissem, hodie Longobardorum gens nec regem, nec duces, nec comites habuisset, atque in summa confusione esset divisa. *Sed quia Deum timeo, in mortem cujuscumque hominis me miscere formido.*' See Baronius (ann. 595, sect. xviii.), who details his various negotiations with the Lombards very accurately.

† There seems to be no authority for this accusation older than the twelfth century. See Bayle, *Vie de Greg.* I.

‡ 'Disciplinis vero liberalibus, hoc est grammatica, rhetorica, dialectica, ita a puero est institutus, ut quamvis eo tempore florerent adhuc Romæ studia literarum, tamen nulli in urbe sua secundus putaretur.' Paul. Diac. *Vit. St. Greg.* Gibbon, c. xlv.

§ There are greater remains of the works of Gregory than of any other Pope; and a diligent and judicious study of his Epistles might still throw much new light on the early History of his Church. Baronius attributes the rudeness of his style to the barbarism of the age in which he lived.

|| We shall treat this—and some other of the Roman Catholic corruptions more fully in the thirteenth Chapter.

Pontiff; and to him more justly than to any individual, we may attribute the practical system to which that speculative opinion gave birth. He also exalted the merit of pilgrimages* to the Holy Places; but the superstition which he most ardently sustained, was, a reverential respect for relics, founded for the most part on their miraculous qualities. The deep and earnest solemnity with which one of the greatest characters of his age and church was not ashamed to enforce so very gross a delusion, cannot so well be depicted to the reader as in his own language.

The Empress Constantina, who was building a Church at Constantinople to St. Paul, made application to Gregory for the head of that Apostle†, or at least for some portion of his body. The Pope begins his answer by a very polite expression of his sorrow 'that he neither could nor dared to grant that favour; for the bodies of the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, are so resplendent with miracles and terrific prodigies in their own Churches, that no one can approach them without great awe, even for the purpose of adoring them. When my predecessor, of happy memory, wished to change some silver ornament which was placed over the most holy body of St. Peter, though at the distance of almost fifteen feet, a warning of no small terror appeared to him. Even I myself wished to make some alteration near the most holy body of St. Paul, and it was necessary to dig rather deeply near his tomb. The Superior of the place found some bones which were not at all connected with that tomb; and, having presumed to disturb and remove them to some other place, he was visited by certain fearful apparitions, and died suddenly. My predecessor, of holy memory, also undertook to make some repairs near the tomb of St. Lawrence: as they were digging, without knowing precisely where the venerable body was placed, they happened to open his sepulchre. The monks and guardians who were at the work, only because they had seen the body of that martyr, though they did not presume so much as to touch it, all died within ten days; to the end that no man might remain in life who had beheld the body of that just man. Be it then known to you, that it is the custom of the Romans, when they give any relics, not to venture to touch any portion of the body; only they put into a box a piece of linen (called *brandeum*), which is placed near the holy bodies; then it is withdrawn, and shut up with due veneration in the Church which is to be dedicated, and as many prodigies are then wrought by it as if the bodies themselves had been carried thither; whence it happened, that in the time of St. Leo, (as we learn from our ancestors,) when some Greeks doubted the virtue of such relics, that Pope called for a pair of scissors, and cut the linen, and blood flowed from the incision. And not at Rome only, but throughout the whole of the West, it is held sacrilegious to touch the bodies of the Saints, nor does such tenacity ever remain unpunished. For which reason we are much astonished at the custom of the Greeks to take away the bones of the Saints, and we scarcely give credit to it. But what shall I say respecting the bodies of the holy Apostles, when it is a known fact, that at the time of

* Baronius, ann. 592, sect. xix.

† Baronius, who cites the Pope's reply with considerable admiration, attributes the Empress's exorbitant request to Ecclesiastical ambition,—to a desire to exalt the See of Constantinople to a level with that of Rome, by getting into her possession so important a portion of so great an Apostle. Fleury quotes the letter chiefly in proof that the *transfer* of relics was forbidden in the Roman Church, while that abuse was permitted in the East.

their martyrdom, a number of the faithful came from the East to claim them? But when they had carried them out of the city, to the second milestone, to a place called the Catacombs, the whole multitude was unable to move them farther,—such a tempest of thunder and lightning terrified and dispersed them. The napkin, too, which you wished to be sent at the same time, is with the body, and cannot be touched more than the body can be approached. But that your religious desire may not be wholly frustrated, I will hasten to send to you some part of those chains which St. Paul wore on his neck and hands, if indeed I shall succeed in getting off any filings from them. For since many continually solicit as a blessing that they may carry off from those chains some small portion of their filings, *a priest stands by with a file*; and sometimes it happens that some portions fall off from the chains instantly, and without delay; while, at other times, the file is long drawn over the chains, and yet nothing is at last scraped off from them.

The pages* of Ecclesiastical History are so full of such idle fables, that the repetition even of the smallest portion of them is a task as tedious as it is unworthy of a reasonable mind; but when such absurdities are propagated and dignified by the pen of Gregory the Great—of him whom the Roman Church reveres almost as the first among her saints, and whose writings for so many centuries directed, and even still direct, the principles of her Ministers—it would be a neglect of historical duty to pass them over in complete silence†.

The public worship of God was still celebrated by every nation in its own language; but its forms were enlarged from time to time by new prayers and offices, as well as hymns and psalmody, and such other additions as were found proper to enliven devotion. Gregory introduced a more imposing method of administering the Communion, with a magnificent assemblage of pompous ceremonies. This institution was called the Canon of the Mass; and such as it appears in the Sacramentaries of

* Eligius or Eloi, Bishop of Noyon (or Limoges), a contemporary of Gregory, and also a Saint, acquired extraordinary celebrity by his ardour in searching after the bodies of martyrs, and his miraculous sagacity in the discovery of them. And as he thus became a person of influence in his day, we may venture to record what, in his opinion, was the sum and substance of true religion. ‘He is a good Christian (says St. Eligius) who goes frequently to church, and makes his oblations at God’s altar; who never tastes of his own fruit until he has presented some to God; who, for many days before the solemn festivals, observes strict chastity, though he be married, that he may approach the altar with a safe conscience; lastly, who can repeat the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer. Redeem your souls from punishment whilst you have it in your power; offer your free gifts and tithes; contribute towards the luminaries in holy places; repair frequently to church, and humbly implore the protection of the Saints. If you observe these things, you may appear boldly at God’s tribunal in the day of judgment, and say—Give, Lord, according as we have given.’ The original is quoted by Mosh. Cent. vii., p. ii. c. iii.

† The Dialogues of Gregory abound with miraculous narratives; and Fleury excuses this practice by pleading that he had not philosophers for his antagonists, who needed argument for confutation, but that the pagans then to be found were chiefly peasants, serfs, or soldiers, and were more moved by a miraculous story than by the most conclusive syllogism. In process of time, Gregory, from being the relater, rose to be the performer of miracles. About one hundred and eighty years after his death, Paulus Diaconus records, that a Roman lady, on some occasion, receiving the Communion from Gregory, and hearing him say the customary words, could not forbear smiling, when he called that the body of Christ which she had made with her own hands—for at that time the people used to bring to the Communion their own bread, which was a small, round, flat cake. The Pope, perceiving her behaviour, took the bread out of her hands, and, having prayed over it, showed it to her turned into flesh, in the sight of the whole people.

St. Gregory, such, word for word (says Fleury*), we say it still. After regulating the prayers, the Pope descended to the modulation of the chant; and to give some permanency to his success in this matter, he established a school of chanters, which subsisted for at least three centuries after his death.† Other alterations were made by the same pontiff in the distribution of the parishes, the calendar of festivals, the order of processions, the service of the priests and deacons, the variety and change of sacerdotal garments; and as most of them were permanent, we may consider the system properly called Roman Catholic as having assumed its peculiar character at this time. And thus, while the Antiquity of the universal Church may justly be regarded as having ceased at the accession of Constantine, it is not a fanciful position that its Middle Age—that indistinct period, during which the principles that were hereafter to give it a more lasting and definite form were collecting strength, but were not yet developed—was brought to a close by the splendid pontificate of Gregory.

If, then, it be not incorrect to date the modern history of the Catholic Church from this epoch, it will be reasonably inquired what elements then existed, or, at least, what indications may be discovered, of the monarchical or *papal* government, which formed the characteristic of the Communion in later ages? We shall, therefore, proceed to point out such of these as were most perceptible during the time of Gregory. We have noticed an early jealousy subsisting between the Sees of Rome and Constantinople, and the sort of superiority which was conferred upon the former by the council of Chalcedon. It appears, too, that St. Leo was addressed by certain oriental correspondents by the title of Œcumenic, or Universal Patriarch, though his immediate successors refrained from adopting that lofty appellation. Matters rested thus till the year 588, when the Emperor Maurice conferred that same title upon his own Patriarch John, commonly called the Faster,‡ an austere and ambitious prelate. Pope Pelagius opposed those pretensions; and, eight years afterwards, the contest was much more vigorously renewed by Gregory. In 595, he addressed five epistles on this subject to John himself, to the Emperor and Empress, and to the

* H. E. lib. xxxvi., s. xix. Fleury describes the alterations of Gregory at length and clearly. The great pains which the Pope took in these matters, and especially in the composition of his celebrated chant, are zealously related by Maimbourg, in his History of the Pontificate of St. Gregory.

† Fleury, lib. xxxvi., sect. xxi. 'In the time of John the Deacon (about 900), the original of his Antiphonarius was preserved with great respect, as well as the couch on which he reposed while chanting, and the whip with which he menaced the children.' Pope Gelasius (says the same historian in sect. xv.) had made a collection of the office of the masses, into which St. Gregory introduced many changes and additions. He collected the whole in one volume, which is his Sacramentarius, for so they formerly called the book which contained the prayers used in the administration of the sacraments, and chiefly of the Eucharist. All that was to be chanted was marked in another volume, called the '*Antiphonaire*, parce que l'on chantoit alternativement; d'où vient le nom d'antiphones ou antiennes (anthems) comme il a été expliqué.'

‡ John the Faster, disputing an unmeaning title with Gregory, is assimilated by Baronius (ann. 595, sect. xxvii.) to the apostate angel rising against the Most High God—a comparison not far removed from blasphemy. In more than thirty sections, which that historian devotes to the subject, he labours to depress the See of Constantinople even below that of Alexandria, and continually advances the obtrusiveness of Rome, as a proof of her rightful authority. However, it is true enough that the power of Rome was now growing real and substantial—a fact much more easily shown than either its antiquity or legitimacy.

rival Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; in all vehemently inveighing against the arrogance of the Eastern, and professing the very purest spirit of Christian humility. In his letter to the Emperor he declares that the public calamities are to be ascribed to no other cause than the ambition of the bishops. 'We destroy (he says) by example that which we preach in word; our bones are consumed with fastings, and our soul is puffed up with pride; beneath the meanest garments we conceal a haughty heart; we repose on ashes, and we pretend to grandeur; under the aspect of the sheep we nourish the fangs of the wolf.' (He proceeds) 'The direction and primacy of the whole Church has been given to St. Peter; nevertheless we do not call him the Universal Apostle, and yet the holy man John, my brother, is ambitious to be called the Universal Bishop.* To Constantina he mournfully complains of the insult which has been offered to the See of Rome; and while he humbly confesses 'that the sins of Gregory have merited such chastisement,' he reminds the Empress that St. Peter at least is sinless, and undeserving the outrage which had been offered him. From these and others, even among the few passages which we have cited from Gregory's writings, it appears that the ground on which the Church of Rome rested its assertion of supremacy was already changed very essentially. In its early days the sort of superiority which it endeavoured to assume was founded for the most part on its imperial name and dignity; but when that basis was overthrown by the conquests of the barbarians, another was substituted, of which the purely spiritual nature was admirably calculated to impose upon the ignorant proselytes. The name of St. Peter became more venerable than that of Augustus or Trajan; and his chair, as it was occupied by the successors of the Apostle and the vicars of Christ, inspired a deeper awe into the blind and superstitious multitude, than the throne of all the Cæsars. This change, no doubt, was gradual—it cannot entirely be ascribed to Gregory, or to any other individual; indications of that assertion may even be discovered in very early ecclesiastical writers; but that Pope exerted himself more than any of his predecessors to confirm it, and to give to that uncertain ground-work a stability which has enabled it to support the mighty papal edifice for so many ages.

It has also been observed that Gregory was the first who asserted the power of the keys, as committed to the successor of St. Peter, rather than to the body of the bishops; and he betrayed on many occasions a very ridiculous eagerness to secure their honour. Consequently he was profuse in his distribution of certain keys, endowed, as he was not ashamed to assert, with supernatural qualities; he even ventured to insult Anastasius, the Patriarch of Antioch, by such a gift. 'I have sent you (he says) keys of the blessed Apostle Peter, your guardian, which, when placed upon the sick, are wont to be resplendent with numerous miracles.† We may attribute this absurdity to the basest superstition, or to the most

* St. Gregory could not foresee that, within twelve years from that in which he was writing, the same title would be proudly worn by a successor to the chair of St. Peter (Boniface III.), though granted to that pontiff by an Emperor who disgraced human nature.

† 'Amatoris vestri, beati Petri Apostoli, vobis claves transmisi, quæ super ægros positæ multis solent miraculis curascare.' He addresses nearly the same words to one Andreas, a nobleman, with a similar present. And in another epistle (to Theotistus) he coolly relates a prodigy which had once been performed by one of those keys upon a Lombard soldier. Baronius, ann. 535, sect. iv., ann. 597, sect. xiv., ann. 591., sect. vii., viii. The historian (in the first of those places) eagerly attaches to the keys the notion and omen of *possession*, which probably did not occur to a Pope (even to Pope Gregory) in the sixth century.

impudent hypocrisy; and we would gladly have preferred the more excusable motive, if the supposed advancement of the See, which was clearly concerned in these presents, did not rather lead us to the latter.

Two descriptions of papal agents rise into notice during the pontificate of Gregory—the Apocrisarii (Correspondents), who acted as envoys, or legates, at the Court and at the See of Constantinople; and the Defensores, or Advocates, who, besides their general commission to protect* the property of St. Peter, appear to have been vested with a kind of appellative jurisdiction, which might sometimes interfere with that of the bishops. The former of these appointments tended to raise the external dignity of the See; the latter to extend its internal influence. Again, we find sufficient evidence in the records of this age, that a practice which afterwards proved one of the most fruitful sources of papal power, was already gaining ground—that of appeal from episcopal decision to the Roman See. It does not, indeed, appear that it was founded on any general law, civil or ecclesiastical; but it proceeded very naturally from the *prejudice* attached to the name of Rome, and the chair of St. Peter; and it was carefully encouraged by the See, whose authority was insensibly augmented by it. Before we quit the subject of papal aggrandisement, we shall mention one other circumstance only†. Great relaxation in the monastic discipline of the age justified the very sedulous interference of Gregory to restrain it; and so much address did that pontiff combine with his diligence, as not only to reform the order, but also to secure and protect it. For, while he enforced the severity of the ancient rules with judicious rigour‡, he took measures to shelter it from episcopal oppression, and taught it hereafter to look to Rome for redress and favour. As none are ignorant how firm a support to papal power was furnished in later ages by the devotion of the monasteries, it is important to record the origin of that connexion; and it is difficult to discover any earlier trace of it than that which we have mentioned.

Gibbon, who has drawn with vigour and impartiality the character of Gregory, has probably over-rated his qualities when he designates him as the *greatest* of that name. It is very true that the mixture of simplicity and cunning, of pride and humility§, of sense and superstition, which singularly distinguished him, was happily suited both to his station and to the temper of the times; and it might perhaps be pleaded, that he did no more

* Baron. ann. 598, sect. xv. xix. Gibbon (chap. xlv.) considers them to have possessed not a civil only, but a criminal jurisdiction over the tenants and husbandmen of the Holy See.

† ‘The bishops of Italy and the adjacent islands acknowledged the Roman Pontiff as their special Metropolitan. Even the existence, the union, and the translation of episcopal seats was decided by his absolute discretion; and his successful inroads into the provinces of Greece, of Spain, and of Gaul, might countenance the more lofty pretensions of succeeding popes. He interposed to prevent the abuses of popular elections; his zealous care maintained the purity of faith and discipline; and the apostolic shepherd assiduously watched over the faith and discipline of the subordinate pastors.’ Gibbon, chap. xlv.

‡ Fleury, H. E. lib. xxxvi. sect. 33 and 34.

§ His humility sometimes descended to baseness. The abject adulation with which he courted Phocas, the usurper of the Eastern throne, the most execrable parricide in history, proves (as Bayle has malignantly remarked) that those who prevailed with him to accept the Popedom, knew him better than he knew himself. ‘Ils voyoient en lui le fonds de toutes les ruses et de toutes les souplesses dont on a besoin pour se faire de grands protecteurs, et pour attirer sur l’Eglise les bénédictions de la terre.’ The motive of his flattery was jealousy of the Patriarch of Constantinople. He addressed, with the same servility, Bruneaud, a very wicked Queen of France, and again found his excuse in the interests of his Church.

than yield to that evil temper, when he gave sanction to opinions and usages which were at variance with the spirit of Scripture. But this was to consult his present convenience or popularity, not his perpetual fame. Those who follow the stream of prejudice may be excused or pitied, but they can establish no claim to *greatness*, no title to the respect or gratitude of a posterity to which they transmit, without correction, the errors or vices of their ancestors. So far as he applied himself to remedy those vices or imperfections, so far as he reformed the discipline and repressed the avarice of his clergy, and introduced such improvements into other departments of the system as were consistent with the Gospel truth on which it stood, his name is deservedly celebrated by every honest Christian; but his eagerness in the encouragement of superstitious corruptions (for he was not even contented to tolerate, still less did he make any effort to repress them) must not be treated with indifference or indulgence; because the diffusion of error* has a far more pernicious consequence in religious than in other matters. A mere speculative falsehood will mislead the understanding of the studious, but it will not reach his principles of action; a wrong political principle will unquestionably influence for a time the happiness of a nation; but on the discovery of its falsity, it is not difficult to modify or reject it, because it can seldom become rooted in the habits or the prejudices of the people. But the religious impostures which were authorized and propagated by Gregory, affected not the belief only, but the conduct and character of the greater portion of Christendom through a long succession of ages; and while their certain and necessary tendency was to debase the mass of believers, and to deliver them over in blindness and bondage to the control of their spiritual tyrants, their final and most disastrous effect has been to enlarge the path of infidelity, by dissociating the use of reason from the belief in Revelation.

Ecclesiastical History is not distinguished by any character of very great eminence for the period of above a hundred and fifty years, which separates Gregory from Charlemagne; nor is that period marked by any single occurrence of striking importance, excepting the separation of the Roman states from the Eastern empire, and the Donation made by Pepin to the Holy See. Yet very considerable changes were gradually taking place in the constitution of the Church, which it is the more necessary to detect and notice, because they are not discovered without some care, and have indeed commonly escaped the observation which is due to them. The conquest of the Western Empire by the barbarians, its subdivision into numerous Principalities and Provinces, and the prevalence of the institutions and habits of the conquerors, could not fail to influence, in many respects, the religious establishment of those countries. And hence it is, that the distinction between the Eastern and Western Churches, which may be traced in name, at least, to the division of the Empire, was afterwards extended and widened by many substantial points of difference. In the former, indeed, very

*Changes from Gregory
to Charlemagne.*

* In his Epistle to the King of England, Gregory (cited by Baronius, Ann. 601. sect. xix.) thus expresses his own millenarian opinions. 'Besides, we wish you (vestram gloriam) to know, as we learn from the words of Almighty God, in the Holy Scriptures, that the end of the present world is already near, and the kingdom of the Saints is at hand, which can know no end. But as the end of the world is now approaching, many things hang over us which before were not,—to wit, change of atmosphere, and terrors from Heaven, and unseasonable tempests, war, famine, pestilence, and earthquakes,—which however shall not all fall out in our days, but will certainly follow afterwards.' The caution of the concluding sentence would almost prove the Pope's distrust in his own prophecy.

few alterations took place after the time of Justinian, even in the form of administering the Church, and none in the principles of its constitution: if some new privileges, or additional revenues, seemed to swell the importance of the clergy, yet the Emperors maintained so firmly their undisputed supremacy*, and exerted, moreover, such frequent interference in spiritual affairs, that the power of the hierarchy received no real increase; nor did any other circumstances accidentally intrude, to enlarge beyond its just limits their influence over the people. But the policy for the most part pursued by the Western kings was different—they were usually watchful in preserving their temporal rights over the Church, and even in usurping others which they did not possess, especially that of episcopal election; but they abstained from all intervention in matters strictly spiritual, and in committing to the priesthood the entire regulation of doctrine, and consigning to their uncontrolled direction the consciences of their ignorant and uncivilized subjects, they left to that Body much larger means of despotic and permanent authority than any of those of which they deprived it. In the more enlightened provinces of the East, the discussion of theological subjects was not uncommonly shared by intelligent laymen; but in the West it became exclusively confined to the clergy, and their dictates, howsoever remote from scripture or reason, were submissively and blindly received. Again, in the aristocratical assemblies, by which political affairs were chiefly regulated, the property and intelligence of the Bishops acquired for them both rank and influence; and thus also were they placed in a different position from their brethren in the East, where the original spiritual character of the hierarchy was more rigidly preserved. It has been already remarked, that the limits of the spiritual and temporal powers were, even from the very establishment of Christianity, liable to some confusion and perplexity. They were long maintained, however, with tolerable distinctness in the countries which escaped from barbarian invasion; but in the West, from the circumstances just mentioned, and from the unsettled and arbitrary form of the civil governments, the causes of discord and temptations to mutual aggression were incalculably multiplied.

The clergy were very early divided into the major and minor orders, of which the latter consisted of the acolyths, porters, exorcists, and readers: between the sixth and eighth century this lost its whole weight and almost name in the Church; and even the higher order of subdeacons, deacons, and priests, suffered great degradation. The kings of the West, in their desire to devote the whole of their free subjects to military service, forbade the ordination of a freeman without their particular consent; and hence proceeded the debasing, but not uncommon practice, of conferring the office of priesthood on serfs of the Church, emancipated for that purpose. Nor did the Bishops contend against this innovation so vigorously as the interests of the Church required, because their own authority was obviously augmented by the humiliation of the order next below them. Add to this, that the Priests were in some places, and perhaps generally, bound, on their ordination, by a solemn obligation to remain attached as it were to the Church, to which they were originally appointed—a sort of servitude which subjected even their persons to the authority of the Bishop. No such changes in the constitution of the clergy took place in the Eastern Church.

Another order was rapidly increasing in the seventh and eighth centuries, which probably exercised more influence in Church matters than is usually attributed to it. The tonsure was originally considered as a sign of

* Giannone, *Stor. di Nap.*, lib. iii., cap. vi.

destination for orders," (*signum destinationis ad ordinem*), and was given to those only who were intended for the sacred profession; but in after-times it was less discriminately administered, and was made the means of connecting with the Church a large body of persons who received some of the immunities without any of the restrictions of the sacerdotal condition, and became clerks without being ecclesiastics. It may be true*, that they introduced to a certain extent a sort of lay influence into the ecclesiastical administration; but they had probably a much greater effect in diffusing that of the clergy among the private and sacred relations of domestic life.

The grand principle of the 'Unity of the Church'—existing as one mighty spiritual communion undivided by any diversity in place, time, language, government, or other circumstances—though it was broached as early as the third century, did not enter into full operation till the dissolution of the Western Empire. Its worst effects had, indeed, been developed before that time in the persecutions* to which it gave birth on both sides of the Adriatic. But the good which it was capable of producing was not felt until the Western Provinces were broken up into numerous, and independent, and hostile states, with no political bond of union, and little friendly or commercial intercourse. It was then that the notion of one universal religious society contributed to supply the want of international sympathy and co-operation, and, through the means of a common belief, introduced the feeling of common interests, and the exercise of common virtues. Subsequently, during the seventh and eighth centuries, the principle was more rapidly progressive; and it presently gave birth to a second principle, which naturally sprang from it, that the one Body could have only one Head; and the general footing which this acquired, at least throughout the West, contributed in no small degree to prepare and smooth the way to papal despotism.

Much of the history of this period is collected from the Canons of the Councils held in all the kingdoms of the West, and especially in Spain—for the ecclesiastical affairs of Gaul† were also in part regulated by these last. Those of Toledo were the most celebrated and influential, and the attention which was paid to their proceedings even by the Roman See sufficiently proves the authority which they held in the Church. The fifteenth of these was assembled in 688, and the *last*, not long before the invasion of the Saracens, in 696. But upon the whole the number of Councils diminished during the seventh and eighth centuries, and in Gaul especially, we find that, whereas fifty-four were held in the sixth, twenty only assembled in the seventh century, and only seven during the first half of the eighth. This gradual disuse of one of the most ancient

* Guizot (*Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, 13 Leçon) mentions four avenues through which the laity still continued, in the seventh and eighth centuries, to exert an influence in ecclesiastical matters. (1.) The distinction between the Ordination and the Tonsure, and the numbers of those who received the latter only. (2.) The founder of a Church or Chapel, whether Bishop or Layman, possessed the privilege of appointing the minister to serve it. (3.) Chaplains were very commonly resident in noble families for the service of the private oratories. (4.) Certain laymen, under the names of *Causidici*, *Tutores*, and *Vicedomini*, were appointed at an early period for the protection of the Church property. They originated, it would seem, in the African Church; at Rome they were called *Defensores*, and they were afterwards employed in Gaul, under the title of *Advocates*. Fleury (end of liv. xlv.) mentions that they were originally *Scholastics* or *Lawyers*; but that after the barbarian conquests they possessed also a military character—to the end that, in case of necessity, they might also be qualified to defend the interests of the Church by material weapons.

† The fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633, ordains a uniformity of rites and ceremonies, prayer and psalmody, throughout Spain and Gaul—the same office of the mass, and other services, Fleury, l. xxxvii, sect. 46.

and legitimate methods of governing the Church, and one of the best guarantees both for its inward purity and external independence, was a proof of its growing corruption, and a fearful omen for its future prosperity. It arose in some measure from a cause which we are about to mention.

The early origin and office of the Metropolitans have already been noticed; they were the Prelates resident in the capital of the Province, and their legitimate office was to preside in provincial councils; but they endeavoured to extend their consequence by usurping a judicial authority in charges against Bishops, and other matters properly lying under the cognizance of the Council; and they had some success until the sixth century. But from this period we may date their downfall: the ambition of the Popes*, always jealous of their power, and anxious to transfer it to the Holy See, pressed and assailed them from above: from below, the episcopal order, preferring a distant and indulgent controul to the more rigid scrutiny of a domestic censor, were equally eager for their overthrow; and this was greatly facilitated by the minute subdivisions of some of the Western Provinces, which in many cases politically separated the Metropolitan from the Bishops who were placed under his superintendance, and thus at once annihilated his influence. From these causes the Metropolitan system fell into decay, so that little more than its name remained at the end of the eighth century—and closely connected with its fall was the disuse of Provincial Councils.

The great result which was brought about by the above circumstances, and which showed itself early in the West—as to the West were also confined the changes which we have mentioned—was the undue aggrandisement of the episcopal order, and its consequent deformity and corruption. From the moment that the princes succeeded in usurping the

* The progress of this usurpation is so well described by Giannone, (*Storia di Nap.*, lib. iii. c. vi.) that we shall here give the substance of his account. In the fifth century the title of Patriarch was universally acknowledged to belong, in common with the four oriental prelates, to the Bishop of Rome. His ordinary power indeed did not extend beyond the Provinces called Suburban (*Suburbicarie*), those which obeyed the Vicar-General of Rome; and to these limits it was confined till the reign of Valentinian. But in process of time, as the prerogatives of *primacy* were united in his person, it was easy to stretch them farther. It belonged to him as Primate to have regard and attention; on this ground he began to send into such provinces as seemed to require such superintendance his own vicars; in Illyria first, afterwards in Thessaly and Macedonia, the delegates of the Roman Pontiff exercised Patriarchal authority. This he presently afterwards extended over the whole of Italy, over Gaul and Spain; as well as over all countries newly converted by his missionaries; so that the Greeks themselves acknowledged him to be sole *Patriarch* of the West. The next step of the Popes, which occasioned no small disturbances, was to usurp the power of ordaining Bishops throughout all the Western Church, which was no less than to subvert the rights of all the Metropolitans. They proceeded farther, and claimed the office of ordaining the Metropolitans themselves.

The method they made use of to usurp the rights of the Metropolitans regarding ordination was, to send them the Vest or *Pallium*—for it was by means of this that the Metropolitans were invested by the Holy Pontiff with the power of ordaining the Bishops of the Province; whence it followed that such power was not possessed by them unless by this grant of the *Pallium*. Here another point was gained—the Metropolitans had not the power of exercising all the episcopal functions until they had received the *Pallium* from the Pope. The last step naturally followed this—that the Pope would not grant the *Pallium* until the Metropolitans had taken an oath of fidelity such as he required. Another ground on which he advanced was this—he contrived that appeals from the decisions of the Metropolitans, especially relating to disputed elections of Bishops, should be brought before himself; that if the electors had been negligent, or the elected unfit, the election should devolve on the Pope; that he alone should possess the right of accepting the cessions of Sees, of determining translations, and the coadjutorships in the next succession; and lastly, that the confirmation of all episcopal elections should be vested in the Holy See.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA.

REPUBLICATION IN MONTHLY NUMBERS,
AT SEVEN SHILLINGS EACH.

IN consequence of a desire very generally expressed that this work should be obtainable at an easier rate, and in smaller portions than the Parts in which it has hitherto been presented, it has been determined to commence a republication in Monthly Numbers, the first of which will appear on May 1, price 7*s.*

The Plan of this Work is entirely original, deviating in a great measure from the Dictionary Form heretofore adopted for Encyclopædias, but preserving so much of that form, as to render it both a book of reference and a Work for occasional perusal and study. There are four Grand Divisions, *viz.* 1. PURE SCIENCES, which will be comprised in Five Volumes; 2. MIXED AND APPLIED SCIENCES, in about Six Volumes: these two divisions, it will be seen, naturally grow out of each other, and may be considered as one-third portion of the Work; 3. HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, conjoined, in about Six Volumes, all chronologically arranged; and 4. MISCELLANEOUS AND LEXICOGRAPHICAL, in Ten Volumes. This portion is, of course, alphabetical: it includes a Philosophical and Etymological Thesaurus of the English Language: each word is first diligently traced to its sources in other Languages; and its various applications in our own are copiously and chronologically elucidated by citations from writers of all dates. This Division will also comprise a complete Geographical Dictionary.

On the first publication of the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, each Part, consisting of 48 sheets and 16 plates, comprised a portion of every Division; and in that form it continues to be published quarterly, in Parts, at £1. 1*s.* each, of which 31 parts, or more than three-fifths of the whole, are printed. So soon as it had proceeded far enough to admit of a new arrangement, it was determined to publish in perfect volumes, taking a volume of each Division alter-

nately. In this manner the following volumes have appeared, *viz.* of PURE SCIENCES, one; MIXED SCIENCES, two; HISTORY and BIOGRAPHY, two; MISCELLANEOUS, four. The new publication in Monthly Numbers will accord with this latter plan, beginning with the first volume of Pure Sciences, which will be completed in six Numbers. The following are its contents, with the names of the very eminent individuals by whom they have been written.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION	By S. T. COLERIDGE, Esq.
GRAMMAR.....	By Sir JOHN STODDART, LL.D., &c.
LOGIC	By Rev. R. WHATELY, D.D., &c.
RHETORIC	By the same.
GEOMETRY	By PETER BARLOW, Esq., F.R.S., &c.
ARITHMETIC	By Rev. GEORGE PEACOCK, M.A., &c.
ALGEBRA.....	By Rev. Dr. LARDNER, LL.D., &c.
GEOMETRICAL ANALYSIS.....	By the same.
THEORY OF NUMBERS	By PETER BARLOW, Esq., F.R.S., &c.
TRIGONOMETRY.....	By G. B. AIRY, Esq., M.A., &c.
ANALYTICAL GEOMETRY.....	By Rev. H. P. HAMILTON, M.A., &c.
CONIC SECTIONS.....	By the same.
DIFFERENTIAL CALCULUS	By A. LEVY, Esq., M.A., &c.
INTEGRAL CALCULUS.....	By the same.

Each Number will contain, on an average, sixteen sheets and four plates; but as it is intended to give in every Number only such plates as belong to the letter-press, the latter will be increased in quantity according to the diminished number of the former; and the contrary: so that, in the end, each subscriber will have paid precisely the same sum for the whole Work, as if he had taken it in Quarterly Parts, or in entire volumes.

The publishers consider that they cannot better evince the originality of this Work, and the talent with which it has been conducted, than by presenting, in an alphabetical list, the names of the writers already engaged, and who, with scarcely one exception, have contributed to that portion of the Work already published.

REV. EDWARD SMEDLEY, M. A., Sidney College, Cambridge,
EDITOR.

H. D. ACLAND, Esq., M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, Esq., M.A., Plumian Professor of Astronomy,
Cambridge.

Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School, Oriel College,
Oxford.

CHARLES BABBAGE, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., London and Edinburgh, Lucasian
Professor of Mathematics, Trinity College, Cambridge.

PETER BARLOW, Esq., F.R.S., Royal Military Academy, Woolwich.

THOMAS BELL, Esq., F.L.S.

Rev. PHILIP BLISS, D.D., St. John's College, Oxford, Registrar of the University

Rev. C. J. BLOMFIELD, D.D., now Lord Bishop of London.

Captain BONNYCASTLE, Royal Engineers.

CHARLES BONNYCASTLE, Esq., Chatham Dockyard.

H. J. BROOKE, Esq., F.R.S., F.L.S.

The late LORD BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

Rev. J. B. S. CARWITHEN, M.A., Vicar of Sandhurst, Berks.

S. T. COLERIDGE, Esq.

J. T. COLERIDGE, Esq., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

W. D. COOLEY, Esq., M.A., Trinity College, Dublin.

C. G. M. DAUBENY, M.D., Aldrich's Professor of Chemistry, Oxford.

H. H. DODGSON, Esq., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

THOMAS EDWARDS, Esq., F.L.S.

Rev. W. A. EVANSON.

J. FAREY, Esq., Civil Engineer.

Rev. R. GARNET, M.A., Lichfield.

J. E. GRAY, Esq., F.L.S.

THOMAS GREATOREX, Esq., F.R.S., F.L.S.

B. R. GREEN, Esq.

Rev. W. H. HALE, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

Rev. HENRY PARR HAMILTON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

GEORGE HARVEY, Esq., F.R.S., London and Edinburgh, and F.G.S.

J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., London, Edin., and Gott., St. John's College, Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL HINDS, M.A., Vice-Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford.

Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.

WILLIAM HORSELEY, Esq., Mus. Bac., Oxford.

JOHN HUGHES, Esq., A.M., Oriel College, Oxford.

JAMES AMIRAUX JEREMIE, Esq., M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CAPTAIN KATER, F.R.S., Member of the Board of Longitude.

Rev. DIONYSIUS LARDNER, LL.D., F.R.S., London and Edinburgh, Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, University of London.

A. LEVY, Esq., M.A., F.G.S., Lecturer on Mathematics in the University of Liege.

Rev. JOHN LINDSAY, M.A., Fellow of Godsgift College, Dulwich.

HENRY LLOYD, Esq.

WILLIAM LOWNDES, Esq., M.A., Brazen-nose College, Oxford.

Rev. FRANCIS LUNN, M.A., F.R.S., St. John's College, Cambridge.

CHARLES LUSH, Esq., F.L.S.

Venerable WILLIAM ROE LYALL, M.A., Archdeacon of Colchester, Trinity College, Cambridge.

Rev. H. MATHEWS, M.A.

JOHN MILLER, Esq., M.A., Lincoln's Inn.

Rev. JACOB HENRY BROOK MOUNTAIN, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

Major A. S. H. MOUNTAIN, 26th Regiment.

THOMAS MYERS, Esq., LL.D.

JOHN NARRIEN, Esq., Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

Rev. THOMAS NELSON.

Rev. J. H. NEWMAN, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

PETER NICHOLSON, Esq.

Rev. J. B. OTTLEY, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

Rev. GEORGE PEACOCK, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

JOHN PHILLIPS, Esq., Museum, York.

Captain GEORGE PROCTER, Adjutant and Secretary to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

Rev. GEORGE CECIL RENOUARD, M.A., F.L.S., Sidney College, Cambridge.

CHARLES RICHARDSON, Esq.

P. M. ROGET, M.D., Secretary to the Royal Society.

Rev. M. RUSSELL, D.D., Leith.

N. W. SENIOR, Esq., A.M., Professor of Political Economy in King's College, London, and Queen's College, Oxford.

FRANCIS SMEDLEY, Esq.

J. F. SOUTH, Esq., F.L.S., Lecturer on Anatomy at St. Thomas's Hospital.

Rev. H. STEBBING, A.M.

J. F. STEPHENS, Esq.

Sir JOHN STODDART, LL.D., Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, Malta.

Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.

CHARLES VIGNOLES, Esq., Civil Engineer.

RICHARD WESTMACOTT, Jun., Esq.

Rev. RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford.

Rev. W. WHEWELL, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

R. WHITCOMBE, Esq., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

ROBERT WILLIAMS, M.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.

LONDON :

PRINTED FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK, PATERNOSTER ROW ;

C. J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON ; J. DUNCAN ; B. FELLOWES ; SUTTABY, FOX, AND SUTTABY ;

E. HODGSON ; J. DOWDING ; H. T. HODGSON ; G. LAWFORD ; J. LAYCOCK ;

J. FRASER ; W. MASON ; F. C. WESTLEY ; JAMES RICHARDSON ; J. BOHN ;

T. ALLMAN ; J. BAIN ; H. DIXON ; AND J. BRYANT ;

AND FOR J. PARKER, OXFORD ; AND J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE.

FOULD ALSO BY EVERY BOOKSELLER IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

PROSPECTUS

OF A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER, TO BE CALLED

THE ACADEMIC CHRONICLE.

IN compliance with a custom by no means without its uses, the Proprietors of the publication which it is intended shall bear the above name, submit the following brief statement of their views:—Their main object will be to make this journal a chronicle of all that can interest that numerous and important body, engaged throughout the United Kingdom in the profession of Teaching.—As similar publications have eminently succeeded in Germany, it becomes matter of astonishment that the members of the scholastic body in Great Britain should be destitute of any special medium of communication with each other, or with the public; should be without a journal to review the books they are called upon to purchase;—to furnish University intelligence and medical reports;—to note improvements in the science and practical art of education;—to receive advertisements which exclusively concern them, or to supply information on any one of the various subjects by which they are affected as a body, or interested as individuals.

It is thought necessary to premise that arrangements have been made which will render the proposed publication any-thing but inferior to other weekly papers in all that regards the latest foreign and domestic intelligence, the proceedings of Parliament and of the law courts; early notices of new publications of interest, of works of art, of events connected with the drama, and every other species of general information which may be expected in a journal devoted to that class of all others in the community most capable of appreciating literary labour, at the same time that it will constitute a good family newspaper, especially suited to parents employing domestic instructors, or anxiously watching the progress of that art upon which the happiness of the rising generation depends.

It is likewise intended that, from time to time, practical essays shall be published on every branch of the useful and polite education of both sexes. Intelligence of recent improvements, in the business of teaching will be supplied at the earliest moment; and to communicate every description of sound information relating to subjects of that nature is an object upon which neither care nor expense will be spared. The columns of the intended journal will, of course under certain limitations, be open to the discussion of any subject connected with general education.

That Heads of seminaries may be enabled to judge how far any new publication will suit their purposes, a complete analysis and impartial review will be given of such as are intended for the instruction of youth. In like manner will all new music be made the subject of critical examination, and that by a person of *competent skill*.

Correspondents will be engaged at the principal Foreign Universities, with a view to the occasional supply of a scientific and classical, yet animated sketch of all that may be attractive to the readers of the ACADEMIC CHRONICLE: under this head notices will be given of the scientific periodical publications of the Continent. Correspondents will be

engaged, with similar views, at the different Universities of the United Kingdom; thus concentrating a body of University intelligence of various kinds, not only unequalled by any single periodical work, but it is hoped such as the combined resources of all existing publications would be insufficient to furnish.

With respect to politics, the *ACADEMIC CHRONICLE* will be perfectly independent; and as its opinions will be delivered with an earnest wish to promote the welfare of all classes in the community, it is hoped that whether supporting or opposing the Administration for the time being, those opinions, sincerely and firmly, but moderately expressed, will not prove unacceptable to the great majority of the enlightened body whose patronage they seek.

To the foregoing statement it is only necessary to add, that a Lady of high literary character will honour the Editor with her assistance in matters relating exclusively to female education;—that the half-yearly awards of prizes will be inserted, not as advertisements, but as gratuitous articles of intelligence; and that at the end of every year an index will be furnished without charge.

* * It need scarcely be suggested that as a medium for the Advertisements of the profession, the *ACADEMIC CHRONICLE* must surpass in efficiency every other publication.

N. B.—Orders received by all News-venders throughout the kingdom, and at the Office, No. 13, Wellington-street, Strand; where Communications to the Editor are to be addressed. Orders from the country must be accompanied by a reference for payment to some resident of the metropolis.

The First Number will be published early in May, in two Saturday editions. One, for country circulation, to leave town by that night's post; the other, for town circulation, bringing down the news of the week to nine o'clock.—Price SEVENPENCE.

appointment to vacant Sees, the mutual awe and dependence of the Bishop and his clergy were at an end. The original method of election, according to which the dignity was generally conferred on some eminent ecclesiastic who had long resided in the diocese, secured at least some degree of deference in the elected to the office and privileges of the priesthood; but the practice of regal appointment broke that tie, and the stranger, who was frequently intruded, with few common interests or affections, gave loose without any restraint to his insolence or his avarice, in an age and condition of society in which public opinion had no influence. Accordingly we collect, even from the Councils of those times which were entirely composed of Bishops, the violent excesses to which many members of that order proceeded. 'We have learnt (says the Council of Toledo, in 589) that the Bishops treat their parishes not episcopally but cruelly, and oppress their dioceses with losses and exactions. Wherefore, let all that the Bishops would appropriate to themselves be refused, excepting that which the ancient constitutions grant to them; and let the clergy, whether parochial or diocesan, who are tormented by the Bishop, carry their complaints to the Metropolitan, and let the Metropolitan hasten to repress such excesses.' Nearly a century afterwards the fourth Council of Braga (in 675) inveighs against the brutality of certain Bishops who treated honourable men like robbers, and lacerated priests, abbots, and deacons, with personal chastisement. 'Avarice (says the Council of Toledo in 633) is the root of all evils, and that detestable thirst takes possession even of the heart of Bishops. Many of the faithful, through the love of Christ and the martyrs, build chapels in the parishes of the Bishops, and leave offerings there; but the Bishops seize them and turn them to their own use. Hence it follows that Clerks are wanting to perform the divine offices, for they receive not their fees; and the chapels when dilapidated are not repaired, because sacerdotal avidity has carried away the resources, &c.' Besides these and similar proofs, which might be brought in great abundance, the tyrannical oppressions of the Bishops are sufficiently evinced by the conspiracies or coalitions of the priesthood to resist them, which are sometimes mentioned, of course with reprehension and menace, by the Councils of the sixth and seventh centuries.

Notwithstanding the measures taken to repress it, the licence and the demoralization of the episcopal order gradually increased, and towards the close of the eighth century it had reached perhaps the farthest limit to which it ever proceeded. The restraint which had formerly been imposed by the watchful superintendence of provincial Councils and Metropolitans was feebly supplied by the rare, and cautious, and often ineffectual interference of the Roman See. The practice of regal election freed the Bishop from any check with which either respect or gratitude towards his clergy and people might otherwise have supplied him—and the positive degradation of the clergy itself removed him still farther from any deference to the feelings, or even the rights, of that Body. Sole administrator of the revenues of the Church, he possessed the most ample means of plunder and usurpation; while his close connexion with political transactions, and the weight which he exerted in the most important deliberations of the State, so interwove the temporal with the spiritual office and duties, and also added to his legitimate authority so much temporal power, that there were few excesses which he might not hope to commit with impunity*. It is therefore without surprise that we find him at one time advancing to

* It should not be forgotten, however, that this character was sometimes assumed on royal compulsion; nor was this the only stain which the Church received from its contact with the wild barbarism of those ages.

battle at the head of his armed attendants, and at another engaged in marauding expeditions from motives of plunder or private hostility. His habits and his manners alike departed from the ecclesiastical character, and he grew to resemble the rude Barons who surrounded him, both in the extent of his power, and the insolence with which he exercised it.

We now turn to Rome—the centre to which most of our attention must hereafter be directed—and having shown the progress of the religious aristocracy during the seventh and eighth ages, let us observe whether any corresponding advance was made by the monarchical principle. Gregory the Great died in the year 604; and certainly if his immediate successors had equalled him in energy and ambition, the period of papal usurpation might have been greatly anticipated. But the fact was so far otherwise, that through a dreary period of almost five centuries the Vatican was never ruled by any character of sufficient transcendency to assert its single supereminence, and seize the sceptre which was so long presented to it by superstition and ignorance. But this accident, though it retarded the maturity of the Roman Church, did not prevent the gradual operation of the principles on which it was now firmly founded; and if it be the province of genius alone to create those commanding situations and circumstances by which systems are formed or established, a very ordinary mind may turn them to advantage when created and presented. And thus the long succession of obscure pontiffs, who presided in the West for the century and a half which followed, may have profited by such occasions as were offered to extend the authority of the Church and exalt the supremacy of its head. At least we have reason to believe, that both the one and the other of those objects were, upon the whole, advanced during the period in question.

Within fifty years from the death of Gregory, Pope St. Martin assembled a Council at Rome, in which, among various expositions of doctrine, he condemned a certain heresy at that time maintained by Constantine, the Emperor of the East. That Prince, little disposed to pardon the offence, sent his Exarch into Italy with orders to seize the person of the Pontiff. By the employment of some address he succeeded in his mission; in the year 653 St. Martin was carried away from Rome a captive to Constantinople, and thence, after enduring, according to the Catholic historians, a multitude of insults, he was exiled to the Chersonesus. In the year following (655) he died there; and his successor Eugenius was appointed by the Emperor. The singularity of this circumstance has recommended it to our notice, rather than its importance. It was an isolated event, depending solely on the political power which the Emperor of the day might happen to possess over his Italian subjects, and not at all affecting the influence which the Holy See was now acquiring in every quarter of the West—for *that* was the ground on which its battles were to be fought and its conquests gained, and to that they were destined to be confined; and so long as it suffered no reverses in that field, it mattered little what might be the result of an occasional dispute either with the Patriarch or the Emperor of the East.

We have already mentioned that, during the seventh and eighth centuries, some successful inroads were made by the Popes on the privileges of Metropolitans, especially in their election or confirmation*; and the

* The pallium or peculiar vest was requested of the Pope by the Metropolitans, at first merely, as it would seem, in token of an honour to which no condition was annexed, but afterwards in attestation of their subjection to the See, and obedience to its canonical com-

influence of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, was warmly exerted about the year 742 among the Bishops of France and Germany, to extend the authority of the See. Another occurrence, which tended much more effectually, though by a very different course, to the same result, took place almost immediately afterwards.

Pepin, who was mayor of the palace to Childeric III., King of France, was desirous to dethrone his imbecile master, and to usurp the name, after having long exercised the power of royalty. *The Donation of Pepin.* Accordingly he assembled the States of the realm, and they gave it as their opinion that the Bishop of Rome should previously be consulted respecting the lawfulness of the project. In consequence ambassadors were sent to Zachary with a question to the following import—‘Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy of rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the State?’ The answer of the Pope was such as the usurper desired: Childeric was stripped of royalty without any opposition, and Pepin took undisputed possession of the throne.

This occurrence is generally related as the first instance of the temporal ambition of the Vatican, or at least of its interference with the rights of princes and the allegiance of subjects—and therefore the conduct of the Pope has commonly been treated (by Protestant writers) with unmeasured reprehension. But certainly if we consider the act of Zachary distinct from those subsequent usurpations, to which in truth it did neither necessarily lead, nor even furnish a plausible precedent—if we consider the act, as historical justice requires of us, with a fair regard to the circumstances of France and Italy, and to the principles of the times, we shall be surprised indeed that a Pope of the eighth century should so easily assent to the most popular principle of republicanism, and we may reject perhaps the political axiom which he has laid down; but we shall not accuse him of ambitious or unchristian arrogance for having resolved a difficulty which he did not create; for having answered a question which was proposed to him, as the highest human authority, and proposed without any interference or solicitation on his own part. It is true that the nature of his answer may have been influenced by his manifest interests, and the necessity in which the See then stood of a powerful protector—but this is a consideration quite distinct from the original broad charge of intrusion in temporal concerns—and even in this matter, the mere absence of that splendid disinterestedness, which is rare in every age, and almost impossible in bad ages, is not to be stigmatized as inexcusably criminal, nor to be placed on the same level with the active, intriguing intrusiveness of guilty ambition.

It is not probable that Pope Zachary foresaw all the advantages which soon afterwards accrued to the Holy See from his decision—but pressed by the Greeks on one hand, and the Lombards on the other, he was no doubt glad of the occasion to create a substantial friendship beyond the Alps. The Lombards had gradually possessed themselves of those provinces of Italy which had remained longest attached to the Greek empire, under the name of the Exarchate of Ravenna*; and those warlike

mands. The virtues of the pallium are described at length in an Epistle from Pope Zachary to Boniface. Baron. ann. 742, sect. v. See above, note on p. 160.

* The strict limits of the Exarchate were included in the territories of Ravenna, Bologna and Ferrara: dependent on it was the Pentapolis, which extended along the Adriatic from Rimini to Ancona, and advanced into the interior as far as the ridges of the Apennines. Gibbon c. 49.

foreigners were now projecting the extension of their conquest to the whole peninsula. Stephen II., the successor of Zachary, applied to the Court of France for protection; and instantly, Pepin, at the head of a numerous army, crossed the Alps, and overthrew the Lombards, and recovered the Exarchate from their hands. Pepin might have restored this valuable spoil to the throne of Constantinople with great praise of justice; or by the indulgence of ambition he might have retained permanent possession of it himself, without any reproach and with much profit—he did neither; but, mindful of his obligation to the Holy See, and sensible of the advantage of intimate alliance with it, he transferred the sovereignty over the provinces in question to the Bishop of Rome. This celebrated *donation* took place in 754-5; and thus we observe that the earliest interference of the Vatican in temporal matters brought after it, in the course of three years only, a rich and solid reward of temporal power, which has never since been either greatly increased or greatly diminished. The degree of authority which individual Pontiffs have exerted in their States has indeed been liable in different ages to extreme diversities; still the authority itself has, in some shape, been perpetuated; and it has survived the splendid pretensions of the spiritual despotism, by whose infancy it was created, whose maturity it assisted to swell and pamper, and whose expiring influence will probably be confined to the same limits with itself.

The donation of Pepin awaited the confirmation of his son Charlemagne; for in the year 774 the Lombards again threatened the Roman territories, the aid of France was again invoked, and the monarch who now afforded it, did not pause till he had entirely and finally subverted the empire of those conquerors, and proclaimed himself their King. Charlemagne was so far from disapproving his father's munificence to the Pope, that he renewed and even increased the grant by some accession of territory; he drew still closer the bonds which allied him with a Bishop whose power was real and solid, however fanciful may have been the claims on which it stood; and thus he secured the zealous assistance of the See, when circumstances at length allowed him to mature the projects of his own ambition, and to proclaim himself, in the year 800, the Emperor of the West.

Charlemagne did not confine his benefactions to the Bishop of Rome, but distributed them among all the orders of the hierarchy. He augmented their wealth, he enlarged their privileges, he exalted their dignity, he confirmed and extended their immunities; and were it not beyond contradiction established, that he was one of the greatest and wisest princes who ever reigned, some writers would not have hesitated to place him among the weakest of mankind. But the motives of his liberality were such as became a magnanimous and a benevolent monarch. Superstition has never been accounted among them, nor any unfounded fears or undue reverence of the ecclesiastical order—from the former he was perhaps more nearly exempt than would have appeared possible in so rude an age; and in his transactions with the clergy, even with the Pope himself, he never forgot, or allowed them to forget, his own supremacy. But he was desirous to civilize his barbarous subjects; he was anxious to influence their rude manners, and correct their vicious morals, by the more general diffusion and comprehension of the Christian truths; and he was willing also to sow the seeds of secular learning, and dispel the ignorance which oppressed his people. As the first step towards this regeneration he presented to them the example of his own piety and his own learning*. But when he looked

* Many writers assert that he yielded not to any contemporary in either of those merits;

round for the means of communicating those blessings, the first and the only one which presented itself was the agency of the clergy. All that was influential among his subjects was contained in the two orders, military and ecclesiastical; and the wild turbulence of the former pointed them out rather as objects than instruments of reformation. The little of literary taste or acquirement which his kingdom contained was confined to the clergy; and there he laboured to encourage its increase, and to distribute it, through the only channel that was open, for the moral improvement of his subjects. It was chiefly with this view that he augmented the power and revenues of the Church, and raised its ministers to a more exalted rank and influence—influence which they subsequently studied to improve by methods not always honourable, but which, as circumstances then existed, it was pardonable if not commendable, it was magnanimous if it was not also politic, in Charlemagne to bestow.

But we shall readily admit, that that monarch's munificence would have been very dangerously bestowed, had he not taken vigorous measures to reform, at the same time that he enriched, the ecclesiastical body; and some of those measures, though we had proposed to defer the particulars of his legislation till a subsequent Chapter, may be mentioned with no less propriety in the present. In the year 789, at an assembly at Aix-la-Chapelle, Charlemagne published a Capitulary in eighty articles, chiefly with a view to restore the ancient discipline of the Church*. It was addressed to all ecclesiastics, and carried by the officers of the monarch into all the Provinces. The instructions which most nearly affected the peculiar abuses of the age were those, perhaps, which exhorted the Bishops to select their clergy from free men rather than from slaves; and which forbade bishops and abbots and abbesses to possess dogs, or hawks, or buffoons, or jugglers. By the celebrated Council of Francfort (sur le Mein) held in 794, it was enacted, among many other wholesome regulations, that Bishops should not be translated from city to city; that the Bishop should never be absent from his Church for more than three weeks; that he should so diligently instruct his clergy, that a worthy successor might ever be found among them; and that after his death his heirs should only succeed to such portion of his property as he possessed before his ordination—all acquisitions subsequently made were to return to his Church. Other articles regulated the discipline of the inferior clergy. We shall conclude with one additional and very singular instance. Towards the close of the year 803 the Emperor held a parliament at Worms, when a petition was presented to him by all the people of his States, of which the following was the substance—'We pray your Majesty that henceforward Bishops may not be constrained to join the army, as they have been hitherto. But when we march with you against the enemy, let them

the former, however, does not appear greatly to have influenced his moral practices; and as to his proficiency in the latter, we may at least venture to prefer to him his own master and preceptor Alcuin, an Englishman, the most celebrated divine of the day; and since we are assured that Charlemagne did not learn to write till late in life, doubtless we might make other exceptions. Alcuin is regarded as the restorer of letters in France, or at least the principal instrument of Charles in that work. In a letter to that Prince he avers that it rested with those two alone to raise up in France a Christian Athens. And his own writings attest his industry in restoring almost every branch of study. (Fleury, Hist. Eccl., liv. 45, sect. xviii.) The devotion of Charlemagne to the services of religion is not disputed; through his whole life he was a regular attendant on the offices, even the nocturnal ceremonies, of the Church, and his last days were passed in correcting the text of the Gospel with the assistance of certain Greeks and Syrians. Fleury, H. E. l. 45, s. viii.

* Fleury, H. E. liv. 44, sect. 46, and liv. 45, sect. 26.

remain in their dioceses, occupied with their holy ministry, and praying for you and your army, singing masses, and making processions, and almsgiving. For we have beheld some among them wounded and killed in battle, God is our witness with how much terror! and these accidents cause many to fly before the enemy. So that you will have more combatants if they remain in their dioceses, since many are employed in guarding them; and they will aid you more effectually by their prayers, raising their hands to heaven, after the manner of Moses. We make the same petition with respect to the priests, that they come not to the army, unless by the choice of their Bishops, and that those be such in learning and morals that we may place full confidence in them, &c.' Charlemagne replied as follows—' In our desire both to reform ourselves, and to leave an example to our successors, we ordain that no ecclesiastic shall join the army, except two or three Bishops chosen by the others, to give the benediction, preach and conciliate, and with them some chosen priests to impose penance, celebrate mass, take care of the sick, and give the unction of holy oil and the viaticum. But these shall carry no arms, neither shall they go to battle nor shed any blood, but shall be contented to carry relics and holy vessels, and to pray for the combatants. The other Bishops who remain at their churches shall send their vassals well armed with us or at our disposal, and shall pray for us and our army. For the people and the kings who have permitted their priests to fight along with them have not gained the advantage in their wars, as we know from what has happened in Gaul, in Spain, and in Lombardy. In adopting the contrary practice we hope to obtain victory over the pagans, and finally everlasting life.'

CHAPTER XI.

On the Dissensions of the Church from the Age of Constantine to that of Charlemagne.

Division of the subject:—I. Schism of the Donatists—its real origin—progress—Circumcellions—conduct of Constantine—and his successor—of Julian—conference of Carthage—St. Augustin—the Vandals—Saracens—real extent of the offences of the Donatists: some account of St. Augustin.—II. Priscillian—his persecution and death—probable opinions—the first Martyr to religious dissent—how truly so—Ithakius—Martin of Tours—effect of Priscillian's death on his followers.—III. Jovinian—his opinions—by whom chiefly opposed—Edict of Honorius—Vigilantius—his character—abuses opposed by him—St. Jerome.—IV. Pelagian Controversy—its importance—and perplexity—Pelagius and Celestius—opposition of St. Augustin—Councils of Jerusalem and Diospolis—reference to Zosimus, Bishop of Rome—perseverance of St. Augustin—and his success—the sum of the Pelagian opinions—opposite doctrine of Fatalism—Semi-Pelagianism—Doctrine of the East—indifference of Greek Church to this Controversy.—V. Controversy respecting the Incarnation—early origin—Apollinaris—his doctrine—Nestorius—his rash assertion—Cyril of Alexandria—Council of Ephesus—condemnation and banishment of Nestorius—progress of his opinions—what they really amounted to—Eutyches—the Monophysite heresy—Dioscorus of Alexandria—second Council of Ephesus—interference of Pope Leo—Council of Chalcedon—condemnation and subsequent conduct of the Eutychians—Henoticon of Zeno—its object—effect—Heraclius and the Monothelites—Council of Constantinople—general remarks on this Controversy—apology for those engaged in it—some of its consequences.—VI. Worship of Images—its specious origin—its progress in East and West—Leo the Isaurian—effects of his Edict—Constantine Copronymus—Synod of Constantinople—the Empress Irene—second Council of Nice, or Seventh General Council—Remarks on the Seven General Councils—Leo the Armenian—Michel—his Epistle to Louis le Débonnaire—The Empress Theodora—Feast of Orthodoxy—general remarks—John Damascenus—miracles—conduct of secular clergy—of monastic orders—of the common people—of Papal See—contrast between the Italian and French clergy.

THE controversies which occasioned the widest divisions in the Church during the five centuries following its establishment, were on two subjects

—the Incarnation of our blessed Saviour, and the Worship of Images. Indeed, if we except the Pelagian opinions, there were none other than these which left any lasting consequences behind them. Still we are not justified in confining our notice entirely to those three, but we must extend it, though more concisely, to some other dissensions, of less importance and earlier date, which animated the passions of Churchmen during the interval between the Arian and the Incarnation controversies. We shall mention them in the following order:—1. The schism of the Donatists; 2. the heresy of the Priscillianists; 3. the opinions of the reformers, Jovinian and Vigilantius; and shall then proceed to the doctrines of Pelagius and Celestius. To these we shall limit our curiosity; for the various disputes, created directly or indirectly, by the writings of Origen, and the many real (or supposed) ramifications of the Manichæan heresy, are not such as to claim a place in this work.

I. On the death of Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, in 311, the clergy and people of that city and district elected in his place the Archdeacon Cæcilianus, and proceeded to his consecration without waiting, as it would seem, for the consent of the Bishops of Numidia, a contiguous and subordinate province. Probably custom or courtesy was violated by this neglect; but the Numidians considered it also as an infringement of their right, and hastened to resent it as such. This was no doubt the real foundation of the schism—an objection taken against the character* of one Felix, a Bishop who had been prominent in the consecration of Cæcilianus, though it was repeatedly brought forward in the course of the controversy, was obviously a vain and contemptible pretext. The dissentients, headed by a certain *Donatus*, assembled a Council of their own, condemned Cæcilianus, and appointed his deacon, Majorinus, for his successor. Both parties then proceeded to great extremities, and as there appeared no other prospect of reconciliation, they agreed to bring the dispute before the Emperor Constantine, who had just then proclaimed the establishment of Christianity. Constantine inquired into the affair, first by means of a Synod at Rome, consisting of three Gaulish and fifteen Italian prelates†, at which the Bishop of the capital presided; and presently afterwards, by an inquiry into the truth of the charges against Felix, before the civil magistrate Ælian, proconsul of Africa, assisted by several lay, and for the most part military assessors: the decision, on both investigations, was unfavourable to the Donatists. They were discontented; seventy venerable Numidian prelates, assembled in council in the heart and light of Africa, had rejected the authority of Cæcilianus—could so solemn an act be superseded by a commission of a small number of obscure Bishops meeting in a different province, and perhaps ignorant of the leading circumstances? They submitted the matter to the Emperor's reconsideration. His patience was not yet exhausted; he immediately summoned a much more numerous synod at Arles, in Gaul, and here again, after much serious debate, the Donatists lost their cause. Still dissatisfied, they had recourse to the final expedient, an appeal to the personal justice of Constantine. The Emperor again consented to their request; but on this occasion the motive of his indulgence may be liable to some suspicion, since the very application admitted the power of the Emperor to reverse the decision of an ecclesiastical council—a right which he might very naturally

* He was accused of being a *Traditor*; i. e. of having delivered up copies of the Scriptures during Diocletian's persecution.

† Fleury, lib. x., sect. 11., records the names of most of them; and the order of precedence.

choose to assert at that moment—at least it is certain that, in the year 316, he condescended to investigate the affair at Milan, in the presence of the contending parties. He deliberately confirmed the former decisions; and then, as these repeated condemnations had no other effect than to increase the perversity of the schismatics, he applied the secular power to their correction*. This measure led to some violent disturbances; many joined, as persecuted, those whom they loved not as schismatics, and the confusion thus generally occasioned gave license to a number of lawless ruffians, the refuse of Africa, of no sect, and probably of no faith, to range their weapons and their crimes on the side of the contumacious. These men, the soldiers of the Donatists, were called Circumcellions; and their savage excesses went very far to convert the schism into a rebellion. When the quarrel arrived at this point, it is well worthy of notice, that Constantine, instead of proceeding to extinguish the malcontents by the sword, attended to the advice of the governors of Africa, so as to repeal the laws which had been enacted against them—and to allow the people full liberty to adhere to the party which they might prefer.

Not so his successor Constans: during his reign we read of the defeat of the Donatists at the battle of Bagnia, and of thirteen years of tumult and bloodshed, and uninterrupted persecution. These severe measures, which the fury of the Circumcellions could scarcely justify, destroyed many, and dispersed into other countries a still greater number of the perverse schismatics—but converted probably none.

The moment of reaction was not far distant; the numerous and revengeful exiles were restored to their home by the suspicious justice of Julian †; and the sect appears to have sprung up, during the few following years, to the highest eminence which it at any time attained. Towards the conclusion of the fourth century Africa was covered with its churches, and its spiritual interests were guarded by a body of four hundred Bishops.

Let us observe the consequence of this prosperity—a violent division grew up among them, respecting some very insignificant person or thing, and opened a breach in their fortress to the persevering assaults of the Catholics. Besides which, the method of assault was now somewhat changed and refined; the weapons of reason and disputation were now again admitted into the service of the Church; and they were not without effect, since they were directed and sharpened by the genius of Augustin. The Bishop of Hippo § attacked the Donatists in his writings, in his public discourses, in his private conversation; and so vigorously exposed their dangerous and seditious spirit, as to lessen their popularity in Africa, and to destroy any sympathy which their former sufferings might have created in the rest of Christendom.

* He certainly exiled some, and is said to have deprived them of their churches, and even to have shed some blood. See Mosh., cent. iv., p. ii., ch. v.

† This change in his policy seems to have taken place in 321—after five years experience of the opposite system.

‡ The horrors which they committed on their restoration are very vividly and seriously related by Fleury, (l. xv., s. 32.) ‘They expelled the Catholic people, violated the women, and murdered the children. They threw the Eucharist to the dogs, but the dogs became mad, and turning against their masters tore them in pieces. One of them threw out of the window a phial of the holy ointment, which fell among the stones without breaking, &c. They exorcised the faithful in order to baptize them anew; they washed the walls of the Churches, and broke the altars and burnt them—for most of those in Africa were then of wood—they broke the consecrated chalices and melted them down, to convert them to other purposes—in a word they held as profane all that the Catholic Bishops had consecrated, &c.’

§ He seems first to have taken the field while a simple presbyter, in the year 394.

From this period they fell gradually into dishonour; somewhat they still endured from the unjust application of the laws against heresy, of which no one has ever accused them; but a dangerous wound was inflicted by the celebrated conference held at Carthage in 411. The tribune Marcellinus was sent into Africa by the Emperor Honorius, with full power to terminate the controversy; he convoked an assembly of the heads of both parties, and two hundred and eighty-six Catholic, and about two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist, bishops presented themselves in defence of their respective opinions. The most solemn preparations were made to give weight and dignity to this meeting, and its deliberations were watched with profound anxiety by the people of Africa*. For three days the Tribune listened with respectful attention to the arguments advanced by both parties, and then proceeded to confirm the decisions of the former century, by pronouncing in favour of the Catholics. Augustin has deserved the glory of this spiritual triumph—and, that no means might be wanting to make it decisive, it was vigorously pursued by the myrmidons of civil authority, who inflicted almost every punishment on the contumacious, excepting the last†.

The survivors took breath under the government of the Vandals, who conquered that part of Africa from the Romans about the year 427; and when it was recovered by Belisarius, more than a hundred years afterwards, the sect of the Donatists was still found to exist there as a separate communion. It was again exposed to the jealousy of the Catholics, and particularly attracted the hostility of Gregory the Great; but we do not learn that it suffered further persecution. We are told that it dwindled into insignificance about the end of the sixth century; but it is not improbable, that the Saracen invaders of Numidia found them, some few years later, the remnant of a sect not ill-disposed to favour any invader, nor unmindful of the sufferings of their ancestors.

The Donatists have never been charged, with the slightest show of truth, with any error of doctrine, or any defect in Church government or discipline, or any depravity of moral practice; they agreed in every respect with their adversaries, except in one—they did not acknowledge as legitimate the ministry of the African Church, but considered their own body to be the true, uncorrupted, universal Church. It is quite clear, that they pushed their schism to very great extremities—even to that of rejecting the communion of all who were in communion with the Church which they called false; but this was the extent of their spiritual offence, even from the assertion of their enemies. The excesses of the Circumcellions lost them much of the sympathy which would otherwise have been bestowed on their misfortunes; but the outrages and association of those outlaws were generally disclaimed

* 'Let the Bishops (says Marcellinus in a previous proclamation) signify to the people in their sermons to keep themselves quiet and silent. I will publish my sentence and expose it to the judgment of all the people of Carthage.' St. Augustin himself addressed an epistle or tract on this controversy, to the Donatist laity. The particulars of the conference are detailed at great length by Fleury in his twenty-second book.

† An exception little more than nominal; for though the infliction of death, as the direct punishment of schism, is not enjoined by the Edict of Honorius, it necessarily followed, as the punishment of contumacy and rebellion. The edict, however, even without that penalty, was so severe, and threatened to drive the Donatists to such extremities, that the civil magistrate, Dulcitus, hesitated to enforce it, until he should have taken counsel of Augustin. That prelate exhorted him to proceed—'since it was much better (he said) that some should perish by their own fires, than that the whole body should burn in the everlasting flames of Gehenna, through the desert of their impious dissension.' Epist. 61, (alias 204). Honorius' Edict appears in the Theodosian Code, and a very sufficient specimen of it may be found in Jortin, H. E. ad ann. 414.

by the most respectable leaders of the sect. One strange sin, indeed, they are accused of encouraging, and of indulging with dreadful frequency—an uncontrollable inclination to suicide*. But suicide is the resource of the desperate; and it is unlikely that it found any favour among them, until oppression had persuaded them, that death was not the greatest among human evils.

In the fortunes of the Donatists do we not trace the usual history of persecution? In its commencement fearful and reluctant, and, as it were, conscious of its corrupt origin, it irritates without depressing; then it hesitates, and next suspends the attack; thereon its object rises up and takes strength and courage. The same process is then repeated, under circumstances slightly different—with the same result. Then follows the passionate and sanguinary assault which destroys the noblest among the recusants, while the most active and dangerous are preserved by hypocrisy or exile—and thus the sect spreads secretly and widely; it secures a sympathy which it may not have merited by its excellence, and on the first occasion breaks out again with fresh force and fury. Then indeed, if recourse be had to argument, if greater right be on the stronger side, and if the secular sword be only employed to *pursue* the victory of reason, the cause of the sufferers becomes more feeble and less popular—but still, unless the pursuit be carried to absolute, individual extermination, the extinction even of the silliest heresy can only be effected by time—and time itself will complete its work, at least as much by calming passion as by correcting judgment.

The above narrative has introduced us to the name of St. Augustin, who was the most celebrated amongst the ancient Christian fathers, and who deserves even now a more than usual *Notice of St. Augustin.* attention, from the influence which his writings have unceasingly exerted in the Roman Catholic Church. But the notice which can here be bestowed upon him must necessarily be confined to very few points. He was born in Numidia, in the year 354, and his early youth was distinguished by his aversion from all study, and especially that of the Greek language. But an ardent passion for poetry at length opened the gate through which he entered into the fields of general literature. From profane, he directed his attention to religious subjects; and when we recollect that Tertullian, the greatest amongst his African predecessors, seceded from the Church in the maturity of his judgment and learning, in order to embrace the visions of a raving fanatic, we are scarcely astonished to learn, that the youthful imagination of Augustin was seduced by the Manichæan opinions. He appears to have retained them for nine or ten years, during which time his rhetorical talents had raised him into notice; and it was not till the year 386, that he was persuaded (as it is said) by the sermons of St. Ambrose, and the writings of St. Paul, to return to the communion of the Church. His baptism (he was previously a catechumen only) speedily followed his conversion; his ordination took place soon afterwards, and the city of Hippo, in Africa, which owes most of its celebrity to its association with his name, was that in which he first ministered as Priest, and afterwards presided as Bishop. He died in 430, in the thirty-fifth year of his episcopate.

* Mosheim, cent. v., p. ii., ch. v. An authority for this fact is Augustin in his *Epistle to Boniface*, ch. iii. *Quidam etiam se trucidandos armatis viatoribus ingerebant, percussuros eos se, nisi ab iis perimerentur, terribiliter comminantes. Nonnunquam et ab iudicibus transeuntibus extorquebant violenter, ut a carnificibus vel ab officio ferirentur. Jam vero per abrupta præcipitia, per aquas et flammam occidere seipsos quotidianus illis ludus fuit.*

The first recorded exploit in his ecclesiastical life was the destruction of an inveterate and consecrated abuse. We have mentioned the innocent origin of the Agapæ or feasts of charity, and the good purposes to which, in early times, they contributed. But as the influx of the Pagan converts grew more rapid, and as these naturally sought in the new religion for any resemblance to the popular ceremonies of the old, the solemnity in question insensibly changed its character under their influence, and degenerated into the licence and debauchery of a heathen festival. Augustin, while yet a presbyter, undertook the difficult office of *persuading* the people to abandon a favourite and hereditary practice, and by the simple exertion of his eloquence he succeeded. Services of reading and chaunting were substituted in its place; and while the churches of the heretics* resounded with the customary revelry, the voice of devotion alone proceeded from the assemblies of the Catholics. This change took place in the year 395; and from that moment the reputation of Augustin spread rapidly throughout the African Church, and thence, as his labours proceeded, was diffused with no less of splendour to the most distant part of Christendom.

Besides the faithful discharge of his episcopal and his private duties, the Bishop of Hippo engaged deeply in the controversies of the day; and his attacks are chiefly directed against the Manichæans, the Donatists, and the Pelagians. His familiarity with the errors of the first may have qualified him more effectually to confute them—but it is at the same time curious to observe the motives which he advances for his own adhesion to the Catholic Church. They are the following: the consent of the people; the authority which began in the faith of miracles, which was nourished by hope, augmented by charity, confirmed by antiquity; the succession in the Chair of St. Peter; and the *name* of Catholic so established, that if a stranger should ask *where* is the Catholic Church? no heretic would certainly dare to claim that title for his own Church†. These arguments, and such as these, have been so commonly repeated in later ages, that, without at all entering (for such is not our province) into the question of their real value, we are contented to record their high antiquity, and the sanction which they received from the name of Augustin.

His exertions against the Donatists‡, which we have already noticed, have attached to the character of that father the stain of persecution. The maxim (says Mosheim) which justified the chastisement of religious errors by civil penalties was confirmed and established by the authority of Augustin, and thus transmitted to following ages. He cannot be vindicated from that charge§; he unquestionably maintained the general principle, that the Unity of the Church should be preserved by secular interference, and that its adversaries should be crushed by the material sword. But his natural humanity in some degree counteracted the barbarity of his

* Fleury, H. E., liv. xx., s. 11. This is the occasion on which it is recorded, that as long as his eloquence was honoured only by the acclamations of the listening multitudes Augustin was sensible of its imperfection, and despaired of success; and his hopes were only revived by the sight of their tears.

† Fleury, liv. xx., s. 23. No heretic was so likely to have laid that claim as a Donatist—yet even a Donatist, while he maintained that the true Catholic spirit and purity was alone perpetuated and inherent in his own communion, would scarcely have affirmed, that that was *bona fide* the universal Church, which did not extend beyond the shores of Africa, and which had not the majority even there.

‡ Cent. iv., p. ii., ch. iii.

§ Besides the epistle to Dulcitus, see his letter, or rather tract, to Boniface, 'de Correctione Donatistarum;' and that to Vincentius (113, alias 48). The principle is avowed and defended in both—at least provided the *animus* be to correct, not to revenge!

ecclesiastical principles; and there is still extant an epistle addressed by him to Marcellinus (in 412), in which he earnestly entreated that magistrate to extend mercy to certain Donatists, who had been convicted of some sanguinary excesses against the Catholics; but the misfortune was, that, while his private philanthropy preserved the lives perhaps of a few individuals, the efficacy which he assisted in giving to the worst maxim of Church policy not only sharpened the shafts of injustice in his own time, but tempered them for long and fatal service in after ages. The Pelagians, the third class of his religious adversaries, will receive a separate notice in the following pages. Of the numerous works which he composed, unconnected with these controversies, that entitled *De Civitate Dei* has justly acquired the greatest celebrity. We may also mention his book on the Trinity among his most important productions. He devoted much diligence and judgment to the interpretation of Scripture; and his writings contain many excellent arguments for the truth of the religion, and of the evangelical history; but the mere barren enumeration of his works would convey neither amusement nor profit to the reader, and we have no space for abstracts sufficiently copious to make him familiar with the mind of the author.

Erasmus has drawn a parallel between Augustin and his great contemporary, the monk of Palestine, which is certainly too favourable to the latter. 'No one can deny (he says) that there is great importance in the country and education of men. Jerome was born at Stridona, which is so near to Italy, that the Italians claim him as a compatriot; he was educated at Rome under very learned masters. Augustin was born in Africa, a barbarous region, and singularly indifferent to literary pursuits, as he avows in his epistles. Jerome, a Christian, the child of Christians, imbibed with his very milk the philosophy of Christ: Augustin began to read St. Paul's epistles with no instructor when nearly thirty years of age. Jerome devoted his great talents for thirty years to the study of the Scriptures: Augustin was immediately hurried to the episcopal office, and compelled to teach to others what he had not yet learnt himself. We observe then, even supposing a parity of country, talents, masters, education, how much more learning was brought to the task by Jerome; for it is no trifling matter that he was skilled in the Greek and Hebrew languages; since in those days all theology, as well as all philosophy, was in possession of the Greeks. Augustin was ignorant of Greek*; at least the very trifling knowledge which he possessed of it was insufficient for the study of the commentaries of the Greek writers †.' The merit of more profound learning was unquestionably on the side of Jerome, but we cannot justly attribute to him any other superiority; in soundness of reasoning and in natural judgment he certainly yielded to the Bishop of Hippo, and in the only recorded point of difference ‡ between them he was very properly cor-

* Dr. Lardner makes, we think, a very ineffectual attempt to prove that Augustin knew much more of that language than he even himself professed to have known—for a few happy translations of Greek words, and even sentences, he was probably obliged to the learning of a friend or secretary.

† Erasmus ends his comparison by affirming, 'that for his own part he learns more of Christian philosophy from one page of Origen than from ten of Augustin;' and others, perhaps, will add, from their own experience, 'and from one page of Augustin, than from ten of Jerome.'

‡ This dispute was on the verse (ch. ii., v. 11.) of St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians: 'When Peter came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.' Jerome had published his opinion, that the apostles had this public difference on a previous understanding, and by a charitable artifice; and that St. Paul in fact saw the policy

rected by that prelate. In depth of moral feeling and energy of affecting eloquence the advantage is also due to Augustin; and the natural suavity of his disposition, which forms so strong a contrast with what might almost be designated the ferocity of Jerome, tended to soften the acrimony of religious difference*, and to throw some sparks of charity into the controversies in which he found himself almost necessarily engaged.

Some particulars relating to his private life are recorded by historians, on the evidence of his own writings, and other respectable authority. His furniture and his dress were plain, without affectation either of fineness or of poverty. He wore, like other people, a linen garment underneath, and one of wool without; he wore shoes and stockings, and exhorted those, who thought better to obey the Gospel by walking with naked feet, to assume no merit from that practice. 'Let us observe charity, he said—I admire your courage—endure my weakness.' His table was frugal, and ordinarily served with vegetables; meat was seldom prepared, unless for guests or for the infirm, but there was always wine. Excepting his spoons, which were of silver, all the service was earthen, or of wood or marble, not by necessity, but from a love for poverty. On his table were written two verses, to forbid any scandal to be spoken of the absent—proving that it was without a cloth, according to the usage of antiquity. He never forgot the poor, and aided them from the same fund on which he subsisted with his clergy; that is, from the revenues of the Church or the oblations of the faithful. He paid great regard to hospitality, and held it as a maxim, that it was a much preferable error to entertain a rogue, than to refuse an honest man. His usual occupation was arbitration among Christians and persons of all religions, who submitted their differences to him. But he liked much better to decide between strangers than between his friends—'for of the two strangers I may make one a friend; of the two friends I shall make one an enemy.' He applied himself little to the temporal interests of the Church, but busied himself much more in study, and in the meditation of spiritual concerns†.

II. Priscillian, a Spanish Bishop of birth and fortune and eloquence, was accused by certain other Bishops of the heresy of the Manichæans; he was condemned by a Council held at Sara- *The Priscillianists.* gossa (in 380), and a rescript was then obtained for his banishment from the Emperor Gratian; but he was speedily restored to his country and his dignity. Gratian was assassinated, and succeeded by Maximus, a tyrant worthy of the throne of Domitian; and before him ‡ Idacius and Ithacius, the two ecclesiastics most persevering in their zeal or malignity, again accused Priscillian. His followers were probably not very numerous, but they presented themselves to plead their cause and prove their innocence, before Damasus, Bishop of Rome,

and propriety of St. Peter's adhesion to the Jews, at the moment when he professed to condemn it. According to Augustin, this interpretation goes to overthrow the whole authority of Scripture; for if it is once allowed to admit there the existence of serviceable falsehoods, and to say that St. Paul in that passage spoke what he did not mean, and treated St. Peter as reprehensible when he did not think him so, there is no passage which may not be similarly eluded. The heretics who condemn marriage would assert that St. Paul only approved it through condescension to the imperfection of the first Christians—and so of others.

* Compare, for instance, the manner of his opposition to the opinions of Jovinian with that of Jerome.

† Fleury, liv. xxiv., chap. xxxviii. xxxix.

‡ Sulpicius Severus mentions Magnus and Rufus as the two Bishops who were finally the successful agents in procuring the condemnation of Priscillian.

and the celebrated Ambrose, at Milan—from neither of them could they obtain a hearing*. Perhaps their unfortunate instructor was not more successful at the court of Maximus; at least it is certain that, in the year 384, he was put to death at Treves, with some of his associates, on no other pretext than his heretical opinions†.

It is now disputed what those opinions were; and it is probable that the same dispute existed in his own time; since no ancient writer has given us any clear account of them—and none of the works of Priscillian or any of his followers have reached us. It seems likely, however, that the Priscillianists made some approaches, perhaps very distant ones, to the wild errors of the Manichæans‡, respecting the two principles, the doctrine of æons, or emanations from the divine nature, and the creation of the world. It is possible that they disputed the *reality* of Christ's birth and incarnation—though they professed to receive the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. They are stated to have disbelieved the resurrection of the body, and they had some errors concerning the nature and functions of the soul. They are blamed for not consuming the Eucharist at Church, and for some irregularity in the season of their fasts; and some of them were charged besides (strange charges to be brought by Catholic accusers!) with having deserted their social rank, in order to betake themselves to solitary devotion; and with holding opinions favourable to celibacy. For these offences, or such as these, Priscillian suffered death; and his fate has gained him the more celebrity, because it is usual to consider him as the first martyr to religious dissent. Not perhaps truly so—for between the years 325 and 384 many an obscure victim of the Arian heresy must have perished for his opinions, in silence and ignominy—but Arius himself escaped the storm; and it cannot be disputed, that Priscillian was the first who atoned with his life for the dangerous distinction of founding a religious sect§. It is some consolation to be enabled to add, that the principle by which he suffered was not yet in favour with the Christian Church; the character of Ithakius, his most active enemy, is thus described by a contemporary historian (Sulpicius Severus),—‘he was a man void of all principle; loquacious, impudent, expensive, a slave to gluttony—so senseless as to represent every holy person who delighted in religious studies, and practised mortification and abstinence, as an associate or a disciple of Priscillian.’ On the other hand, the persecuted heretic found a powerful protector in one of the most venerable prelates of that age, Martin of Tours, ‘a man comparable to the apostles.’ So long as Martin remained at the court of Maximus, his authority was sufficient to prevent the meditated injustice; he had even ventured to represent to that usurper, that it

* Their opinions may have been adopted by several both among the nobility and the people, and by a vast multitude of women (as is also asserted) in Spain; but they obtained no footing elsewhere. They are said to have been introduced into that country by one Marc, an Egyptian of Memphis, and a Manichæan.

† We need not pause to notice some monstrous charges of immorality—such as we have seen so commonly affixed to an unpopular heresy.

‡ It is a curious reflection, that at the same moment when Priscillian was suffering the pangs of death, for opinions *resembling* the Manichæan heresy, St. Augustin, the destined bulwark of the Catholic Church,—the man whose future writings were to become a storehouse of the true doctrine for so many countries and ages—was actually and deeply involved in the very intricacies of the heresy itself. He returned to reason—but Priscillian, who was nearer to it than himself, was hastily executed.

§ We should mention, perhaps, the distinction that Priscillian suffered death for the opinions themselves—directly and avowedly—not, as thousands before him had suffered, for contumacy in persisting in them—a distinction which has no real value, except as marking the greater shamelessness of persecution in at length casting off her mask.

was 'a new and unlawful attempt of the civil magistrate to take cognizance of an ecclesiastical cause'—a boldness consistent with his peaceful virtues, and derived from the now acknowledged dignity of his profession. The deed was perpetrated in his absence, and he then protested against the act, and withdrew from the communion of the murderers. The memory of this excellent prelate has been disfigured by the credulous historian, who intended to be his eulogist; and we would willingly believe, that the stupendous miracles so profusely attributed to him were created by the veneration of the vulgar, or even by the enthusiasm of the writer, not by the deliberate imposture of a pious Christian*.

Sulpicius proceeds to say, that 'the death of Priscillian was so far from repressing the heresy of which he had been the author, that it conduced greatly to confirm and extend it; for his followers, who before had revered him as a pious man, began to worship him as a martyr. The bodies of those who had suffered death were carried back to Spain, and interred with great solemnity; and to swear by the name of Priscillian was practised as a religious act.' Such were the immediate consequences of his execution; it does not appear, however, that his opinions took any deep or lasting root, or ever again became the occasion of offence or confusion to the Church.

III. The same age, almost the same year, which witnessed the death of one heretic for opinions, among which was a rigid, undue admiration of bodily austerities and religious seclusion, beheld *Jovinian*, with less surprise the banishment of another heretic, for daring to raise his voice in disparagement of those same practices. Jovinian had received his education in an Italian convent, but the common feelings and principles of nature were not extinguished in him. He left his retirement, and published a volume in which he rashly endeavoured to show, that those who followed the rules of the Gospel, amid the temptations and perplexities of social life, possessed as just a claim to the rewards of futurity as those who observed the same rules in solitude; that pleasures are not necessarily sins; that temperance is as excellent a virtue as abstinence; and that the chaste enjoyments of marriage are as agreeable to the eye of a benevolent Deity, as the mortifications of unnatural celibacy†. Jerome, 'the monk of the age,' poured out in reply much passionate declamation in praise of the established superstitions, and some calumnious invective against the person of the reformer; and as the current already ran too strongly in his favour, his clamours were echoed by the zealous multitude, while the wise were constrained to sorrow and silence‡. Among Christian Churches the foremost in the extinction of reason and true Christianity was the Church of Rome. Her impatience to crush the dangerous

* 'Men of probity in other respects, and fully persuaded of the truth of Christianity, (and such I take Martin, Paulinus, and Sulpicius to have been) having found in the populace a strong taste for the marvellous, and no capacity for better proofs, judged it expedient rather to leave them to their prejudices, and to make use of those prejudices to confirm them in the true faith, than to undertake the vain task of curing them of their superstition, and run the risk of plunging them into vice and unbelief. Therefore they humoured the trick, and complied with the fashion for the good of those who were deceived.' Le Clerc, *Bibl. Chois.*, ap. Jortin, ad ann. 402. This seems to be the simplest solution of the difficulty.

† He was also charged with the speculative error, that all who have been regenerated by baptism, with perfect faith, were indefectible, and could not fail of their heavenly recompense. He may have held this opinion—but the points on which the controversy turned, were those which much more nearly affected the practice of mankind.

‡ It should be mentioned that the reply of Jerome was not written till after the condemnation of the offender, in consequence of some progress which the opinions are said for the moment to have made at Rome.

innovator was emulated by St. Ambrose at Milan; and the opinions of Jovinian were formally condemned, in the year 390, by a Council there held by that Prelate. But the work was not yet complete; the Emperor Honorius was prevailed upon to interpose the secular authority in the same cause; and the following was his proclamation—‘The complaint of some Bishops mentions as a grievance that Jovinian assembles sacrilegious meetings without the walls of the most holy city. Wherefore we ordain that the above-mentioned be seized and whipped, together with his abettors and attendants, and confined to some place of banishment; and that the machinator himself be immediately sent away to the island of Boa.’ Boa was a wretched rock, near the Illyrian coast; and in this exile, Jovinian, during the remainder of his life, expiated the crime of proclaiming in the fourth century truths which no one had dreamed of disputing in the second, and which are defended with almost equal clearness by the authority of reason and of revelation.

This example did not prevent another and a bolder attempt at Reformation—for as the corruptions of that time had not yet subsided into habits; as they could not yet plead prescription and long familiar practice; as they were not yet consecrated by the claims of hereditary reverence, it was natural that the voice of reason should sometimes raise itself in faint opposition to their progress. Very early in the following century Vigilantius, a native of Gaul, who had performed the functions of presbyter in Spain, and afterwards, by his travels through Egypt and Palestine, enlightened and enriched a vigorous understanding and character, boldly avowed his disgust at the growing abuses of the day. Nor did he confine his attack to one or two points; he directed it against the castles and strong holds of superstition. He denied that the tombstones of the martyrs were proper objects of homage and worship; he denied the holiness of places so sanctified, and censured the pilgrimages that were made to them. He derided the prodigies by which the temples of the martyrs were so much celebrated, and condemned the vigils performed in them; and he even ventured to assert that the custom of burning tapers at their tombs, in the face of day, was a foolish imitation of the Pagan practice. He denied the efficacy of prayers addressed to departed saints, and spake lightly of fasting and mortifications, and celibacy, and the various and useless austerities of the monastic life. And lastly, he disparaged the merit of that suspicious charity which lavished large sums for devout purposes, in fancied atonement for unrepented sin. The clamorous guardian of ecclesiastical depravity was again awakened by this second invasion of abuses so dear to him; and immediately, from his monastery at Bethlehem, he assailed the Reformer with such overbearing vehemence of plausible and popular argument, that the good Vigilantius deemed it wiser to retire from the conflict than to expose himself to unprofitable martyrdom. And in fact we find that this heresy (so it was designated) gained so little ground, that the interference of a Council was not required to extinguish it. The principal credit of both these triumphs is due to St. Jerome—than whom the Church, in her whole history, has not ever listened to a more pernicious counsellor.

IV. The controversy to which we next proceed was on a subject of the deepest and most permanent importance to the whole Christian world; and though, through the perverse misapplication of human ingenuity, dissensions have flowed from it, to the great disturbance of former ages, and to the division even of the present, we cannot affect either surprise or

The Pelagian Controversy.

regret, that a question of so much moment should have agitated thus early the minds of pious men—for it went to the bottom of the Christian doctrine respecting the original corruption of human nature, and the necessity of divine grace, to enlighten the understanding and to purify the heart.

It is in all cases extremely difficult, in the statement of those antient controversies, to do justice to the arguments, or even to the opinions, maintained by either party—because these, in the process of the dispute, became closely, often inseparably, connected with *consequences* imputed to them by the adversary as necessary, and disclaimed by the advocate as unfair and arbitrary. So that those very subtleties of reasoning, which professed to unfold and explain the difference, did in fact only produce perplexity. In the Pelagian controversy this difficulty is increased by two causes: first, that we know little of the opinions of the heretic, except from the writings of his opponents; secondly, that the fear of public condemnation, and perhaps temporal punishment, occasionally led him into unworthy equivocation; so that his expressions are sometimes such as seemingly to convey an assertion of orthodoxy at variance with the whole drift of his previous argument. Again, the mere facts of the controversy have been variously related, according as the opinions of the relators have been tinged, however slightly, by the opposite colours of Pelagianism or Fatalism. We must endeavour, however, to disentangle the truth from these intricacies.

Pelagius was a native of Britain, probably of Wales; the associate of his travels, his heresy, and his celebrity, was Celestius, an Irishman: both were monks; both, too, were men of considerable talents, and no just suspicions have ever been thrown on the sanctity of their moral conduct. They arrived at Rome in the very beginning of the fifth century, and remained there in the undisturbed, and perhaps obscure, profession of their opinions till the year 410, when they retired, on the Gothic invasion, the former to Palestine, the latter to Carthage. Here the peculiar doctrines of Celestius did not long escape detection; they first attracted the attention of the Deacon, Paulinus of Milan, who arraigned and caused them to be condemned in a Council held at Carthage in the year 412*. It does not appear that Augustin assisted at this Council, as he was still engaged in pursuing his advantages over the Donatists; however, he did not delay to enter the field against the new adversary, and very soon afterwards assailed the infant heresy, both by his sermons and writings†.

* The errors here charged against Celestius were comprised in seven articles—1. That Adam was created mortal, and would have died, whether he had sinned or not; 2. that the sin of Adam injured himself alone, not the human race; 3. that infants, at their birth, are in the condition of Adam before his sin; 4. that neither the death nor sin of Adam is the cause of man's mortality, nor the resurrection of Christ of his resurrection; 5. that man may be saved by the Law as well as by the Gospel; 6. that before the coming of Christ there had been men without sin; 7. that infants inherit eternal life without baptism. These were partly disclaimed or explained away, but enough remained to shew the real nature of his opinions, though we may observe that the words free-will and grace do not yet appear in the controversy.

† The natural causes of the opposition of the Church to the Pelagian opinions are ingeniously and reasonably discussed by Guizot (*Cours d'Histoire Moderne, Leçon V.*) We shall transcribe one passage, which deserves attention, and which cannot be condensed:—'Augustin, who was the chief among the doctors of the Church, was peculiarly called upon to maintain the general system of its belief. Now, the notions of Pelagius and Celestius appeared to him to be in contradiction with some of the fundamental points of Christian faith, especially the doctrine of original sin and that of redemption. He attacked them, then, in three characters;—as philosopher, because their *science* of human nature was, in his view, narrow and incomplete; as practical reformer and governor of the

Dissatisfied with the easy triumph which attended his exertions in his own Church, he followed the fugitive into the East, and having ascertained that Pelagius maintained the same errors in Palestine, he occasioned him to be accused before two Councils; the one at Jerusalem*, the other at Diospolis. John, Bishop of Jerusalem, was favourable to the cause, perhaps to the tenets of Pelagius; and thus, partly by his influence, partly from the absence of any fixed rule of orthodoxy on those particular subjects in the Eastern Church, partly from the very modified statement of his own opinions delivered to the Councils by Pelagius, that sectarian, in spite of the violent opposition of Jerome, was acquitted in both. This event took place in 415; and in the year following, Augustin, undaunted by this repulse, again assembled Councils in Africa and Numidia, and again condemned the offensive doctrines.

The scene of action was then transferred to Rome, on the appeal, as it would seem, of the two heretics, and with the hope, perhaps, (not a reasonable hope,) that the authority of the Church of Jerusalem would have as much weight at the Vatican, as that of the Church of Carthage. Zosimus had been just raised to the pontificate; to him the controversy was referred, with great shew of humility, by Celestius; and whether deceived by the artful composition of the creed presented to him for approval, or overlooking the importance of a question to which his attention had not previously been much directed, or flattered by the personal appeal to his justice and the acknowledged submission to the Chair of St. Peter, or influenced by all these reasons, Zosimus pronounced the innocence of the disputed doctrine.

Augustin was not even thus discouraged; and his ardent religious feelings, as well as his reputation, were now too deeply interested in the controversy to allow him to rest here. Once more he assembled his Bishops, and after the public renewal of former declarations, he proceeded to inform the Pope more clearly as to the real nature and importance of the question; as to the errors which had been actually professed by the heretics; and those which, though disingenuously disavowed, followed of course from them. Zosimus does not appear to have been much moved by these representations; but in the mean-time a more powerful avenger had been roused by the perseverance of the Africans. An imperial Edict descended from Constantinople, which banished both the delinquents from Rome, and menaced with perpetual exile and confiscation of estates all who should maintain their doctrines in any place. This decisive blow was struck in the March of 418; in the May following, another and still

Church, because they weakened, in his mind, the most efficacious method of reform and government; as logician, because their ideas did not exactly square with the consequences which flowed from the essential principles of the faith. Observe, then, what gravity the dispute assumed from that moment; everything was engaged in it—philosophy, politics, and religion; the opinions of St. Augustin, and his business, his vanity, and his duty. He abandoned himself entirely to it, publishing treatises, writing letters, collecting communications which flowed in upon him from all quarters, profuse in regulations and counsels, and carrying into all his writings and all his measures, that mixture of passion and mildness, of authority and sympathy, of expanse of mind and logical strictness, which gave him such singular power.

* On this occasion, being asked if he really maintained opinions which Augustin had condemned, he replied, 'What is Augustin to me?' Many were offended, for Augustin was the most venerable authority of the age; and some immediately proposed to excommunicate the spiritual rebel: but John averted the blow, and kindly addressed Pelagius, — 'It is I who am Augustin here; it is to me that you shall answer.' Pelagius spoke Greek, and is said to have thus obtained some advantages over his accuser Orosius, who was ignorant of that language.

more numerous Council* met at Carthage for the purpose of completing the triumph; and then the Bishop of Rome was at length prevailed upon to place, in conjunction with his clergy, the final seal of heresy on the Pelagian opinions. The opinions themselves did not, indeed, expire from these successive wounds, but have frequently reappeared under different forms and modifications; but no further attempts were made to extend them by their original authors.

The sum of those opinions was this:—1. That the sins of our first parents are imputed to themselves alone, and not to their posterity; that we derive no corruption from their fall; that we inherit no depravity from our origin; but enter into the world as pure and unspotted as Adam at his creation. It was a necessary inference from this doctrine, that infant baptism is not a sign or seal of the remission of sins, but only a *mark* of admission into the kingdom of Christ. 2. That our own powers are sufficient for our own justification; that as by our own free-will we run into sin, so, by the same voluntary exercise of our faculties, we are able to repent, and reform, and raise ourselves to the highest degree of virtue and piety; that we are, indeed, assisted by that external † grace of God which has taught us the truths of revelation; which opens to us our prospects, and enlightens our understanding, and animates our exertions after godliness; but that the internal and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit is not *necessary*, either to awaken us to religious feeling, or to further us in our progress towards holiness; in short, that man, by the unassisted agency of his natural perfections under the guidance of his own *free-will*, is enabled to work out his own salvation.

Regarding these doctrines, it is sufficient for a Christian to examine, whether or not they are in accordance with the obvious interpretation of Scripture; and the long experience of a fruitless controversy must at length have convinced us respecting such inscrutable subjects, that if we advance one step beyond the safe and substantial ground of revelation, we become entangled in the mazes of metaphysical disputation. In these matters, we are not to inquire what is probable, but what is *written*; and it has become a question, whether the presumptuous arrogance of reason, which is objected to the system of Pelagius, did not lead his opponents, who believed themselves humble, equally far away from that entire submission to the Gospel, which is the only true humility.

Augustin maintained the Church doctrines of original sin and saving grace with great force and zeal, and the most unaffected sincerity; and his writings on this subject continued for above twelve centuries to distribute the waters of regeneration over the barren surface of the Roman Catholic Church. But Augustin himself, in the ardour of his opposition to free-will, did he not overstep the just limits of reason, and advance into the contrary extreme of fatalism? It is true that he warmly disclaimed that doctrine, when nakedly objected to him as the obvious and inevitable result of those which he professed; but it was not without some sacrifice of logical severity that he declined the formidable conclusion. Nevertheless, more rigid logicians and more daring theologians were found, who pressed to their utmost consequences the opinions of their master, and

* Two hundred and three, or, as some assert, two hundred and fourteen Bishops were present.

† Pelagius artfully perplexed the subject, by his assertion of six different kinds of grace; and if there be any of his expressions which may seem to imply more than we here give them credit for, they are, at least, so vague, and, we think, purposely so vague, as to make it impossible to attach any definite meaning to them.

deduced from them the predestinarian dogma in its full extent. Again, the publication of the astounding tenet on such authority (for St. Augustin, as well as his adversaries, was held responsible for the consequences of his positions*) became the occasion of another series of divisions in the Church, which more particularly distracted that of Gaul; so that the discord which grew out of the Pelagian controversy was not confined to the original ground of dispute, but spread with baneful luxuriance over the vineyard of Christ.

Among the opinions to which it gave birth, the most popular, and perhaps the most reasonable, were those of the *Semi-Pelagians*. They began to spread in the South of France about the year 428, and are attributed to an oriental, named Cassian, who resided in a monastery at Marseilles. These Sectarrians† regarded with equal suspicion that absolute independence of the Divine aid, so rashly ascribed to the human soul by the Pelagian system, and its entire prostration and helplessness as exhibited by the Fatalists; and they consequently concluded, that, by holding a middle course between opposite errors, they should most nearly arrive at truth. And so they maintained, on the one hand, that the Grace purchased by Christ was necessary for salvation, and that no man could *persevere* or advance in holiness without its perpetual support and assistance: on the other, that our natural faculties were sufficient for the beginning of repentance and amendment; that Christ died for all men, and that there was no *particular* dispensation of his grace in consequence of predestination, but that it was equally offered to all men; that man was born free, and therefore capable of receiving its influences, or resisting them. These doctrines were generally condemned in the Western Church‡. It is true, they have continued, with slight variations, to find many advocates there in every age; but the Church faithfully followed the line which had been traced by Augustin. By adopting his doctrines on grace, it condemned the heresy both of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians; and by rejecting the dogma of the Fatalists, it relieved itself from that, which would have proved a perpetual source of internal dissatisfaction and dissent. But in the East, if we may judge from the writings of Chrysostom§, and the general tone of the Greek fathers, the Semi-Pelagian opinions had obtained an earlier and common prevalence, and they appear to have maintained it, with little interruption or dispute, to the present moment. The Greeks, however, engaged with little ardour in the Pelagian disputes; and the reason may have been, that the seeds of another contention, even

* In fact, St. Augustin attributed the progressive sanctification of man to the direct, immediate, and special action of God on the soul; that is, to grace, properly so called; grace to which man had, by his own powers, no title: and which proceeded from the absolutely gratuitous gift and free choice of the Divinity. His twelve fundamental points of the doctrine of grace are delivered in the epistle (to Vitalis) numbered 217 or 107.

† Guizot has justly observed, that none of these doctrines gave birth to a *Sect*, properly so called; those who held them were not formally separated from the Church and formed into a distinct religious society, nor had they any peculiar organization or worship. The doctrines were pure opinions debated among enlightened men, and varying both in their credit and in the degrees of their deviation from the Church, but never such as to menace a formal schism.

‡ St. Augustin died about two years after their birth, but his work was followed up by Prosper and Hilary, who caused them to be condemned very soon afterwards by Pope Celestin. On the other hand, the opinions of the Predestinarians were also condemned by the Councils of Arles (in 472), and of Lyons (in 473).

§ The opinions of Chrysostom on the subject appear to be fairly discussed by Dupin. *Nouv. Bibl.*, in his *Life of that Father*.

more suited to the peculiarity of their metaphysical taste, were now ready to burst forth with abundant fertility. The great controversy respecting the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, which engaged, for about two hundred and fifty years, the ingenuity and the passions of the Eastern world, first discovered itself in the beginning of the fifth century, emerging, as it were, from the mists of some early heresies. We shall give as concise an account of it, as is consistent with the illustration of its more important features.

V. The controversy respecting the Trinity was terminated by the Council of Constantinople in the year 381, which established the belief in the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, as the true doctrine of the Universal Church. *Controversy on the Incarnation.* The Arian heresy had been previously condemned; and about the end of the fourth century, the attention of speculative minds began to turn from the momentous consideration of the eternal and celestial nature of Christ, and the consequent degree of worship which is due to him, to a subordinate inquiry into the probable nature of his existence during his temporary residence here on earth. This question had, indeed, been moved in the first ages of the Church, and some of the errors of Marcion, of Cerinthus, Carpocrates, Basilides, and others, are connected with it; but their opinions were so immediately derived from the absurd theories of Gnosticism, that they gained no great or lasting prevalence, nor have any claim on our present attention. And it will seem, indeed, a very singular circumstance, that the first speculations on this subject, which necessarily fix our notice, should have proceeded from the friend and associate of Athanasius—Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, whether carried into excess by his hostility to Arianism, or inextricably entangled in his own unnecessary subtilities, so far lost sight of the moderation of reason, that in asserting the divinity of Christ he denied the reality of his human nature. For he held that the divine nature (the Logos) supplied in Him the place of the spiritual and intellectual principle, and constituted, in fact, *His mind*. In this sense he could not be considered as perfect man; and in effect, the substitution of the Divine essence for the human soul, so far confused the two natures of Christ, as to reduce them to ‘one incarnate nature,’—a doctrine which, indeed, Apollinaris did not disavow. This opinion took deep root in the Egyptian Church, but it was condemned by the clergy of Asia and Syria.

The question, however, not being publicly pursued by the directors of the Church, rested in an unsettled state until the accession of Nestorius to the See of Constantinople in the year *Nestorius*, 428. That Prelate was a native of Antioch, and had been educated in the Syrian schools; and having then been strongly impressed with the *distinction* of the two natures and the dangerous error of confusing them, he inculcated so strongly the difference between the Son of God and the Son of Man, as to seem almost to extend the distinction of natures to a distinction of *persons*, though he avowed no such intention. In consequence of these principles he defended one of his presbyters, Anastasius, who in a public discourse had ventured to argue, that the Virgin Mary ought not properly to be called ‘Mother of God’ (Θεοτόκος), but ‘Mother of Christ’ (Χριστοτόκος), or even ‘Mother of Man’ (Ἀνθρωποτόκος). Whatsoever may be the most appropriate appellation for the Mother of Jesus Christ, it was assuredly the proof of a narrow and contentious spirit, that the Head of the oriental Church should in any * way interfere in so vain a dispute. But Nestorius

* In a letter addressed to John of Jerusalem, about two years afterwards, when the

interfered with earnestness and ardour. It also happened, that [the opinion which he undertook to protect was at variance with the popular enthusiasm; *that* had already set in the opposite direction, and it was easily urged on and roused into a tempest, when an insult was represented to have been offered to the dignity and holiness of the Virgin. On one occasion, in the midst of a numerous assembly, one Eusebius (then a lawyer, and afterwards Bishop of Doryleum) interrupted the sermon of the patriarch with these words:—‘It is the Eternal Logos himself who has undergone a second birth according to the flesh, and by means of a woman.’ The people were excited; the subject occupied universal attention; the passions became inflamed, and Nestorius, in his own capital, was absurdly* accused of reviving the heresies of Photinus and Paul of Samosata. But it was not among his domestic adversaries that he found his most formidable opponent. That opponent was Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria—a man of learning and eloquence, and intolerable arrogance. And some jealousy which at that time subsisted, respecting the relative dignity of the two Sees, probably heightened the contention, and is believed by some to have caused it. Whether that be so or not, the two patriarchs anathematized each other with mutual violence; and such troubles were raised, that the Emperor (Theodosius the younger) deemed it necessary to convoke a general Council for the purpose of appeasing them. It was assembled at Ephesus in the year 431, and stands in the annals of the Church as the third General Council. Cyril was appointed to preside, and consequently to judge the cause of his adversary; and he carried into this office such little shew of impartiality, that he refused even to wait for the arrival of the Bishop of Antioch and others, who were held friendly to Nestorius, and proceeded to pronounce sentence, while the meeting was yet incomplete. To secure or prosecute his advantages, he had brought with him from Egypt a number of robust and daring fanatics†, who acted as his soldiery; and it had been skilfully arranged, that Ephesus should be chosen for the decision of a difference respecting the dignity of the Virgin; since popular tradition had buried her in that city, and the imperfect Christianity of its inhabitants had readily transferred to her the worship which their ancestors had offered to Diana.

After publishing an unjust condemnation‡ of the undefended patriarch,

matter was inflamed almost beyond hope, Nestorius, indeed, attempts a justification, by saying that he *found* the religious world divided between Theotocos and Anthropotocos; and that his only object was to unite both parties by the intermediate term Christotocos. But he had then discovered the folly of his attempt.

* In a sermon, delivered in answer to a public attack made by Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicum, Nestorius maintains that it is improper, ‘nakedly to assert, that God was born of Mary; but rather, that God, the Word of the Father, was joined to him who was born of Mary. It was the Man, and not the Word God, which rose again; the Temple should be distinguished from the God who dwells there.’ (Fleury, liv. xxv. sect. 2.) It seems very probable, that if Nestorius had abstained from all mention of the Virgin Mary, or merely avoided the imprudence of interfering with the *title* of a being who was already becoming the object of superstition, the *controversy* would not have taken place at all.

† These were chiefly monks—a race which swarmed with singular fecundity along the banks of the Nile, and in the deserts of the Thebais. The influence which they possessed in the Egyptian Church is proved by the circumstance, that the first attack which Cyril made upon his brother-patriarch, appeared in the form of an Epistle General to the Monks of Egypt. Its success was very sensibly displayed at Ephesus.

‡ The first burst of the unanimous (if it was so) indignation of the Fathers was expressed nearly in these words:—‘Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius; the orthodox faith anathematizes him; the holy Council anathematizes him. We all anathematize the heretic Nestorius; we anathematize all who communicate with him and his impious belief. All the earth anathematizes the unholy religion of Nestorius. Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius.’—Fleury, liv. xxv. sect. 39.

and causing, through its own dissensions, some sanguinary tumult throughout the city, the third General Council was at length dismissed by Theodosius in these words:—‘God is my witness, that I am not the author of this confusion. His providence will discern and punish the guilty. Return to your provinces; and may your private virtues repair the mischief and scandal of your meeting.’ The banishment of Nestorius did not immediately follow his condemnation; and four other years of intrigue and malevolence were necessary, before he was dismissed,—first, to his original convent at Antioch, and finally to an island (or Oasis) in the deserts of Upper Egypt. There he died; and as he died a persecuted exile, he has a strong and natural claim on our sympathy; but it is lessened by the recollection of his dangerous indiscretion; and we are forbidden to forget or to conceal, that in his days of prosperity, while in the enjoyment of dignity and power, he had not refused to inflict on the Arians and other heretics the calamities which were impending over himself*.

In the mean time his opinions extended themselves rapidly throughout central Asia, along the Eastern extremities of Christendom. Through Chaldea, Persia, Syria, and Assyria; in Arabia, India, Tartary, and even China, they took deep root during the fifth and following century; and the numbers of their professors, their indignation against the persecutors of Nestorius, and their consequent enmity against the Church and name of Greece, prepared them, in a later age, for alliance with the Mahometan invader †.

They assembled their councils at Seleucia, and their doctrine, as there determined, amounted to this—‘That in the Saviour of the world there were two persons or substances (*ὑποστάσεις*), of which the one was divine, the Eternal Word; and the other, which was human, was the man Jesus; that these two substances had only one *aspect* (*barsopa, πρόσωπον*); that the union between the Son of God and the Son of man was not an union of nature or of person, but only of will and affection; that Christ was therefore to be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in him as in a temple; that Mary was to be called the mother of Christ and not the mother of God.’ From this exposition ‡ of doctrine it has been suspected, and with great justice, that the difference between the Nestorians and the Orthodox was in fact merely verbal; and that the more rational disputants of both parties were maintaining, with some variation of expression, the very same opinions. Indeed, if in that exposition we are to consider the word *person* as in *both* cases synonymous with *Hypostasis*, or substance, there remains little, if any thing, which could divide the most pugnacious polemics.

In the history of this controversy, the name of Eutyches immediately

* During his banishment he was carried into captivity by the Blemmyes; and after his release by them, was hurried about from place to place by the governor of Upper Egypt, so that he had no repose even in exile. ‘Enfin (says Fleury) il mourut, accablé de vieillesse et d’infirmités; et on dit, que sa langue fut rongée de vers.’ Of all Roman Catholic historians, Fleury is the most charitable.

† The successors of Mahomet in Persia employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs, both of the cabinet and of the provinces, and suffered the patriarch of that sect only to reside in the kingdom of Babylon. The Monophysites enjoyed in Syria and Egypt an equal degree of favour and protection.’ Mosh. (Cent. vii. p. ii. ch. v.)

‡ It is taken from Mosheim; and the peculiar word Barsopa may perhaps be properly translated *aspect*. Only render it *person*, and omit that same word when it is used synonymously with substance, and even the shadow of the difference is almost removed. It is at least certain that the Monothelites have commonly accused the Catholics of Nestorianism, and have sometimes mistaken the one for the other. See Fleury, xxvii, sect. 23.

succeeds to that of Nestorius. This person was the abbot of *Eutyches*. a convent at Constantinople, and an intemperate opposer of the opinions of Nestorius. He carried the doctrine of the Egyptian school to its extreme interpretation, and appears to have exceeded the obscure limits of the error of Apollinaris*. For that heresiarch affected to draw some distinction between an intellectual and a *sensitive* soul, which, however subtle, may seem to remove his doctrine one step from that of the Monophysites; but Eutyches at once boldly pronounced 'that in Christ there was but *one*† nature—that of the incarnate word.' Dioscorus, who had succeeded to the throne of Alexandria and to the character of Cyril, gave his decided support to Eutyches, and as both parties grew violent, Theodosius was exhorted to convoke another Council to determine the difference. He did so; and, as if to prove the inefficacy of experience to confer wisdom, he again appointed Ephesus as the place of the meeting, and again selected the Bishop of Alexandria to preside in it. The tumults which had disgraced the Church in 431 were repeated with some additional brutalities in 449; the Egyptians again were triumphant; and the assembly at length dispersed, after having sanctioned the doctrine of Eutyches, and acquired the title, by which it has been stigmatized in every age of the Church, as 'The Assembly of Robbers.' This meeting, we should observe, has not obtained a place among the general Councils of the Church ‡.

The western Bishops had hitherto interfered, not very warmly, in these disputes, which were indeed peculiarly oriental both in their origin and character. But Leo the Great, sensible of the scandal now brought upon the whole Church even by the temporary establishment of an erroneous doctrine, saw the necessity of more zealous interposition. He therefore prevailed upon Marcian, the successor of Theodosius, to summon another Council on the same subject. It met at Chalcedon in 451; and the Pope's Legates (under the usual superintendence of the Imperial Officers) presided there. The proceedings were conducted with greater decency; Eutyches and Dioscorus were condemned, and the orthodox§ doctrine of 'Christ in one person and two natures' was finally established.

As before with the Nestorians, so now with the followers of Eutyches, their energy, and perhaps their numbers, increased on the public condemnation of their opinions. Some monks of that persuasion obtained posses-

* In the mean time Eutyches was so far from acknowledging this resemblance, that in his letter to St. Leo, and in the presence of the Council, he anathematized Apollinaris, together with Valentinus, Manes, Nestorius, and Simon the magician. He had reached his seventy-first year, when his opinions were attacked by the very same man who had first sounded the trumpet against Nestorius—Eusebius, now Bishop of Doryleum.

† A necessary consequence of this doctrine seems to be the ascription of the passion and sufferings of Christ to the Divine (the only) nature, and this could scarcely be avoided without taking refuge in the heresy of the Phantastics. In fact, the dissensions between the Corruptibles and Incorruptibles, in the reign of Justinian, were little else than a continuation of the Eutychian controversy, in ITS CONSEQUENCES. These disputes chiefly prevailed in Egypt, the hot-bed of the Monophysite heresy.

‡ Σύνοδος ληστρονική, Conventus Latronum, Latrocinium Ephesinum, are the terms in which it is usually mentioned by the writers of both Churches.

§ Admitting, as we do, that the opinions of Nestorius were in fact very little, if at all, removed from orthodoxy, we cannot at all assent to the reasoning of Le Clerc, who would persuade us (and who appears to have persuaded both Jortin and Gibbon) that Eutyches also held the same doctrine with both Nestorius and the orthodox—for in this last dispute there is no confusion of *terms*; in the very same words the one party plainly asserts *one*, the other *two* natures of Christ; and the same train and description of argument, which is applied to reconcile this difference, would, in our mind, be equally successful in removing every religious difference.

sion of Jerusalem, and indulged in the most violent excesses; and the Catholic successor of Dioscorus, after a contention of five years with his Alexandrian subjects, was at length sacrificed to their religious fury. Presently afterwards, in the year 482, the *Henoticon of Zeno*. Emperor Zeno made a fruitless but memorable attempt to extinguish all religious dissension, by the publication of an Edict of Union, called the *Henoticon*. In this proclamation he confirmed the established doctrines, and anathematized alike the Arians, Phantastics, Nestorians, and Eutychians; but out of tenderness to the feelings of the last, he avoided any particular mention of the Council of Chalcedon. The more moderate men, both among the Catholics and Monophysites*, (still the two prevailing parties) subscribed this decree; but the fruits of their moderation were not such as, by their principles and example, they deserved, and perhaps expected. Among the latter a violent schism arose, and this speedily gave birth to numerous other schisms which divided into several sects the followers of Eutyches; while among the Catholics very great and general indignation was excited, by the omission of the name of Chalcedon, against all who had signed so imperfect a declaration of orthodoxy. And thus, to the disgrace of the disputants, and almost to the scandal of human nature, it proved that an attempt, judiciously conceived by a benevolent Prince, to compose the religious differences of his subjects, produced no other effect than to inflame the character and multiply the grounds of dissension. And that unhappy result was not in this case attributable to the infliction of any civil penalties in the arbitrary enforcement of the decree, but solely to the vehemence of the passions engaged on both sides, which had hardened the greater number against any representations of wisdom or reason, and even against the ordinary influence of their human feelings.

However, time effected much towards the healing of these animosities, and they were diverted during the reign of Justinian into other channels. After the lapse of nearly two *The Monothelites*. hundred years the agitations of the tempest had seemingly subsided, and the differences, and even the malevolence, which may still have existed, no longer broke out into open outrage. The vain curiosity of the Emperor Heraclius threatened the revival of those evils. On his return from the Persian war in the year 629, that Prince proposed to his Bishops the unprofitable question—'Whether Christ, of one person but two natures, was actuated by a single or a double *will*?' The Greeks in general favoured the former opinion, but not with their usual impetuosity; indeed they seem at length to have been so far exhausted by such fruitless contests, as to have considered the question trifling and superfluous. And it was not until the year 680, that, through the angry opposition of the Latins to this dogma, the Sixth General Council was assembled at Constantinople, which formally pronounced that *two wills* were harmonized in the person of Christ. Such is still the doctrine both of the Greek and Latin Churches; and with the establishment of that doctrine the controversy respecting the incarnation, after an interrupted duration of about three hundred years, expired†.

* The Eutychians, or Monophysites, are also known in history by the appellation of Jacobites, from the name of one of their teachers, James Baradaeus.

† Accurately speaking, the Monothelite Controversy was rather a consequence, than a part, of that respecting the Incarnation, since those who adopted the doctrine of one will, did not in consequence reject the decisions either of Ephesus or Chalcedon, but adhered, on the contrary, to both,—so as to unite (in profession at least, if not in reason) the strictest

The heretics who advocated the *one will* were called Monothelites, and by this name the dispute is generally known. It lasted about fifty years; and it is a painful but necessary reflection, that during its continuance, while the attention of Christendom was in some degree engaged by it, the Mahometans had found time to convert Arabia and to complete the conquest of Persia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt: the three patriarchal thrones, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, had fallen into their hands; and Carthage itself was already on the point of undergoing the same fate.

Having treated the conduct of the parties engaged in these dissensions with unrestrained freedom, we shall conclude with some considerations not unfavourable to them, and not less just than our censure. 1. None of the disputants at any time relapsed into any heresy respecting the Trinity—the doctrine which had been established by the first and second General Councils was followed with equal fidelity by those who deviated from the Church respecting the Incarnation, and by those who adhered to it. 2. As the manner, in which this controversy was conducted, exhibited the earnest devotion of all parties to their respective opinions, so the origin of all those opinions may be traced to an anxiety (oftentimes indeed a very injudicious anxiety) to acquire accurate notions respecting the Redeemer, so as neither to exaggerate nor disparage his dignity. It may be traced to an excess of the religious feeling, even to a tendency to superstitious enthusiasm, but at least it was free from the infection of that cold, indifferent apathy, which sometimes shelters itself under the name of philosophy, but which, in fact, is not far removed from scepticism. 3. The very individuals who, under the excitement of religious dissension and the bustle of public councils, heated too by the various passions which the mere spirit of resistance will create in the calmest temperament, ran loose into scandalous excesses, might very consistently be endued with the purest piety, and habituated, in the private exercise of their sacerdotal functions, to the fervent discharge of every Christian duty. It argues a very slight or a very partial view of human nature to infer, from the occasional extravagance of public feeling, the general destitution of moral principle or the absence of virtuous habits; and we must be careful not to be misled by those historians who bid us judge the general character of the Eastern Clergy by their conduct at the Councils of Ephesus. Lastly, Whatever may have been the original policy of convoking General Councils for the suppression of religious difference, it cannot be asserted that such Councils were wholly useless—for besides the particular doctrine which they were called upon to settle, and which on some occasions was fundamentally important, they also published numerous canons and ordinances for the regulation and reform of the Church. These were disseminated and received through every part of Christendom, and very often proved of the highest utility; and even as to the doctrines on such occasions established, we should observe, that after the first tumult of opposition had subsided, they met with general acquiescence; that they were almost universally adopted in succeeding ages, and still constitute the creed of the great majority of Christians*.

orthodoxy respecting the nature and person of Christ with their perverse opinion respecting his will.

* The Controversy, which we have described, branched out into various theories respecting the *manner* of the union of the two natures, which amused the refined imaginations of the Greeks. But it was reserved for the grosser absurdity of a German to originate the following offensive speculation:—'Eodem tempore aliud ex Germania certamen in Gallias inferebatur de modo quo Sanctissimus Servator ex utero Matris in lucem prodit. Germani quidam Jesum Christum non communi reliquorum hominum lege, sed singulari et extraordinaria, utero Matris exiisse statuebant. Qua sententia in Galliam delata, Rattram-

VI. We proceed to the contest respecting the Worship of Images, which claims our careful attention, partly from the extreme agitation which it excited throughout Christendom during the eighth and ninth centuries—partly, because it occasioned (should we not rather say accelerated?) the separation of the Roman States from the Greek Empire. Among the various superstitions which had gradually grown up in the Church, and of which the vestiges may, in some cases, be traced to its earliest ages, none had obtained such general influence and firm footing among the lower orders (especially in the East) as Image-worship. It was an idle distinction to uphold a respect for images, as *means* and not as *objects* of devotion, when they were presented to the uninstructed and indiscriminating vulgar. When the understanding has never been enlightened, when the heart has never been informed with the genuine feelings of religion, the devotee will surely address his prayer to the Deity which is placed before his eyes, and turn, in the darkness of his intellect, to that which is perceptible by his mere senses. And it was therefore the greatest among the crimes of the ancient directors of the Church, and that which appears more peculiarly to have brought down upon it the chastisement from Arabia, that they filled the temples with their detested idols, and obruded them upon the eyes and into the hands of the most ignorant. Nor can their advocates plead the necessity of this conduct; for the example of the Mahometan faith alone has proved, that a people may be barbarous without being idolatrous, when idolatry is discouraged by the ministers of religion. And if any excuse be furnished by the general and deeply-rooted influence of the ancient superstition, it is at least none for those who exerted their power and their talents to extend and perpetuate it. Unhappily, those exertions were attended by too easy success; before the year 600, idolatry was firmly established in the Eastern Church, and during the following century it made a gradual and very general progress in the West, where it had previously gained some footing.

It was not till the year 726 that any vigorous attempt was made to disturb its sway, and then the minds of men were become weakened by long acquiescence in superstitious maxims, even so far as to regard with submissive reverence the sins and follies of their ancestors. Nevertheless, the Emperor Leo, surnamed the Isaurian, a prince of sense and energy, had the boldness to undertake*, in the face of so many difficulties, the purification of the Church; and he began his pious enterprise by an attack on its most flagrant corruption. It is disputed, whether the first measure of Leo was prudently confined to the abolition of idolatrous *worship*, and the removal of its objects to higher and more distant situations in the Churches, wherein they were suspended; or whether, without any indulgence to prejudice, he entirely concealed them from view, and even destroyed them. The effect of the edict would rather lead us to the latter

nus eam oppugnabat, atque Christum per naturæ januam in mundum ingressum esse tuebatur. Germanis subveniebat Paschasius Radbertus, libro singulari, &c. &c. Jortin, vol. iv, p. 489. This occurred about the year 840, and it is worthy of notice, if it were only that we find the great patron of Transubstantiation, Paschasius Radbertus, advocating such extravagant and impious nonsense.

* Roman Catholic historians attribute Leo's resolution to the sudden appearance of a new island in the Archipelago, from volcanic causes. This phenomenon the superstitious Emperor ascribed to the Divine wrath, excited by the idolatrous impiety of his subjects. He is also supposed to have derived his prejudice from the Mahometan religion, to which his attachment is more than insinuated.

conclusion—for it immediately occasioned a civil war, both in the East and in the West. In the East, the islands of the Archipelago, and even a part of Asia, broke out into a tumultuous insurrection, which however was speedily suppressed; but in the West, the more deliberate resistance of the Bishop of Rome (Gregory II.) encouraged the rebellion of the Italian provinces (in 730), and led to the defeat of the Imperial troops before Ravenna; the tribute paid to the Eastern Emperor was then withdrawn, and his authority was never afterwards acknowledged in the Ecclesiastical States.

This reverse did not abate the zeal of Leo, who proceeded at least to enforce his resolutions, so far as his power extended; and as he found the strongest opposition to proceed from the monastic orders, he extended his scheme of reformation to them. And in spite of various tumults, excited partly by their influence and partly through a popular prejudice in favour of superstition, he persisted in his project, with uncompromising perseverance, and even with some prospect of success, until his death. In the year 741 he was succeeded by his son Constantine, surnamed Copronymus, who faithfully followed his footsteps. Thirteen years afterwards that Prince assembled a synod in the suburbs of Constantinople, at which three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops attended. They decreed the destruction of images*, and the decision, which has sometimes been attributed to their loyalty, may with equal justice be ascribed to their sense and their piety. They were called Iconoclasts, or image-breakers; and the execution of their decrees occasioned many calumnies against the Emperor's character, and many tumults, which disturbed the peace and even endangered the security of his reign. Nevertheless, that reign lasted thirty-four years; and the whole space was perseveringly employed in contention with idols, with the monks who protected them, and with the pernicious influence of Rome, which was active and constant in the support of both.

Leo, who succeeded, was guided by the principles of Constantine; but he died soon after his accession, and the education of his son, a boy of ten years old, as well as the direction of public affairs, was entrusted to the Empress Irene. *Seventh General Council.* Immediately the religious policy of the palace was changed; and as fifty years of vigorous opposition had not availed to extirpate corruptions which were the gradual growth of four centuries, the change was hailed with delight by a large proportion of the people. In the year 787, a General Council was assembled at Nice, by which the images were reinstated in their former honours †, through the united exertions of the monks and the mob, and the Pope and the Empress. This Council, the second of Nice, is accounted in the East as the seventh and last General Council, and its decisions completed the body of doctrine and discipline which constitutes the system of the Greek Church.

* Some of the arguments seriously advanced on this occasion by the Iconoclasts seem intended to surpass the absurdity of their adversaries; according to them, even the painter is convicted of several and even the most opposite heresies. They may be found in Fleury, liv. xliii., sect. 7.

† The following is a part of the Confession of Faith published with the authority of this Council:—‘We receive, besides the figure of the cross, the relics of saints, and their images; we embrace them according to the ancient tradition of our fathers, who have placed them in all the Churches of God, and all the places where he is served. We honour and adore them, viz. that of Jesus Christ, of his holy Mother, of the angels,—for though they are incorporeal, they have revealed themselves in a human form; those of the apostles, the prophets, the martyrs, and other saints; because those paintings recall to us the memory of the originals and *make us participate in their sanctity.*’ Fleury, liv. xliv. sect. 34.

It may be proper, in this place, very briefly, to remind our readers of the particular objects for which these seven celebrated councils were severally summoned; not merely as matters of barren recollection, but because we perceive in them, if we are not greatly in error, an indication of the gradual departure of the Church, first from scriptural simplicity, and then from truth. Between the first and the last of them the space of 462 years intervened, an interval full of important, and for the most part, pernicious changes in the ecclesiastical constitution: but most of these were imperceptibly introduced, especially into the Western Church, without the authority or cognizance of any general assembly, and they involved many circumstances of power, property, or discipline, to which we do not here intend any reference. The professed purpose for which the general councils were in every instance convoked, was to compose the controversy of the day, and to pronounce a final decision upon the doctrine which happened to be disputed; and thus, in the history of those councils, we follow the track of theological investigation, and observe it gradually receding from soberness and sense.

(1.) The object for which the two first were assembled was to ascertain and promulgate the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity; and a more important inquiry, and one more worthy of the deliberate consideration of the directors of Christendom, was not ever propounded to any religious assembly: and their decisions respecting this doctrine were in accordance with the sense of Scripture, as it has been interpreted by the great majority of Christians in every following age.

(2.) The questions proposed for the investigation of the third and fourth Councils were of less importance to truth, and, in the same proportion precisely, more difficult to comprehend and determine,—the nature of Christ's existence on earth. The manner in which they were argued was not calculated to diminish this difficulty; and the violence with which even the more decorous* of these meetings was disgraced was such as would naturally result from eager disputation on a matter of mysterious and almost impenetrable abstruseness. The subject of the labours of the Sixth Council grew out of that which occupied the third and fourth; and while it surpassed the other in metaphysical intricacy, it presented even less prospect of any practical advantage from its decision.

(3.) The matters which employed the Fifth Council were derived from the individual opinions of Origen; and if these should be thought by some not to have merited by their importance the cognizance of so solemn a tribunal, they had at least a far greater claim on general attention than the foolish speculation of the Monothelites.

(4.) The seventh and last† established idolatry as the law of the Christian

* We might refer to the whole account of the sessions of the Council of Chalcedon, even as it is given by Fleury (lib. xx. 8.). One short passage may serve as a specimen. The assembly was divided into two parties; the Bishops of Egypt, Illyrium, and Palestine formed one; those of the East—of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace—the other. *Theodoret* was obnoxious to the former party, as being suspected of the Nestorian heresy. Nevertheless, he was allowed a seat in the Council by the Emperor. When he took his place the Orientals cried out, 'He is worthy of it.' The Egyptians exclaimed, 'Call him not Bishop—he is no Bishop; expel the enemy of God—expel the Jew!' The Orientals cried, 'Expel the seditious—drive out the murderers!' And they continued for some time to vent such exclamations on both sides. At length the magistrates interfered: 'These popular cries are unworthy of the episcopal character, and are of no use to either party—allow the paper to be read to you.' The Egyptians exclaimed, 'Expel that one man only, and we will all listen; our voice is raised for the Catholic faith,' &c.

† It would seem very strange, were we not accustomed to such phenomena, that the last public act of the united Greek and Latin Communions, the last which was, in truth, bind-

Church : and thus was completed the structure of oriental orthodoxy. It rose from the most solid and substantial foundation ; it advanced, by the labours of a busy but unwise generation, through the mid air and mist of metaphysics, and terminated in a still blinder age, in clear and manifest superstition.

The same seven Councils are also received by the Roman Church, but not as a perfect rule, either of faith or discipline ; and, indeed, when we consider that they were held, without exception, *in the East*, on the occasion of controversies originating in the East, and almost confined to it ; that their deliberations were closely surveyed and influenced, if not directed, by the Eastern emperor ; and that the prelates who framed them were almost exclusively Orientals*, we shall be disposed, perhaps, to feel some surprise that the Western Church, with so many causes of variance with her rival, should have acquiesced so submissively in their decisions.

The edicts of the last general Council did not secure immediate obedience. Leo the Armenian, who reigned from 814 to 820, relapsed into the heresy of the Isaurian. He fell an early victim to conspiracy ; but his successor, Michael, fearlessly proceeded in the same difficult endeavour ; and the earnestness of his wishes and the perplexities of his situation are naturally displayed in an epistle addressed by him to the son of Charlemagne, Louis, Emperor of the west. As this document throws great general light on the ecclesiastical history of that age, we shall transcribe it here.

‘ Many of our clergy and laity, departing from the apostolical traditions, have introduced pernicious novelties. They took down the crosses in the churches and put images in their room, before which they lighted up lamps and burned incense, honouring them as the cross. They sang before them, worshipped them, and implored their succour. Many dressed the female images with robes, and made them stand godmothers to their children. They offered up hair to them when they cut it off for the first time. Some Presbyters scratched off the paint from the images and mixed it with the holy Eucharist, and gave it in the Communion. Others put the body of the Lord into the hands † of the images, and made the communicants take it out thence. Others used boards with pictures painted on them, instead of an altar, on which they consecrated the elements ; and many such-like abuses were committed. Therefore, the orthodox Emperors and the most learned Bishops, assembled in council, have forbidden these enormities, and have removed the images to higher places in the church, where they stood formerly, and when they were not worshipped, as they have been of late, by ignorant people.

‘ Some of the complainers are gone to Rome to calumniate us there ; but we are orthodox ; we believe the Trinity, one God in three persons,

ing on the *universal* Church, was the establishment of the grossest practical corruption which the religion has ever suffered. Let us add, too, that it was established solely on the authority of *tradition*, while it was that, of all others, for which even the traditional authority is most defective, since it cannot be traced higher than the fourth century.

* At Nice, among 318 members, three were of the Western Church ; at Constantinople (1), among 150, one only ; at Ephesus, among 68, one ; at Chalcedon, among 353, three ; at Constantinople (2), among 164, six ; at Constantinople (3) among 56, five ; and even at the last, among the 377 who assisted, we can observe no Occidentals, except the Pope’s legates, a very small number of Sicilian Bishops, and a deputy of the Bishop of Sardinia.

† Thus it appears that the distinction at present so broadly drawn by the Greek Church between the worship of *painted* and of *graven* images did not then exist. The distinction is, indeed, very old in the writings of the Church ; but it is probable that it was not practically introduced until after the Mahometan conquest.

the incarnation of the Word, his two wills and two operations; we implore the intercession of the Holy Virgin, the mother of God, and of all the Saints; we reverence their relics; we receive all the apostolical traditions and the decrees of the six Councils*.

The spirit of appeal and justification in which the above epistle is conceived, indicates the weakness of a falling cause; and so, indeed, it proved: for in the year 842 the Empress Theodora re-established the authority of the Seventh Council, and replaced the images with so firm a hand that they have never since been shaken. In celebration of this achievement, a new festival was instituted under the name of the "Feast of Orthodoxy†," and the most riotous enthusiasm generally attended the proclamation of idolatry.

The malice of historians has not failed to observe, that as the first success over the reviving reason and religion had been obtained under the auspices of Irene; so the second and mortal wound was inflicted by the rashness of a second woman‡. The charge is true and remarkable; but the strenuous and systematic exertions of a long succession of Popes in the same cause will easily excuse the blindness of two empresses. Indeed, a general view of history rather tends to raise our astonishment that so many princes were found wise and bold enough to stem the popular torrent. But this attempt at reformation commenced so late, and under circumstances so unfavourable, that even another century of judicious exertion, continued without pause or vacillation, might scarcely have sufficed for its success.

We shall conclude the chapter with a few additional remarks on this controversy. The best writer in the Eastern Church during this most critical period in its history,—indeed, the only writer of any reputation even in his own day,—was John Damascenus§; and with his name the long list of Greek Fathers may properly be said to terminate. His laborious and subtile works (of which the principal are 'Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith,' and 'Sacred Parallels') are tainted by the infection of the Aristotelian philosophy, and by a strong superstitious tendency; and, therefore, we are not surprised to observe that his eloquence and influence were zealously engaged in the defence of images. He possessed consi-

* See Jortin, *Eccles. Hist.* ad ann. 814. From this concluding confession we observe how many were the abuses to which even a reformer of the Church felt obliged to publish his adhesion.

† There seems some reason to believe that this feast was not established until after the Council which was assembled by Photius, in 879, in further confirmation of idolatry.

‡ In favour at least of the consistency of that sex, we must mention that it declared itself for idolatry from the very commencement of the contest, and very strongly too, as will be seen. Leo the Isaurian began his enterprise by an attack upon a very celebrated image of Jesus Christ, called the Antiphonetes, or Respondent; and he despatched one of his officers, named Jovinus, to break it down. Several women who were present endeavoured to avert his design by their supplications; but Jovinus, nothing moved by them, ascended a ladder and dealt some severe blows on the image. On this the women became furious; they pulled down the ladder, massacred the officer on the spot, and tore him in pieces. The image fell notwithstanding, and the women were led away to execution.

§ He was a monk, and contemporary with Leo the Isaurian, against whom he vented his indignation with great impunity, as his ordinary residence was the monastery of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem, beyond the limits of the imperial control. He condescends to appeal to the authority of older fathers in his defence of images—to that of Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Anastasius of Antioch, and others. But we believe that he has not even affected to advance any name of higher antiquity than the fourth century,—not, by the way, that his cause would have been much better if he had. He was anathematized by the Iconoclast Council in 754.

derable learning; and his sophistry, no less than his authority, may really have blinded the reason of some, while many more would feed, under the shelter of his name, a previous inclination to idolatry*.

We believe it to be true, that of the miracles which are recorded to have abundantly signalized this prolonged dispute, the very great proportion, if we should not rather say the whole, were performed by the *friends* of the idols,—a fact which, while it proves the higher principles of the other party, will also assist in accounting for their unpopularity. The people in the East were not, indeed, at this time so stupid and unenlightened as the serfs of the Western Empire; but they were by nature more disposed to fanaticism; they were familiar, by long habits of deception, with preternatural appearances, and disposed, by a controlling imagination, to eager credulity.

The Bishops, and, in general, the secular clergy of the East, appear to have taken no violent part in the contest. Indeed, we are persuaded that that numerous body contained many pious and rational individuals who were shocked by the degradation of Christianity and human nature, and who watched with an anxious eye the endeavours which were made to remove it. But such characters, which are among the best of the sacred profession, are seldom busy or ambitious; and the anxiety of those excellent men may have been often confined to their own bosoms, or at least to the narrow limits of their diocese. On the other hand, the monastic orders have too generally attested the spuriousness of their origin by their alliance with impurity and imposture. And thus, in the present instance, they were furious advocates for a system so necessary to their influence and their avarice; and it is chiefly, no doubt, to their perseverance that we are to attribute the evil result of the conflict.

The common people, partly from a natural tendency to a sensible worship, partly from the inveteracy of long habit, were strongly disposed to the same party; and that disposition was effectually improved by the monks, who, from a greater show of austerity, had the greatest hold upon their minds. Nor is the circumstance to be slightly noticed, that the contest in this case was for an intelligible and visible object. Unlike the metaphysical intricacies of some former controversies, it carried a direct appeal to the understanding of the vulgar, because its subject was the subject of their senses. If they positively worshipped the image, its destruction deprived them of their god; and even if the worship was only relative, it was extremely easy to persuade them that, in parting with the symbols of their faith, with the book of their religion, they were rashly casting away religion itself. Their enthusiasm was heated by false miracles; and when we think of the violence which the populace of the East were wont to exhibit even at their public spectacles, in the frivolous contests of the Hippodrome, we shall understand to what excesses they might be hurried by the agitation of religious excitement.

The Papal Chair perseveringly supported the cause of superstition; and this, perhaps, is the first occasion on which the close alliance of *principle* between the Pope and the monastic orders displayed itself. The Pope's legates were present at the last general Council, and his Italian clergy appear to have given him very cordial assistance. Not so the more rational Prelates of France. Less awed by the presence of the spiritual

* Theodore Studites, a monk and abbot, has acquired great reputation in the history of the Eastern Church by his obstinate defence of the orthodox practice, chiefly during the second contest. Exile was the punishment of his zeal, and severer punishment was very seldom, if ever, inflicted on the contumacious.

director, more so by the dictates of real piety, they established, under the guidance of Charlemagne*, a very broad distinction between positive and relative worship; and without entirely disclaiming the authority of the Seventh Council, they endeavoured to obviate, as much as possible, the great practical evil which directly flowed from it. This difference in the conduct of the French and Italian Churches on so great a question is a fact of some importance in history and deserving of attentive notice; and it is but justice to our own ancestors, as well as to the German divines of the age, to admit that they generally endeavoured to follow the same difficult course. But their resistance was not long effectual, nor indeed could it reasonably expect success; because, by permitting the use of images and their presence in the congregations of the converts, they made that first concession to error, of which all the others were remote, perhaps, but necessary consequences†.

CHAPTER XII.

On the Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches.

Preliminary considerations—political causes—Ecclesiastical—Origin of the Dispute—Dignity and jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople—Council of Chalcedon—Ambition of the Patriarch—Oriental dissensions—profitable to the Pope—Popish legate at Constantinople—Disputes between the two Sees—Title of Œcumenical Bishop assumed by John the Faster—Opposition of Gregory the Great—Emperor Phocas—Limits of papal influence in Greece—Ground of controversy changed—Procession of the Holy Spirit—the original doctrine—Process of the change—Spain—France—Charlemagne—Moderation of Pope Leo III.—Perseverance of the Greeks—Forgery of the Latins—the Patriarch Photius—his character—his excommunication of Pope Nicholas I.—Five heresies charged on the Roman Church—Transfer of several provinces from papal to patriarchal jurisdiction—Bulgaria—Dissensions of the Greeks—Fortunes of Photius—Connexion of Rome with Greek parties—defeat of the designs of the former—Subsequent differences—Michael Cerularius—Anathema of Leo IX. by his legates at Constantinople.

WE have so frequently had occasion, especially in our later pages, to distinguish between the conduct and character of the Greek and Roman Churches, that it becomes necessary to enter still further into the causes of this distinction, and to trace the differences which had for some time disturbed their harmony, and which ended in their entire separation. In so doing, we must, in the first place, be careful not to confound the division of the churches with that of the empires; for the former, in fact, did not take place until more than a century after the final alienation of the ecclesiastical States from the sceptre of Leo the Isaurian. Nor, on the other

* The Council of Francfort, whose deliberations were held under the eye of that monarch, went, indeed, somewhat further than this, and, though it permitted the images to remain, forbade any sort of adoration to be addressed to them.

† Dupin (Nouv. Bibl. on second Council of Nice) gives a tolerably fair *historical* view of the subject of image worship. He admits that, during the three first ages and the beginning of the fourth, images were *very rare* among Christians; that towards the end of the fifth, pictures and images made their appearance, chiefly in the East, and became common in the sixth; they represented combats of martyrs and other sacred stories, for the instruction of those who were unable to read. The simple vulgar were touched by these representations; and when they beheld the Saints so vividly, and, as it were, bodily presented to them, they could not prevent themselves from testifying, by *exterior signs*, the esteem, the respect, and the veneration which they felt for them. Thus the worship of images insensibly established itself, and it was still further confirmed by the miracles which were attributed to them.

hand, should we be correct in considering these events as perfectly unconnected. Doubtless, political causes had great influence both in opening and widening the spiritual breach. The division of the empire under Arcadius and Honorius, though not immediately affecting the unity of the Church, operated indirectly to its disturbance by weakening the bonds of connexion and destroying the complete community of interests which more naturally subsists under a single government. Again, the circumstance that the seat of the Western Empire was removed from Rome to Ravenna communicated that sort of independence to the Roman Bishop, which, though it conferred not, in fact, any temporal authority, failed not to give nourishment to his pride and some countenance to his general claims of supremacy. A further alienation was necessarily occasioned by the barbarian conquest of the West; because this event not only annihilated the former relations and the reciprocal dependence of the two empires, but also produced a great and rapid change in the character of the Western clergy, and even in the principles of the Church.

Lastly, the common violence and mutual insults of Leo the Isaurian and Pope Gregory II., the civil war which broke out between them, the complete triumph of the latter and the consequent transfer of certain jurisdiction in Sicily and the South of Italy, from the Roman to the Constantinopolitan See, greatly tended to weaken the spirit which had hitherto identified the Churches, and to remove any notion of their inseparability. These are some of the political causes which undoubtedly prepared the way for the Grand Schism, and contributed to accelerate and inflame it. But there are others, of a nature purely ecclesiastical, to which it is more usually ascribed, and which had doubtless the principal share in its accomplishment.

The earliest recorded difference between the churches was that already noticed by us respecting the celebration of Easter; and we also remarked the tone of authority which the Bishop of the *imperial* city arrogated even in those days; but their connexion, and even their harmony, was not seriously endangered by that dispute, nor, indeed, can we trace the origin of the fatal controversy with any certainty to an earlier period than the fifth century. On the foundation of the new capital at Byzantium, the Bishop was, of course, invested with some power and dignity, which gradually increased through the consent or the neglect of the immediate successors of Constantine; however, the superior rank and precedence of the Roman Pontiff was not yet disputed. But in the beginning of the fifth century the spiritual jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople was much more widely extended; it then comprehended Asia, Thrace, and Pontus, and advanced on the west within the confines of Illyricum; and in 451 the Council of Chalcedon not only confirmed that jurisdiction, but conferred on the Bishop of Constantinople the same honours and privileges which were already possessed by that of Rome; the equality of the Pontiffs was justified by the equal dignity and lustre of the two capitals. The legates of Leo the Great were present, and had considerable influence in that council; but neither their exertions, nor those of the Pope himself, were able to prevent this affront to his dignity. Having attained so elevated a situation, the patriarch very soon proceeded to exalt himself still higher; the method which he took to extend his authority was, to humble, if possible, his brethren of Antioch and Alexandria*, and thus the

* It was not till a little before this time that Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, *usurped* the title of patriarch, which, however, was confirmed to him by Theodosius the Younger.

same ambition was found to pursue the same course at Constantinople as at Rome. But there it was liable to severer mortifications and more effectual control from the immediate presence of the Emperor, from his power and supremacy, and his habitual interference in church affairs.

Again, the grasping ambition of the patriarch, and the dissensions which, from other causes no less than from that, so continually disturbed the Oriental Church, were productive of great influence to the Pope, not only through the positive weakness occasioned to that Church by such divisions, but chiefly because the injured or discontented party very generally made its appeal to the Roman See, where it met with most willing and partial attention. We may recollect that Athanasius, when persecuted in the east, fled to the western Church for refuge; and this example was not lost on those who thought themselves aggrieved in after ages. It is true that Roman interference was, on every occasion, indignantly rejected by the rival Pontiff; nevertheless the habit of interposing would lead many to suppose that it was founded on some indefinite, unacknowledged right, and disaffection was encouraged in the east by the certainty of a powerful protector.

Very soon after the Council of Chalcedon, Leo appointed a resident legate at Constantinople to watch over the papal interests, and to communicate with the Vatican on matters of spiritual importance. That useful privilege, as we have already seen, was not abandoned by succeeding Popes: and those ecclesiastical ambassadors, or 'Correspondents,' continued for some time to represent the Papal chair in the eastern capital.

For the next hundred and thirty years the disputes respecting the equality of the two Sees, as well as the limits of their jurisdiction, were carried on with little interruption perhaps, but with little violence. But in 588, at a Synod called at Constantinople respecting the conduct of a patriarch of Antioch, John, surnamed the Faster, who was then Primate of the East, adopted, as we have observed, the title of Œcumenical, or Universal Bishop. It appears that this title had been conferred on the patriarchs by the Emperors Leo and Justinian, without any accession of power; nor was it, in fact, understood to indicate any claim to supremacy beyond the limits of the Eastern Church. But Gregory could not brook such assumption in an Eastern Prelate, and used every endeavour to deprive his rival of the obnoxious title, and at the same time to establish his own superiority. He failed in both these attempts—at least his success in the latter was confined to the Western clergy, and to the interested and precarious assent of the discontented subjects of the Eastern Church.

The quarrel proceeded during the seventh century, and Roman Catholic writers confidently assert, that the Emperor Phocas (a sanguinary usurper) through the influence of Pope Boniface III. *transferred* the disputed title from the Greek to the Roman Pontiff. It seems probable that he acknowledged the pre-eminence of the latter—and early usage justified him in so doing—without at all derogating from the independence of the former. But the alliance of the Eastern Emperor with a foreign Bishop against his own patriarch could not possibly be of long duration; and, accordingly, throughout the controversy about images (which presently followed) we find the Pope in direct and open opposition to the Emperor, and to the powerful party in his Church which favoured him.

On the other hand, the ecclesiastical orders in the East were so widely and passionately divided on the subject of this dispute, and the hopes of the weaker and more violent party were obliged for so many years to fix themselves on Rome, that the Pope must again have acquired great influ-

ence in that quarter. It was great, but it was temporary only; for the popular prejudice, especially in Greece itself, was still strong and general against any acknowledgment of papal supremacy, and the national vanity was still jealous of the name and ascendancy of Rome. And thus the actual influence of the Pope was generally confined to those who stood in need of his assistance, and seldom survived the crisis during which they needed it.

Thus far the disputes between the Pope and the Patriarch were confined almost entirely to the question of supremacy in the Universal Church, pertinaciously claimed by the one, and perseveringly refused by the other; and to this difference we need not doubt that a great proportion of the violence which disgraced the controversy may be ascribed. But during the eighth century the contention assumed a different aspect, and took a ground and character less discreditable to either party.

According to the original creed of the Latin as well as of the Greek Church, the Holy Spirit was believed to proceed *from the Father only*; and the question, though of great theological importance, does not appear to have been generally investigated until the eighth century—at least to that period we must refer the origin of the controversy respecting it. It is true that the change in the established doctrine was first introduced into the Church of Spain*, an event which must have taken place before the Mahometan conquest. Thence it proceeded into France, and in the year 767 it was agitated in the Council of Gentilli, near Paris; it then received the assent of the French clergy. Soon afterwards it was warmly advocated by Charlemagne himself; and in the year 809, at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle †, Pope Leo III. acknowledged the truth of the doctrine, but still objected to making it an article of faith, observing, with great reason, ‘that every doctrine which is true should not, for that reason, be inserted in a *creed* ;’ nevertheless, as it had previously obtained place in the Latin creeds, his authority, or his inclination, was not sufficiently strong to effect its general erasure. It was maintained in France, and its rejection by Rome was feeble and temporary.

But the Greeks obstinately adhered to their original faith, as established by the Council of Constantinople; and what gave them great advantage in the subsequent controversy was, that their adversaries had begun the contest by abandoning the defensible ground of argument; they forgot the authority of scripture, and took refuge under a falsified copy of the Canons of that Council, into which (through that obtuse craft which becomes a principle in ignorant ages) the words *Filioque (and the Son)* had been interpolated. The fraud was instantly detected, and the homage which they had thus reluctantly offered to the Council in question was converted into a conclusive argument by an adversary, who rested his own faith on no better ground than its antiquity.

A controversy conducted on such principles could hope for no rational discussion, nor any friendly termination, its only effect was to inflame the enmity already too hotly kindled, and to accelerate the certain hour of separation. This consummation was presently secured by the promo-

* Baronius asserts, that the words *Filioque* were first added by the Council of Toledo, by the authority of Pope Leo I., about the year 447; but he confesses that the doctrine was not expressly received by the Roman Church until some ages afterwards.

† Fleury, Hist. Eccl. liv. xlv. sect. 48. The Pope defended his opinion by the argument, that two General Councils, that of Chalcedon and the Fifth, had forbidden any addition to the creed.

tion of a very extraordinary person to the patriarchal throne. In the year 853, Photius*, a layman of splendid talents, unusual extent of erudition both secular and theological, and unimpeachable moral character, was raised to that dignity by the Emperor Michael, who, with that view, removed and banished the actual Bishop, Ignatius. The exile appealed to Rome. And if the jealousy of the Vatican was excited by the splendid reputation of the new patriarch, its anxiety might also be awakened by his ambitious and fearless character: therefore Pope Nicholas I., who was as proud and aspiring as his rival, listened to the appeal, and eagerly espoused the cause of Ignatius. He assembled a Council at Rome† in 862, in which he pronounced the election of Photius illegal, and excommunicated him with all his abettors. The patriarch was not much disturbed by this violence, and four years afterwards, in a Council summoned at Constantinople, he retorted the anathemas of his rival, pronounced his deposition, and removed him from the communion of all Christians.

Photius justified this extremely bold measure by a circular letter addressed to his brother patriarchs, in which, besides some strong reflections on other grievances, he charged the Roman Church with five direct heresies. We shall here enumerate them, both that we may more clearly show what were held to be the principal points on which the Churches were divided, and also that we may observe how low the malevolence of controversy will sometimes condescend to stoop: 1. That the Romans fasted on the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week; 2. that in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese; 3. that they prohibited their priests to marry, and separated from their wives such as were married when they went into orders; 4. that they authorized the Bishops alone to anoint baptized persons with the holy chrism, withholding that power from Presbyters; 5. that they had interpolated the creed of Constantinople by the insertion of the words *Filioque*, and held the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as the Father.

These charges, and the consequent recriminations, embittered as they also were by national animosity, had, of course, no other effect than to exasperate the violence of both parties; but we should be mistaken if we were wholly to attribute that fury to the differences either in doctrine or discipline. Its deepest motive is, perhaps, to be traced to another source. The Emperor, with the assistance, and probably through the influence of his ambitious Primate, had lately and definitively withdrawn from the papal jurisdiction various provinces to the east of the Adriatic, Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Thessaly, and either transferred them to the patriarch, or (for the point is disputed) confirmed his previous authority over them; and this, indeed, was an ecclesiastical offence of a description little calculated to find forgiveness at Rome. Moreover, it happened that this sensible injury was immediately succeeded by another of the same nature. The heathen inhabitants of Bulgaria, a province of

* 'Photius, than whom Greece, the parent of so much genius, has never produced, perhaps, a more accomplished man, is singularly recommended by talents applicable to every object, sound judgment, extreme acuteness, infinite reading, incredible diligence. He had held nearly all the offices of state, he had thoroughly investigated all the records of the Church; in his Bibliotheca alone, still extant, he has brought together nearly two hundred and eighty writers, chiefly ecclesiastical, which he has studied, reviewed, and abstracted, and pronounced a most accurate judgment on their arguments, style, fidelity, authority.' Caec. ap. Jortin, in A. D. 861.

† Mosheim, cent. ix, p. ii., c. iii.

the Eastern Empire not far distant from Constantinople, had very lately been converted to christianity by Greek missionaries; or, if it be admitted that some very imperfect efforts had been previously made there by the emissaries of Charlemagne, the Greeks at least had the merit of completing the spiritual conquest*: consequently, Photius placed Bulgaria under his own jurisdiction; nor will the impartial historian blame that Prelate for his endeavour to make the limits of the Church co-extensive with those of the empire, and to repel the intrusive invasions of Rome.

But the influence of the Pope was still maintained, and nourished by the dissensions of the Greeks; and the flame of controversy had not at all abated, when Basilius, the Macedonian, on his accession to the throne, deposed Photius, and restored Ignatius to his former dignity. This act was confirmed by a Council assembled at Constantinople in 869, in which the papal legates had great influence, and which the Roman Church still acknowledges as the *Eighth* General Council. In 878 Photius was recalled, and in 886 again deposed; but neither his recall nor his deposition had the effect of conferring on the papal chair the jurisdiction for which it had struggled so pertinaciously. And, indeed, we may again observe, that throughout her long succession of interferences in the religious affairs of Greece, Rome has, on no occasion, gained any substantial or permanent advantage. In fact, even at the moment when she seemed to be playing her part most artfully, she was little more than a tool in the more artful hands of a Greek party, who flattered her as long as their own interests required her support, but were always ready to reject her intervention when they required it no longer.

We might have closed the account of this controversy with the mutual excommunications of Photius and Nicholas; indeed the *Cerularius*. schism did properly commence at that period; and though the Popes continued to prosecute, through the two succeeding centuries, their unsuccessful schemes of ambition, they produced little mischief, and have, consequently, little attracted the notice of history. About the middle of the eleventh century the attention of Rome seems to have been particularly directed to the reduction of the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch under its own supremacy†. Michael Cerularius, a man of lofty, perhaps turbulent, spirit, was at that time patriarch, and after some angry correspondence between him and Pope Leo IX., the latter pronounced at Rome the sentence of excommunication. Nevertheless, his legates were invited to Constantinople with a view to heal the schism; there they asserted some insolent claims, which Cerularius indignantly rejected; as the conference continued, the differences grew deeper and wider, and at length the legates in the heart of Constantinople, in the Church of St. Sophia, publicly excommunicated the patriarch and all

* It appears, indeed, from Roman Catholic historians, that the Pope maintained a sort of communication with the Bulgarians, by means of missionaries, and that their King actually sent his son to Rome in acknowledgment (as those assert) of spiritual obedience. The utmost that can be truly alleged is, that the field, which both parties had exerted themselves to cultivate, was the subject of *equal* claims.

† While the Pontiffs were contending for authority, the Churches were debating with extreme ardour a point of difference posterior in origin to the time of Photius, *viz.* whether the bread used at the Eucharist should be leavened or unleavened? The Greek clergy held the former opinion, and objected the latter to the Latins as an unpardonable error. Some other abuses are also imputed to them by Cerularius, and they are among the most frivolous which could have been selected out of the long and dark list of their corruptions—a proof that the *spirit* of the Greek Church in that age was as far from the true comprehension of Christianity as that of its rival.

his adherents. They then solemnly deposited the written act of their anathema on the grand altar of the Temple, and, having shaken off the dust from their feet, departed.

This event took place in 1054, and confirmed and consummated the separation; and though some degree of friendly intercourse has been occasionally resumed since that time, as political rather than religious exigencies have required it, the imputed errors of the Greeks (of which the most offensive was their independence) have never been seriously retracted by their Church, nor ever have been pardoned by its rival.

CHAPTER XIII.

I. Review of the ante-Nicene Church—Its construction and government—its real character and utility—Doctrines and heresies—moral excellences—Origin of various abuses—Early false miracles—their nature and object—Exorcism—Literary forgeries—Distinction of the converts—mysterles—Original Sacraments—their gradual corruption—Reverence for martyrs—celebration of their nativities—Prayers and offerings for the dead—Fasts, occasional and general—Certain terms and usages borrowed from Jewish and Pagan systems—Inferences—the ante-Nicene Church had imperfections which might easily have been remedied.—II. From Constantine to Gregory the Great—(1.) Some particular innovations—Celibacy of the Clergy—practices of the Eastern and Western Churches—Gregory I. and VII.—Relaxation of penitential discipline—Purgatory—Use and consequent worship of images—(2.) The Church in connexion with the State—Origin of distinction between temporal and spiritual power—sources of ecclesiastical power and influence—increased authority of the Church—abuse of civil power for spiritual purposes—(3.) Internal government of the Church—decrease of popular, increase of episcopal, power—causes of this change—Elements of the Papal system—the most obvious causes of its rise and progress.—III. From Gregory to Charlemagne—Differences between the Eastern and Western Churches—Further growth of episcopal authority in the latter—Further exaltation of the See of Rome—The Athanasian creed.—IV. Jurisdiction and immunities of the Clergy—Arbitration of ancient Bishops—confirmed by Constantine—enlarged by Justinian—Great extent of privilege conferred by Charlemagne—his probable motives—The False Decretals—Donation of Constantine—their objects and effects.—V. Revenues of the Church—oblattons—fixed property—Donations—various descriptions and objects of—other sources of wealth—Early distribution and application of ecclesiastical funds—Payment and establishment of Tithes—Various advantages conferred upon the world by the Church during the ages preceding Charlemagne.

WE shall depart from that important position in our history which is occupied by the acts of Charlemagne, with a clearer view of their nature and a better comprehension of the character of the Roman Church, if we previously throw even a hasty retrospect over some portion of the path which we have traced; and thus, after faintly retouching some parts which may not have been sufficiently illustrated, and noticing others with more care than has yet been bestowed on them, we shall complete the account which we propose to give of the first eight centuries of the Church. Some particulars also will be introduced, of which all mention has purposely been deferred till this occasion, in order to bring them into contact with those more remarkable events to which they are allied in principle, though separated by time or other circumstances. We shall commence this review from the earliest ages.

I. The Primitive Assemblies (*ἐκκλησίαι*) of the converts were called Churches. These, in the first instance, were scattered, as the religion spread itself, in perfect equality and independence, and their affairs were, for the most part, regulated by a body of presbyters, who acted with the consent of the people, and under the guidance of the Apostles. This form of government was, to a certain extent, modelled on that of the

The Ante-Nicene Church.

Jewish Synagogues, and it was natural that it should be so; since most of the first converts were Jews; since Christ himself had not laid down any general rules of ecclesiastical polity; and since his Apostles were more intent on enlarging the numbers of the believers, and informing their piety, than on constructing partial laws for the external constitution of a society which was destined to comprehend every race and variety of Man.

Over two at least among the original Churches presidents were apostolically appointed under the name of Bishops; and presently, as the Apostles were gradually withdrawn, it is certain that all the principal Churches, with one or two exceptions, elected for themselves a superintendent under the same name. That custom prevailed very commonly even before the death of St. John, and became almost universal before the end of the first century; still, for a certain time longer, the various Churches continued to conduct their own affairs without any mutual dependence, and with little other correspondence than that of counsel and charity; and the Bishop, in almost all matters, acted in concert with the Presbytery in the internal administration of each.

Thus, in the unsettled constitution of the Primitive Church, we may observe the elements of three* forms of government subsisting under apostolical direction, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and the Independent. But of these the second scarcely survived the departure of the inspired directors, and immediately subsided into a limited episcopacy; and the third, though it continued somewhat longer, so coalesced with the other two, that the greater part, if not the whole, of the Independent Churches during the first half of the second century, were ruled by a Bishop and a Presbytery: that is to say, the various societies which constituted the body of Christendom were so ruled, though as yet they exercised no control over each other.

In a very short time, as new circumstances rapidly sprang up, it was found necessary for the common interest to facilitate a more general communication between societies, which, though separate in government, were united by far more powerful ties. This was most reasonably accomplished by the assembling of occasional Councils, called Synods, composed for the most part of Bishops, each of whom represented his own Church, and acknowledged no superiority of power or rank in any of his brethren. These associations of Churches cannot be traced to the first century; but before the time of Tertullian† they were very common and extensive, at least in Greece, and the custom rapidly spread over every part of Christendom. The rules or canons enacted by these Synods were received as laws of the Church throughout the province which had sent its deputies to the meeting; they were frequently published and communicated to other provinces, and the correspondence and co-operation thus created united, in a certain measure, the whole body, and combined the many scattered Churches into that *one*, which, even in those early days, was called the *Catholic* ‡ Church. But from this description we observe both the independent equality of the members composing it, and also, that

* Perhaps we might even say four—at least those, who maintain the sufficiency of the occasional and spontaneous exhortation of any zealous member of any congregation for spiritual instruction, also seek their authority in the partial and transient practice of the Primitive Church.

† De Jejuniiis.—‘Aguntur per Græcias illa in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur.’

‡ See Bingham, Antiq. b. i., c. i. sect. 7.

it had no acknowledged chief or head. For though the Metropolitans might assume, each in his own province, some superiority in rank, perhaps even in authority, yet these among themselves were equal, and their precedence and power were strictly confined to their own district.

The principal bond which united the original Catholic Church was the possession of a common canon or catalogue of sacred books; and thus, when everywhere tried by the same test, the opinions which might be stigmatized as heretical by any one of the Churches were, for the same reason, condemned by the Universal Church; and the spiritual delinquents, who were removed from the communion by a part of the Catholic body, were consequently repudiated by the whole. It is true, that those who combined and directed this external system of Catholicism were the ecclesiastical ministers, and chiefly the Bishops; it is also true, that the influence of all these over the people, and the power of the latter in the government of their dioceses, were augmented beyond their original moderation by the circumstances which led the clergy to so general a co-operation. But, on the other hand, it is extremely doubtful whether, without such a confederation, the faith itself, loosely scattered over so broad a space, could have withstood the various tempests which were levelled against it; and it certainly was not possible, that any general confederation could have been formed among the Churches, unless by the exertions of their directors—and those, too, in each instance invested with some personal authority; so that if there are any who inveigh against the original Catholic Church as the first corruption of Christianity, and the parent of all that have followed, they do not appear sufficiently to consider either the simple objects and character of that Church, or the perilous circumstances under which it coalesced, and combined many defenceless members into one powerful body. Under *any* circumstances, a close association and unity among religious societies possessing the same canon of faith and the same form of administration would have been natural and desirable; but, under the pressure of common danger and calamity, it was not only reasonable, but necessary*.

The writings of the ante-Nicene fathers contain all the most important

* Semler (*Observationes Novæ in Historiam III. primor. sæc.*) considers it to have been the worst consequence of the formation of the early Church as a single body, that it restrained the liberty of individual judgment, or what he calls *internal religion*; that it imposed certain rules, both of doctrine and discipline, upon the more ignorant and worldly Christians, and discouraged any laxity, or, as he would say, freedom, of interpretation or practice. And on that principle he exalts the character of the bolder and more mystical writers, Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, who were not partizans of the Church, at the expense of Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, and praises the independence of the heretics in thinking and reasoning for themselves. We are not, however, able to discover that the expositions of Scripture contained in the Alexandrian, are, upon the whole, more sound and rational than those of the Carthaginian, Fathers, while they certainly abound with many fanciful extravagances from which the latter are free; and we have shown that the tenets of many of the early heretics were incalculably remote from the precincts of reason and Scripture. At the same time, we are willing to agree with Semler, that it were better far for religion to endure all those irregular absurdities, than to support the Unity of the Church as it was proclaimed in the Roman Catholic sense, and as it was upheld by execution and massacre. But it cannot be asserted that the papal system was the *necessary* offspring of the early Catholic Church; for, if so, it would have arisen in the Eastern as surely as in the Western communion. The worst principles of that system proceeded from causes posterior far to the second century: and the union of the religious societies which at that time constituted *the Church* was, in our opinion, an instrument in God's hands both for the preservation of sound doctrine amidst the numerous and irrational deviations of heresy, and also for the association of the faithful in discipline, and in devoted resistance to the attacks of persecution.

doctrines of Christianity; but we should vainly search those books for a complete and consistent system of theology. In fact, their writers did not commonly handle the dogmas of faith, unless with a view to the confutation of some new or prevalent heresy*. Thus their arguments were usually directed to a particular purpose, and addressed to the views and prejudices of the time or place in which they were published. Many of them were uninstructed in the art of reasoning, and almost all were, in some degree, infected either with the narrow spirit of Judaism, or the loose and speculative genius of philosophy; so that, in correcting the errors of others, they often deviated very widely from sense and truth themselves †. Those controversies, however, though not always conducted with becoming moderation, were not, perhaps, without their use even in those days, since they warmed the zeal and animated the industry of the parties without endangering their personal security. And to us their retrospect may bring some increase of charity, if the consideration of the very broad and essential points, on which they turned, should haply lead us to attach less weight to those less momentous differences, which have raised such heats in later times, and which even yet have not entirely lost their bitterness.

It is certain that a very important moral improvement was immediately introduced by Christianity, wheresoever it gained footing. The earliest societies of the converts furnished an example of rigid, but simple and unaffected piety, to which the history of man can, perhaps, produce no parallel; and even in the following century we need not hesitate to assert the incomparable superiority of the Christians over their Pagan contemporaries: the principles of their religion, the severity of their discipline, the peculiarity of their civil condition, confirm the evidence which assures us that such was the fact. But the golden days of Christianity were confined to its infancy, and it is a great delusion to imagine that its perfect integrity continued throughout the whole period of its persecution, or to refer indiscriminately to the history of the three first centuries for a model of Evangelical purity. We must also be careful not to exaggerate the merits of the early Church, nor to extenuate the abuses which it certainly admitted, nor to exculpate the ministers who created or encouraged them.

So far, indeed, are we from any such intention, that we consider the present as a proper opportunity to examine with more specific notice the innovations which successively appeared either in doctrine or discipline: that we may ascribe to its proper age each of the several abuses which at length combined to deform the structure of the Catholic Church; and that we may perceive how gradual was their growth, and how deep and ancient the root from which many of them proceeded.

That to which we shall first recall the reader's attention (for there are few, if any, of which some mention has not already been made) is the claim to miraculous power, as inherent in the Church, which was asserted by several among the early Christians, from Justin Martyr downwards, and asserted (as evidence and reason have persuaded us) without any

* 'C'est la matière de tous les Sermons des Pères la morale et les hérésies du tems. Sans cette clef souvent on ne les entend pas; ou du moins on ne les peut goûter. Et c'est encore une utilité considérable de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique. Car quand on scait les hérésies qui régnoient en chaque tems et en chaque pais on voit pourquoi les pères revenoient toujours à certains points de doctrine.' Fleury, Disc. 1. sur l'Hist. Eccles., s. xiv.

† Even Irenæus, almost the earliest among them, is not exempt from this charge; his errors are enumerated by Dupin, Nouv. Biblioth., Vie S. Irénée, vol. i. p. 73.

‡ See Chap. ii. p. 19.

truth. According to the Apologists, and other writers of the second and third centuries, the sick were commonly healed, the dead were raised*, and evil spirits cast out, through the prayers of the faithful in the name of Jesus. Men of unquestionable piety eagerly retailed, and may possibly have believed, each other's fabrications. Visions and dreams became the motives of action or belief, and the commonest feelings and resolutions were ascribed to the immediate impulse and inspiration of the Deity. Some nominal converts may thus have been enrolled under the banners of the Church; but the evil of the practice overbalanced its profit, even its momentary profit; since the minds of men were thereby hurried away from the proper understanding of the Gospel, and the true character of the religion, to gaze after marvels and prodigies, and prepared to ascribe to fallacious impressions a belief, which can only be sound when it is founded in reason. It is proper, however, to point out one general distinction between these early miracles and those which clouded the Church in later ages; for, though it is insufficient to establish their credit, it may lead us to regard their authors with more charity. There appears to have been nothing absurd or superstitious in the *manner* of their performance, nor base or wicked in their *object*. They are related to have been usually wrought by the simple invocation of Christ's name; and it does not appear that their accomplishment directly tended to feed avarice or individual ambition—neither to augment the power of the clergy, nor to decide religious controversy, nor to subvert any obnoxious heresy, nor to establish any new doctrine, nor to recommend any foolish practice or superstitious observance†. We can seldom trace them to any other motive than an injudicious zeal for the propagation of the faith.

The triumphs of the Exorcists over the powers of darkness are so loudly and perpetually celebrated by the oldest Church writers, that they may deserve a separate notice. It seems, indeed, probable that the Jews, espe-

* The following is part of the celebrated testimony of Irenæus (lib. ii. cap. 31 or 57) as cited by Eusebius (lib. v. cap. 7):—οἱ μὲν γὰρ δαίμονας ἐλαύνουσι βεβαίως καὶ ἀληθῶς· ὥστε πολλὰκις καὶ πιστεύειν αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους καθαρῶσθιντας ἀπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν πνευμάτων καὶ εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οἱ δὲ καὶ πρόγνωσιν ἔχουσι τῶν μελλόντων, καὶ ὀπτασίας καὶ ῥήσεις προφητικὰς· ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς κάμνοντας διὰ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως ἰάνται, καὶ ὕγιαι ἀποκαθιστᾶσιν. ἤδη δὲ καθὼς ἔφαμεν καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγίγθησαν, καὶ παρέμειναν σὺν ἡμῖν ἰκανοὶ ἔτησι. Καὶ τί γὰρ; οὐκ ἔστιν ἄξιον εἰπεῖν τῶν χαρισμάτων ἃν κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ Θεοῦ λαβούσα, &c. &c. "Some effectually expel devils, so that the very persons who are cleansed from evil spirits believe and are in the Church; others have foreknowledge of the future, and visions and prophetic declarations; others heal the sick by imposition of hands; and it has happened (as we have said) that the dead have been raised and continued among us for some years. It is impossible to enumerate the grace which the Church throughout the whole world has received from God, &c."

We shall here only remark (as Jortin has remarked before us) that in speaking of resurrection, the writer uses the *past* tense, while the other miracles are described as in the actual course of present occurrence; yet the words *σὺν ἡμῖν* cannot, without great violence, be understood of any preceding generation, and we doubt not that Irenæus intended to assert that dead persons had been brought to life in his own time. In a subsequent paragraph, that father also claims the gift of tongues for his age. καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔχόντων, καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλούντων διὰ Πνεύματος γλώσσαις. After this passage, there is scarcely any mention made of that gift in ecclesiastical history. We should observe, that Eusebius makes the above citation in proof of his assertion 'that miraculous powers ἐν ἐκκλησίαις τισιν ὑπέλειπτο as late as the time of Irenæus.' He does not appear disposed to claim them *for the Church* at any later period.

† This subject is very fairly treated by Dr. Jortin in the beginning of his second book.

cially after their intercourse with the Chaldæans during the captivity, attributed to the direct operation of evil spirits a great number of those disorders of which the causes were not obvious; and such particularly as were attended by distortion of body, or extraordinary mental agitation and phrensy*. This delusion necessarily created a large and various multitude of 'Dæmoniacs,' whose manifold diseases could hope for no relief from ordinary remedies, as they proceeded not from human accidents. The language even of Scripture, when literally understood, appears to sanction such an opinion, and the literal interpretation has had its advocates among the learned and pious in every age of the Church. But the notion of real Dæmoniacal agency was carried to an extreme of absurdity, and led, we fear, to many acts of deceit in the second and third centuries. "Oh, could you but hear (says Cyprian†) and see those dæmons when they are tortured by us, and afflicted with spiritual chastisement and *verbal* anguish, and thus ejected from the bodies of the possessed (*obsessorum*); moaning and lamenting with human voice, through the power divine, as they feel the rods and stripes, they confess the judgment to come. The exorcists rule with commanding right over the whole army of the insolent adversary. Oftentimes the devil promises to depart, but departs not; but when we come to baptism, then indeed we ought to be assured and confident, because the dæmon is then oppressed, and the man is consecrated to God and liberated." The invocation of Christ, attended by the sign of the cross, was the method by which those stupendous effects were usually produced; and one among the many evils which proceeded from this absurd practice was an opinion, which gained some prevalence among the less enlightened converts, that the object of Christ's mission was to emancipate mankind from the yoke of their invisible enemy, and that the promised *Redemption* was nothing more than a sensible liberation from the manifest influence of evil spirits.

Of the literary forgeries which corrupted and disgraced the ante-Nicene Church, we have made frequent and sorrowful mention; and the great number ‡ and popularity of such apocryphal works seem indeed to prove that the Canon of the New Testament, though very early received among the clergy, was not in general circulation among the people. They arose in the second, even more, perhaps, than in the following age, and originated partly in the still remaining influence of Judaism, partly in the connexion between Christianity and philosophy, which at that time commenced. Almost all the Church writers partook more or less of one or the other of these tendencies; Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, and even Tertullian himself, were in some degree tainted by the former infection, and Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen were deeply vitiated by the latter. But we do not intend to ascribe the forgeries in question to those respectable fathers, nor even wholly to any members of the Church, though we admit that some of them received undue countenance from that quarter. We shall here only remark, without pausing again to condemn the prin-

* See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*.

† Epist. 76. Both Irenæus and Tertullian are very animated on the same subject.

‡ Among these, besides the Epistle to Abgarus, the works ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus, the Sibylline Prophecies, Hydaspis, the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, we may mention various apocryphal histories of Jesus, of Mary, and his other relatives—of Tiberius, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea—of the Apostles, especially St. Peter—the origin of the Apostles' Creed—the Synods of the Apostles—the Epistle of Seneca to Paul—the Acts of Pilate, &c. &c.

ciple which created them, that their immediate effect was exceedingly injurious, since they contributed, together with the other abuses just mentioned, to disseminate false and unworthy notions respecting the nature of Christianity. Foremost among them, the gross Millenarian doctrine, which was the firstborn child of tradition, was supported and diffused by those writings; and it did not cease to exercise, in various parts of Christendom, a pernicious and perhaps powerful influence, until it was checked by the pen of Origen and succeeding writers.

The distinction of the converts into 'Catechumens,' and 'Faithful,' or 'Believers,' (Πιστοί) was introduced after the age of Justin, and before or during that of Tertullian*. Its motive was probably twofold;—first, to prove the sincerity, to instruct the ignorance, to ascertain or correct the morality of the ruder proselytes, who were now numerous and eager for baptism, and so to restrain the indiscriminate performance of that rite; next, to conciliate reverence and excite curiosity by the temporary concealment of the most solemn ceremonies of the new religion. To this end the Catechumens were only admitted to the previous part of the service, and, before the celebration of the Holy Sacraments, were *dismissed*†: all that followed was strictly veiled from them, until the time of their own initiation. Even from the above short description it is easy to discover in this early Christian practice an imitation of the system of Pagan mysteries. These, as is well known, were twofold in number and importance—the first or lesser being of common notoriety, and easy access to all conditions and ages, while the greater were revealed, with considerable discrimination, to such only as were thought qualified for the privilege, by their rank, or knowledge, or virtue. The name also passed into the Liturgies of the Church; and the Sacraments, which were withdrawn from the profane eye of the Catechumens, were denominated mysteries.

These mysteries continued for some time, perhaps till the beginning of the fourth century, to be two only, Baptism and the Eucharist. We have proofs, indeed, that in *that* age the ceremonies, at least of Penitential Absolution, of Ordination, and Confirmation ‡, were concealed from the uninitiated, as carefully as the two original Sacraments; and hence no doubt arose the error which has sanctified them by the same name. Regarding

* De Prescrip. adv. Hæret. cap. 41. He censures the heretics for not making the distinction in question in their congregations.

† Itē, *Missa* est. (i. e. Ecclesia.) Go—it is dismissed. This seems, upon the whole, the most probable origin of the words, Missal, Mass; though many others have been proposed. (See Bingham, b. xiii., chap. i.) Οἱ ἀκοινωνήτοι, ποιεῖσθε τῆσαστε—Non-communicants, depart—was the Greek form of separating the two classes. Bingham is very minute, and probably very faithful, in describing the nature of the Missa Catechumenorum and the Missa Fideium, or Communion Service—though the forms, as he gives them, probably belonged to the fourth and the subsequent, rather than the preceding, centuries. But a summary of the instructions delivered to the former is given by the author of the Constit. Apostol., lib. vii., c. 39. It embraces the knowledge of the Trinity, the order of the world's creation and series of Divine Providence, as exhibited in the Old Testament: the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, and Assumption, and what it is to renounce the devil and to enter into the Covenant of Christ.

‡ The passages which respectively prove these three facts are from Optatus contr. Parmen., liv. ii., p. 57; Chrysostom Hom., 18, in ii. Cor. p. 872; and Innocent I., Epist. i., ad Decentium Eugubini: and are cited by Bingham, Antiq., book x., chapter v. St. Basil (De Spir. Sanct., c. 27) places the Oil of Chism among the things which the uninitiated might not look upon; while St. Augustin (Comm. in Psalm ciii., Concio. i.) says, 'Quid est quod occultum est et non publicum in Ecclesia? Sacramentum Baptismi, Sacramentum Eucharistiae. Opera nostra bona vident et Pagani, Sacramenta vero occultantur illis.' The practice probably varied in different Churches; but the whole proves that the *Seven Sacraments* were not yet acknowledged in any.

the rite of Baptism, we have noticed in a former chapter a misapprehension of its true nature and object, which gained very early footing in the Church; and the consequent abuse of deferring it until the hour of death was clearly customary before the days of Constantine; we need not pause to point out the evils which obviously proceeded from it*. The original simple character of the eucharistical assemblies of the primitive Christians, such as they are described by Justin Martyr, was first exalted by the strong and almost ambiguous language of Irenæus, and still further by the exaggerated though vague expressions of subsequent writers †. By such means the Eucharist gradually rose to be considered the most abstruse and awful of the mysteries. Yet is it still doubtful whether this grew to be a great abuse before the establishment of the Church; though the secrecy and exclusiveness which surrounded its most holy ceremony offended the open character of the religion, and even lessened its estimation among the wise and virtuous, by introducing an unworthy assimilation to the mummeries of Paganism.

It was an opinion in the third century, originating, perhaps, with Tertullian, but more expressly declared by Dionysius, 'That the holy martyrs were the assessors of Christ and participators in his kingdom, and partakers in his judgment, sitting in judgment with him ‡.' While we read this extravagant conceit of that early age, we might almost be disposed to praise the moderation of later times, which were contented to invest those holy sufferers with the character of mediators. But long even before the age of Dionysius, and probably before any thought had been raised respecting their immediate exaltation or beatification, it had been a natural and even pious custom to celebrate the *birthdays* of those who had offered themselves up as sacrifices for their religion. By their birthdays (their γενέθλια) were understood, not the days of their introduction to the sins and afflictions of earth, but of their release from such bondage and their resurrection to glory. These days of their nativity to everlasting life were observed (as indeed it was fit) in joyous commemoration of the piety of the departed, and of the example which they had bequeathed to posterity. Assemblies were held for this purpose at the tombs of the martyrs, or on the spots where they had perished, and their frequency is attested by Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, and others of the oldest fathers. The *Μαρτύρων γενέθλια* were the saints' days of the early Christians, and may be traced at least as far back as the execution of Polycarp §; and as the places of meeting were not then consecrated by chapels or sanctuaries, and as the mortal, whose euthanasia was commemorated, was not yet made an object of superstitious adoration, it would be too severe to charge upon those innocent demonstrations of popular reverence the system of idolatrous impiety which was built in later ages on that foundation ||.

* Gibbon somewhere proposes a question, which we profess our inability to resolve, whether this pernicious practice was at any time condemned by any Council of the Church?

† The passages in Irenæus which have given occasion to the warmest controversy, and not wholly without ground, are lib. iv., c. 17 (or 32) and 18 (or 34), and lib. v., c. 2, *Miracula Sacræ Cænæ vel Cyprianus audet narrare.* Semler. *Observ. Nov.*, &c.

‡ Tertull. de Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 43. *Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyrii prerogativa, Paradiso scilicet non Inferis deversurus.* And lib. de Anima, cap. 55. Dionys. ap. Euseb., liv. vi., cap. 42. *τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάτερδοι, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ κοινωνοὶ καὶ μέτοχοι τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνδικάζοντες αὐτῷ.*

§ In the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna to that of Philomelium (in Euseb., liv. iv., cap. 15), the writers, after mention of the martyrdom of Polycarp, express their intention, 'by God's permission, to meet at his tomb and celebrate his birthday.' See Cave, *Primitive Christianity*, p. ii., ch. 7.

|| We do not mean that there was no *tendency* to superstition in the honours paid to

The use of prayers and even of offerings for the dead was earlier than the age of Tertullian*; nor is it any wonder that the numerous converts from Paganism should bring over with them some fragments of their former observances. But there is no just reason to suspect that the ante-Nicene Church studied to turn them to its own profit, or at least that they were made to minister to the avarice of the clergy. If they were encouraged, it was rather through the hope of increasing by such indulgence the number of the proselytes.

The mortification of occasional fasting was probably enjoined in the earliest age. For the ceremony of Baptism, as we learn from Justin, both the neophyte and the congregation were prepared by abstinence; and in the time of Tertullian, the Bishops, if he believ† them not, found their advantage in increasing the number of such observances. The first general fast was on Good Friday, and it does not appear that any others were very soon added, or at least universally received. Yet there can be no doubt, that long before the fourth century at least some ‡ part of Lent was strictly observed, and a partial fast (till three in the afternoon) on the fourth and sixth days of every week, is by some referred to very high antiquity. Upon the whole it would seem, however, that, until the establishment of the Church, a great variety prevailed in this department of its discipline, dependent in some measure on the circumstances of particular provinces, and the individual regulations of the Bishops presiding there.

When we consider in what countries the religion was revealed, and among what people it first spread, it is natural to search for the oldest forms of its external economy in the Jewish, and for those somewhat less ancient in the Pagan, system;—and thus we find them to have originated, so far at least as the origin of either can be discovered with any certainty. There can be little doubt, for instance, that the very early distinction between Clergy and Laity was immediately derived from the corresponding institution of Judaism. The gradations and offices of the original Priesthood, and the power of the Presbytery, proceeded from the same source§, and the subsequent introduction of the more dignified term *Sacerdos* attested the continuation of the same influence. Again, ‘There seems to be nothing more uncontested among learned men than that the Jews had set forms of worship in all parts of Divine Service, and that the Apostles freely used these in all instances in which they thought it necessary or becoming to join with them. Their ordinary service was of two sorts—the service of the Temple and the service of the Synagogue. These differed in many

martyrs even in the third century. Relics were already coming into consideration, the blood of the sufferers was eagerly collected in sponges, and other similar extravagances are recorded; but these were the natural excesses of popular enthusiasm, and would have ceased with the cessation of persecution, if they had not afterwards been perpetuated and systematized by the arts of a corrupt priesthood.

* Tertull. de Monogamia, c. 10.

† He may do so, for in his ‘*Liber de Jejuniis*’ he is writing in favour of Montanism against the Church. Bene autem quod et Episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent; non dico de *industria stipium conferendarum, ut vestra captura est*, sed interdum et ex aliqua sollicitudinis Ecclesiasticæ causa. See Thomassin, *Traité des Jennes de l’Eglise*.

‡ The Quadragesimal Fast (*τεσσαρακωστή*) is by some supposed to indicate the number of hours of abstinence which preceded the festival of the Resurrection. But in the time of Chrysostom (who calls Lent ‘the remedy and physic of the soul’) and of Theodosius the Great (who suspended all criminal proceedings and punishments during its continuance) the entire period was unquestionably observed. See Cave on the Early Church, chapter vii.

§ There is a passage in St. Clement’s First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 40, in which the system of Jewish discipline is indirectly proposed as a model for the imitation of Christians.

respects; but both agreed in this, that the public prayers in both were offered up in a certain constant form of words*.' To what extent this practice was imitated in the primitive Church remains extremely uncertain, notwithstanding the controversial labours of many learned men. Perhaps this very uncertainty should be sufficient to convince us, that the earliest forms of services were extremely short and variable—otherwise more ample specimens of them would have reached posterity. On the other hand, the scanty passages which are adduced from Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian, certainly prove, that there were *some* fixed prayers in use in some of the ancient Churches, which may or may not have been common to them all. And this usage was an imitation, imperfect as it was, of the Jewish offices. On the other hand there are many of the early Ecclesiastical terms, and some few ceremonies chiefly of the third century, which are more usually considered of Pagan derivation, though some of them may with equal justice be ascribed to a Jewish original. The oldest name for the chancel was *θυσιαστήριον*, Ara Dei, or *Allare*; oblations were made there, and 'the unbloody sacrifice' offered up, and frankincense smoked, and lamps were lighted, even during the persecutions of the Church; even *votive* donations (*donaria—αναθήματα*) were suspended in the yet rude and ill-constructed temples of Christ. But the simple superstition of the Faithful in those ages did not proceed to more dangerous excesses. It was reserved for the following century to fill those temples with images, and to introduce into the Sanctuaries of God the predominating spirit of Paganism.

In reference to the facts which we have now stated, and which carry with them the plain conclusions to which we proceed, it seems only necessary to observe—*first*, that we are not to attend to those writers who represent the ante-Nicene Church as the perfect model of a Christian society—as the unfailling storehouse whence universal and perpetual rules of doctrine and discipline may be derived with confidence, and followed with submission. The truth is far otherwise; and though we ought assuredly to distinguish the authority of the apostolical from that of the later uninspired writers, still even the works of those first Fathers are not without much imperfection, and furnish, besides, very insufficient materials for the construction or defence of any system; and in the extensive *variety* both of opinions and arguments which distinguishes their successors from Justin to Eusebius, we cannot fail to observe, that the former are sometimes erroneous, and the latter very commonly feeble and inconsequential. From such facts we are compelled to infer, that the true nature and design of Christ's mission on earth were not yet very perfectly comprehended by the mass of Christians in the second and third centuries. Indeed, it was scarcely possible that it could be otherwise, since they consisted of converts, or the children of converts, many of whom were imbued with the deep and unbending prejudices of Judaism, and the others attached by long hereditary affection to the splendid ceremonies of Paganism. To either of these classes it was necessary to address a *peculiar* form of argument, and to present a peculiar view of the religion, that there might be any just hope of persuading them to embrace it. We should also mention that some of the errors of the third, and even of the second century, may be ascribed to the undue weight already attached to apostolical tradition, and the authority that was blindly attributed to any precept or usage, however obscurely traced to that uncertain source.

* Bingham (Church Antiq. Book xiii, chap. v.) in prosecution of this subject, exhibits too warmly the zeal of an advocate.

But, in the *second* place, we are equally bound to remark, that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity shine with a steady and continuous light through the strange mists in which the ante-Nicene Church has sometimes involved them; it was a great advantage which that age possessed over those which followed, that it confined itself to plain and scriptural expressions, and was contented to deliver the truths of God in the language of the holy writings. Moreover, we should add, that among the abuses which we have described, though some were shameful to their inventors, and injurious to the cause, there were many which, in their origin, were comparatively, if not absolutely, innocent: in many instances they arose rather from the circumstances of the converts than from the design of the priesthood, and there were few, if any, among them which might not have been arrested after the establishment of Christianity, if that security which gave power to the ministers of religion had conferred wisdom and true piety along with it.

To conclude, then:—a general view of the Church of the three first ages presents to us a body always unconnected with the State, frequently at variance with it; surrounded by multitudes of heresies, many of them very monstrous, which it combated with the sword of the Spirit alone; under a government in which the gradually-increasing influence of the Bishop was still for the most part extremely limited by the power of his presbytery; with a rule of faith not curiously definite on abstruse questions, but simply conceived and scripturally expressed—rising into strength and confirming its consistency, and, finally, making good its long-neglected claims to toleration and respect. A closer examination of the same body discloses to us a number of stains and defects, proceeding at different moments from various causes, and spreading, in some degree, as that advanced in magnitude: but they had not yet penetrated to its heart, they might still have been checked, and even removed, by an influential and truly Christian priesthood. It is true that the substantial and fatal corruptions of after ages sprang, in many instances, directly from them; but the crime of those consequences must rest, for the most part, with those who combined and perpetuated the first abuses; for these were indeed rather the produce of circumstances than the work of men. We have also observed, in the various conditions of apostolical Christianity, the scattered elements of some forms of government and discipline, which, though they were very early absorbed by the episcopal system, should not be passed over in silence, since they are still pleaded as precedents and imitated as models by many excellent Christians.

II. Fleury, who is the most moderate and reasonable of the Roman Catholic historians, laments that after the first six centuries the brightest days of the Church were *From Constantine to passed away**. In his first Discourse he represents *Gregory the Great.* the brilliancy of that period in vivid and exaggerated colours. The reverence due to the sanctified martyr—the solemn aspect of monastic solitude—the piety and disinterested poverty of the early prelates—the purity of their election—the austerity of their life—the magnificence of the offices—the severity of discipline—the venerable names of tradition† and antiquity—are objects of his warm and indiscriminate

* Discours sur l'Hist. Ecclés. depuis l'an 600 jusques à l'an 1100. 'Les beaux jours de l'Eglise sont passés, mais Dieu n'a pas rejeté son peuple ni oublié ses promesses,' &c. &c.

† 'It was one of the rules of discipline not to commit it to writing, but to preserve it by a secret tradition among the Bishops and Priests, chiefly that regarding the administration of the sacraments; and the better to keep that secret, that the Bishops should confide

enology. But it was an error (for to Fleury we would not willingly ascribe the intention of deceiving) to confound the three earliest with the three following centuries; as if the same had been the government, discipline, spirit of the Catholic Church from the age of St. Clement to that of St. Gregory. Even the first of those periods was somewhat removed from apostolical perfection; but in the second the distance was incalculably multiplied, and that, not only according to the customary progress of unreformed abuse, but also through a change of principles in the administration of the Church, which proceeded from other causes.

At present, before we enter on any general review of the outward form and position of the Church, or even of its internal administration, we shall mention, as in continuation of *Particular innovations*, the subject which has been most lately treated, some particular innovations in belief and discipline which either began or were established during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. The first, and by far the most important of these, was the institution of the monastic system, of which it cannot be properly said that there existed any vestige before the beginning of the fourth age, and which, before its termination, had fixed its roots deeply, and struck them with pernicious vitality into the very heart of Christendom. Its origin and progress will be the object of future inquiry; at present we shall confine our notice to a subject very closely connected with it—the celibacy of the Clergy. In the first ages the Church writers advocated the universal lawfulness of marriage against the *heretical* rigour of the Encratites, of Saturninus and Basilides, of the Montanists, and even the Novatians; so that any undue respect for celibacy which may have prevailed during the three first ages cannot justly be attributed to the Church: it was also very partial and vague in its nature, and wholly unsupported by canonical regulations. Afterwards, there can be no question that the cause which first gave impulse to the principle, and carried it into practice, and subjected it to repeated legislation, was the growing prevalence of Monachism, and the popular veneration which was found to attach to excessive austerities. Already at the Council of Nice* it was proposed to forbid the marriage of the Clergy; but through the opposition of an Egyptian Bishop, named Paphnutius, it was only enacted, that all Clerks who had been married before they took orders should be allowed to retain their wives, according to the ancient *tradition* of the Church, but that they should not marry a second time †. Such continued both the rule and practice of the Eastern Church; it was confirmed by the Council in Trullo in the year 692, with

their ecclesiastical letters to the Clergy only. So, when the ancients speak of observing the canons, imagine not that they speak of written canons; they speak of all that was practised through a constant tradition. For we must believe, according to the maxim of St. Augustine, that that which the Church has observed at every time, and in every place, is apostolical tradition. In fact, from what other source could have come those universal practices, such as the veneration of relics, the prayer for the dead, the observance of Lent? Fleury, Discours sur l'Hist. des Six Premiers Siècles, &c. &c.—Of the three practices here instanced, two at least were much posterior to the times of the Apostles.

* Eleven years earlier it was enacted, by the tenth canon of the Council of Ancyra, that when a Deacon declared his intention to marry, at the time of his ordination, he might be allowed to do so, but not otherwise. Dupin, Nouv. Bibl. tome ii. p. 312. Bingham, Church Antiq. b. iv. ch. v.—Dupin, Nouv. Biblioth., tome i. (Abrégé de la Discipline) mentions, as the rule of the early (ante-Nicene) Church, that it was permitted to a Priest to keep his wife, but not to marry again: on a Deacon there was no such restraint. It is impossible to trace that, which is mentioned as being imposed upon the Priest, to the first ages; but in the beginning of the fourth century, perhaps somewhat earlier, it was undoubtedly established, that no man who was ordained Priest could marry.

† Socrates, lib. i. c. 11. Sozomen, lib. i., c. 23.

an exception against Bishops, who were obliged, on their promotion, to separate from their wives; and this law was never afterwards altered. But in the West, where the spirit of sacerdotal domination more strongly prevailed, many attempts were made in those days to enforce perfect celibacy on all the orders of the ministry, and their constant repetition proves their inefficacy. Siricius, who held the See of Rome from 385 to 398, published some letters or decretals, which have acquired the weight of canons in the Roman Church. One of his great objects was to discourage the marriage of the Clergy, but it does not appear* that his regulations much exceeded the severity of those of Nice. However, it must be admitted, that the perseverance of his successors was not fruitless, at least so far as their immediate influence extended; and we are assured that at the end of the fifth century, the rule of celibacy was very commonly observed by the Clergy of Rome †. But a hundred years afterwards, Gregory, as we have seen, was still engaged in the same struggle against the natural affections and the common reason of man, and he transmitted it, still unfinished, to his distant ‡ posterity. His object was clerical celibacy in the strictest sense; but we should remark that no ordinance going to that extent had yet been enacted by any *general* Council, even of the Western Church, and that the common practice was still in opposition to it; a great number, probably far the larger proportion, of the German, French, English, and Spanish Clergy continued to avail themselves at least of that portion of their scriptural right, which the Council of Nice had left them.

The penitential discipline of the ante-Nicene Church was exceedingly severe, even in the season of persecution, and it was by rigour rather than indulgence that it sought to secure the fidelity and increase the number of its members. For the space of fifteen, or sometimes of twenty years, it might be for his whole life, the repentant sinner was excluded from the precincts of the Church, and exposed to the contempt or compassion of every beholder. After this long endurance, when the gates of the sanctuary were at length unclosed to him, it was only, perhaps, that he might worship there for some additional years in the attitude of prostration, muffled and unshaven, fasting and covered with ashes§. A discipline which, in some ages, would be deemed barbarous if it were not impracticable, was found very effectual in those early times, both in preserving individual morality, and in upholding the external show and dignity of the Church. It seems to have been maintained in its original spirit throughout the fourth century||, and its rigour was still further aggravated by the

* Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.*, Vie de Sirice.

† A distinction in this respect was observed a century earlier between the Catholic and the Arian Clergy; the *laxity* of the latter, who were almost universally married, was made matter of reproach by their more rigid adversaries.

‡ In the ninth century (about the year 860) we observe Hulderic, Bishop of Augsburg, vigorously resisting the edicts of Pope Nicholas; and two hundred and twenty years afterwards, when Gregory VII. at length achieved the object which had foiled his predecessors for above six centuries, he encountered an opposition which could scarcely have been surmounted by a less extraordinary character.

§ Fleury, *Discours sur les Six Premiers Siècles*, &c. et passim. Cyprian is the most ancient Father who is mentioned as having laid down rules of penance. But some derive such rules from the discipline imposed in the Pagan system previous to initiation in the great mysteries.

|| See Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.* tome ii. p. 247, Vie de S. Ambroise. 1. Sinners were expected to request that they might be admitted to penance. 2. The circumstance of their doing penance separated them from the Communion. 3. They did penance publicly. 4. They practised a number of fastings, austerities, and humiliations during the whole

necessity of public confession. The measure of Pope Leo, which substituted private confession, may have been made necessary by the universal profession of Christianity, and the degeneracy of many who professed it. But not only was it attended by an immediate relaxation in the penitential discipline of the Church (for secret penance very speedily followed secret confession), but it became, in process of time, one of the most abundant sources of sacerdotal influence.

During the four first centuries there was no mention or thought of Purgatory—neither St. Ambrose, nor even St. Jerome, had any belief in such an intermediate state. But St. Augustin* expresses himself somewhat more ambiguously; for if, in [some passages, he rejects the supposition as vain and improbable, in others he admits that the truth cannot be certainly ascertained, but may deserve investigation. During the two following ages, the plausible scheme gained some little credit among the Clergy of the West, and most especially among the monastic orders; but the credit of establishing it among the unquestionable truths of the Church is due to the superstition or the craft of Gregory the Great. In the Fourth Book of his Dialogues he maintains the existence of a purgatory for the expiation of the more venial offences of persons, whose general excellence may have deserved such indulgence. He then takes occasion to remark, that many discoveries had lately been made respecting the condition of souls after death, which had not been penetrated by antiquity, and for this reason—that as this world was approaching to its end, men saw more closely into the secrets of the next†. A theory which had been tolerated by St. Augustin, and defended, however absurdly, by St. Gregory, found easy acceptance in the Western Church; it was eagerly seized by the Benedictine Monks, and was presently perceived to be so profitable in its operation on the people, that it soon became one of the dearest and most necessary tenets of the Roman Communion.

The general influence of Paganism on the Christian ceremonies was already discoverable in the second and third ages; and the particular practice which, in its abuse, was especially destined to assimilate two forms of worship essentially dissociable, and to bring them together, too, on that very point where their difference had been the widest, may be traced, perhaps, to the early but innocent reverence which was paid to martyrs. During the progress of the fourth and fifth centuries many new concessions were made, on various and important points, to the popular genius of the old superstition. Expiatory processions and supplications were framed and conducted after the ancient models. The sanctity which had been inherent in the Temples of the Gods was now transferred to the Christian Churches‡, which began to rival the splendour and magnitude, if they failed to emulate the elegance, of their profane competitors. If any inspiration had been communicated to the devout Pagan by sleeping within the holy precincts, the same descended upon the Convert when he

time of penance. 5. They could be admitted to that penance once only. Of course the penance here mentioned was the severest which the Church ever inflicted for the most enormous sins.

* Mosheim (cent. v. p. ii. c. iii.) remarks that ‘the famous Pagan doctrine concerning the purification of departed souls by means of a certain kind of fire was more amply explained and confirmed now than it had hitherto been,’ and he refers to St. Augustin, *De viii. Questionibus ad Dulcitium N. xiii. tome vi. De Fide et Operibus, cap. xvi. p. 182. De Fide, Spe et Charitate, sect. 118, p. 222. Enarrat. Psalm xxxv. s. 3.*

† See Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl., Vie de St. Grégoire I.*

‡ The ancient privilege of sanctuary was conferred upon Christian Churches by Constantine, and afterwards extended by Theodosius II. to the consecrated precincts.

reposed upon a martyr's tomb. If any purity had been conferred by customary lustration, it was compensated by the frequent use of holy water. Other such compromises might be mentioned; and so completely was the spirit of the rejected worship transfused into the system which succeeded it, that the very miracles which the Christian writers of those days credulously retailed concerning their saints and martyrs were, in many instances, only ungraceful copies of the long-exploded fables of heathenism*: so poisonous was the expiring breath of that base superstition, and so fatal the garment which it cast, even during its latest struggles, over its heavenly destroyer. But in no respect was its malice so lastingly pernicious as when it fastened upon Christianity the badge of his own character by the communication of idolatrous worship. It is true that in the ante-Nicene Church martyrs were revered, and even relics held in some estimation; but no description of image, whether carved or painted, was tolerated in the Churches of Christ, and it was through that distinction chiefly that they claimed exclusive sanctity. In the fourth and fifth centuries the previous veneration for the saints was exalted into actual worship, their lives and their miracles were recited and devoured with ardent credulity, astonishing prodigies were performed by fragments of their bones or garments, distant and dangerous pilgrimages were undertaken to obtain their ashes, or only to pray at their tombs; and this rage was encouraged by the unanimous acclamation of the ecclesiastical directors. Yet does it not appear that any one, even the least considerate among those writers, warmly advocated the worship, or even the use, of images†; the opinions, and practice of some of them were certainly opposed to it. Among the Emperors, both Valens and Theodosius enacted laws against the painting or graving the likeness of Christ. Nevertheless we perceive (from passages in Gregory of Nyssa, St. Cyril, St. Basil, and others) that representations of the combats of the martyrs, and of some scriptural scenes, had already obtained place in some of the Churches, though they were not yet in general honour. Thus the seeds were sown, and as they were watered by the enthusiasm of the vulgar, ever prone to some sort of sensible worship, and fondly nourished by the headstrong prejudice of the heathen converts; and as the fathers of the Church did not interpose to root them out, they spread with rapid, though, perhaps, silent growth, and before the end of the sixth century the *use* of images was very generally permitted throughout the Christian world. During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, Severus, Bishop of Marseilles, observing that the people worshipped the images which were placed in his Church, tore them down and destroyed them: on this occasion the Pope addressed to him two epistles, in which, while he praised the zeal that

* See Jortin, *Ecl. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 73, 124, 220, 238, &c. &c.; and Middleton's Letter from Rome, *passim*.

† St. Epiphanius, in his letter to John of Jerusalem, translated by St. Jerome, and written towards the end of the fourth century, writes as follows:—"Having entered into a church in a village in Palestine, named Anablatha, I found there a veil which was suspended at the door, and painted with a representation, whether of Jesus Christ or of some Saint, for I do not well recollect whose image it was, but seeing that, in opposition to the authority of Scripture, there was a human image in the Church of Jesus Christ, I tore it in pieces, and gave order to those who had care of that Church to bury a corpse with the veil. And as they grumbled out some answer, that "since he has chosen to tear the veil he might as well find another," I promised them one, and I now discharge that promise." Baronius, Bellarmine, and some others, have disputed the genuineness of this passage by arguments, which have been very easily and candidly confuted by Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl. Vie de S. Epiphane*. St. Augustin somewhere praises the religious severity of the ancient Romans, who worshipped God without images.

combated any show of idolatry, he maintained the propriety of filling the Churches with idols; 'for there is a great difference,' he says, 'between worshipping an image, and learning, from the history represented by that image, what it is that we ought to worship; for that which writing teaches to those who can read, painting makes intelligible to all who have eyes to see. It is in such representation that the ignorant perceive what they ought to follow; it is the book of the illiterate. On this account it is of great service to the barbarians, to which circumstance you, who are placed in the midst of barbarians, should be peculiarly attentive, so as to cause them no scandal by an indiscreet zeal.' This passage probably discloses the principal motive of that attachment to the cause of the images which was afterwards so warmly manifested by the Church of Rome; at least, it teaches us, that the places, which they had gradually usurped during the three preceding ages in the Christian Churches, were at length confirmed to them, and secured by the highest authority. We may pause once more to condemn the sophistry which distinguished between the use and the worship, and coldly forbade the ignorant barbarian to adore an object which could not seriously be placed in *his* hands with any other prospect.

From the above review of the principal abuses in doctrine and discipline* which took root in the Church during the three centuries following its establishment, let us proceed to consider that body; first, in regard to its connexion with the state; secondly, in respect to its own internal administration. As the Pagan system was merely an engine of State, so its entire regulation, even to the performance of its most sacred rights and offices, was consistently and properly intrusted to the control and exercise of the civil magistrate. The power which directed it, the power which its ministers possessed to enforce their decrees, was not distinguished from that with which they were invested for any other purpose,—it was strictly and exclusively temporal. Christianity rose from a very different foundation; it claimed to be a direct revelation from Heaven; its truth, not its utility, was the fact which its professors unbendingly asserted by their arguments and their sufferings; they *believed* that it was the work of God which they were forwarding, and that their souls were placed for ever in his retributive hands. From this lofty ground they were enabled to discern that there was a limit to all human authority, and that there was a Power above, which was greater than the might of Emperors. That heavenly power they considered to be, in some degree, communicated to Christ's ministers on earth, and associated with their *spiritual* office.

During the period preceding the accession of Constantine, the exercise of this power was confined to preserving the purity of the apostolical doctrine, to augmenting the number, enforcing the morality, and preventing the apostacy of the converts. It was working silently among the faithful, and had already established a solemn and indissoluble connexion between the clergy and the lower orders; but it had not hitherto, on any occasion, been brought into open communication with the temporal power, either to co-operate or to contend with it, nor, indeed, was its existence yet acknow-

* Dupin has collected from the works of Athanasius a sort of summary of the discipline of that age. Among the particulars we observe, that there were Priests, and even Bishops, who were married, though in small number; that the people and Clergy continued to choose their Bishops; that there were no translations; that Lent was observed as a fast; Easter as a solemn festival; that the Gospel was read in the vulgar tongue. It is St. Jerome who has somewhere declared, that fasting is not so truly called a virtue as the foundation of every virtue.

* Dupin has collected from the works of Athanasius a sort of summary of the discipline of that age. Among the particulars we observe, that there were Priests, and even Bishops, who were married, though in small number; that the people and Clergy continued to choose their Bishops; that there were no translations; that Lent was observed as a fast; Easter as a solemn festival; that the Gospel was read in the vulgar tongue. It is St. Jerome who has somewhere declared, that fasting is not so truly called a virtue as the foundation of every virtue.

ledged, or perhaps perceived, by the latter*. Let us now advance one century, and consider the position of the Church as it then stood in connexion with the State. Its real substantial weight proceeded, in fact, from one cause, and from one only,—the influence of the Clergy over the people. Many circumstances at this time contributed to confirm and consolidate that influence—the judicial authority and acknowledged dignity of the Bishops, the increase in their number and wealth, the popular character of their election, their public and powerful eloquence. Moreover, there can be no question that even the spiritual control of the ecclesiastics was exerted with greater confidence, when the civil power was at hand to support them; while their zeal was warmly and successfully employed in asserting the vast superiority of that control, and the interests connected with it, over any that were merely temporal and worldly. To these considerations we should add, that during the three preceding centuries the nobility of the Roman empire had, for the most part, fallen into decay; no body had grown up in the State to supply the defect of the aristocratical influence, and hence it rose that the vacant place in the social system was occupied by the Christian hierarchy. This order, sometimes powerful from other causes, always possessed peculiar advantages for the acquisition of popular influence, through the very office which forces it into contact with the lower classes, and through the attractive character of its duties, which are such as can never fail, when faithfully and discreetly discharged, to conciliate the affections of those for whose happiness alone they are imposed.

From the above and similar causes, the authority of the Church grew with great rapidity even during the first century after its alliance with the State; of the boldness thus communicated to its individual Ministers, both in speech and action, some instances have been mentioned, and many might be added. Indeed, the mere existence of eighteen hundred magistrates (to speak of the Bishops only) who held their offices for life, over whose nomination the civil power had no direct control, who were connected by intimate relations with the people, and who, for the most part, were bound together by common opinions and principles and interests, was alone sufficient to establish a counterpoise against the weight of imperial despotism. In fact, under the uncertain sceptre of the successors of Constantine, it might have been difficult to moderate the progress of ecclesiastical power, had it not been checked and dissipated by the perpetual dissensions which divided the Church itself.

The same cause which restrained the vigour, polluted the character, of the Church; for being unable immediately to repress by its own spiritual weapons the violent animosities of its ministers, and impatient of the gradual influence of time and reason, in a dark and disastrous moment it had recourse to that temporal sword which was not intended for its service, and which it has never yet employed without disgrace or with impunity. Thus was it, indeed, a blind, if not suspicious affection, which led even the most orthodox Emperors to labour for the ‘Unity of the Church;’ since it was

* Paul of Samosata was the subject and favourite of Zenobia, and that Queen was engaged in hostile designs against the Roman empire at the time when Aurelian, on the solicitation of the Italian Bishops, deposed the heretic. Semler (*Observat. Novæ*, sec. iii. sec. lv.) seems to infer from this coincidence, that the whole accusation against Paul proceeded from political rather than from spiritual differences, which is not probable; but we so far agree with him as to attribute the interference of the Emperor entirely to that motive. It is an isolated fact in the history of the ante-Nicene Church, and probably only proves Aurelian's willingness to avail himself of *any* charge to punish a *magistrate* who was in favour with his enemy.

the unfailing effect of their measures to influence and nourish the intolerance of the ruling party, without entirely quenching even one among the thousand eternal fountains of dissent. We repeat that the most fatal consequence which has in any age resulted from the connexion between Church and State, is the application of the penalties of the one to the disorders of the other,—the correction of spiritual offences by temporal chastisements. But that abuse of the civil power is so far from being the necessary consequence of that connexion, that it is manifestly injurious to the interests of both; and since its wickedness and its folly have been exposed and acknowledged, there can now be no circumstances under which a wise government would employ such interference, or an enlightened priesthood desire it.

It has been observed that in the ante-Nicene Church the power of the Bishop was closely limited by that of the Presbytery of his diocese, though less so in the third, as it would seem, than in the preceding century. During the three following ages that restraint was gradually loosened, though not yet entirely cast away. The affairs of the diocese were still, in name at least, conducted ‘with the assent of the clergy’ (*cum assensu clericorum*); and their influence, in many places, was probably more than nominal. Still we cannot fail to observe that a higher and more independent authority was assumed by the Prelates; a broader interval was interposed between the different ranks of the hierarchy; the government lost most of the remains of its popular character, and assumed the form of an active and powerful aristocracy. Some of the causes of this change have been incidentally mentioned in the preceding pages; and among them we should particularly notice the prevalence of councils, both general and provincial, by which the public affairs of the Church were now regulated, and in which the only influential members were the Bishops*. The legislative authority thus exercised by the order, added to the judicial power which was vested in the individual, raised the prelacy to a necessary and legal pre-eminence before the next inferior grade of the ministry. It would appear, moreover, especially from the records of the fifth and sixth centuries, that the greater portion of the learning of those times was in possession of the episcopal order. Such reasons are sufficient to account for the aggrandizement of that order; while, at the same time, they show us, that the steps by which it rose were neither unlawful nor dishonourable. The change in the form of Church government naturally followed the change in other circumstances; and it would be unjust to qualify that as usurpation, which proceeded from causes independent of private interest or professional ambition. It is not denied that such motives may frequently have stimulated many to individual encroachment; but the elevation of the body was the natural effect of ecclesiastical, of political, and even of moral combinations.

Having observed in what respect the alteration in the general administration of the Church extended to the economy of its several dioceses, we shall shortly retrace some of those early vestiges of the monarchical form

* Fifteen Councils are recorded to have been held in France alone during the fourth, and five-and-twenty during the fifth century. The Bishops still attended as the deputies of their people, but Presbyters appear now to have been never present, unless as representatives of their Bishop. Many canons of the Councils of the fifth century (especially of that of Orange held in 441) declare that no Council shall ever separate without appointing the time of the next meeting. The ancient canonical regulation for meeting twice a year was still in force, but in those disturbed ages it was not easily observed. See Guizot, *Cours d'Histoire Moderne*, leçon iii.

of administration, which were already discernible during the rise and progress of the religious aristocracy; or, in other words, we shall search among the component parts of the episcopal system for some elements of the papal government. Before the establishment of the Church, notwithstanding one or two attempts at aggression on the part of Rome, which were immediately repelled, the various Sees were, without any acknowledged distinction, equal and independent. Thus far, at least, the Bishop of that city had no superiority, or even claim to superiority, above his brethren; and it was to the imperial dignity of his See that he owed any accidental and voluntary deference which may have been offered to him. The next circumstance, second in time and very considerable in influence, which contributed to his exaltation, was the name (for it was little more than the name) of Patriarch. This title was conferred first upon three, subsequently upon four, of the Prelates of the Eastern Church; but in the West it was confined to the Bishop of Rome: and the distinction was not without effect in creating, especially among the distant and the ignorant, that sort of blind and indefinite respect which is so easily converted into submission.

The next event which may be mentioned as having augmented the authority of the See was the removal of the civil government from Rome to Ravenna by Honorius. The domestic importance of the Bishop was essentially increased, and facilities for usurpation were created by the absence of the Emperor.

That which follows, perhaps, next in time (for we are disposed to place it towards the end of the fifth century), but which yields to none in importance, was the special protection vouchsafed by St. Peter to the same See, and at this time loudly asserted by it. While some have invented circumstantial fables respecting the marvellous success of that apostle in Italy and at Rome, others have advanced ingenious arguments to show that he never at all visited that city. To us, so far as any opinion can be formed on so obscure a matter, it appears probable that St. Peter died at Rome, as well as St. Paul; and during their previous residence there, it is not impossible that the one may have presided over the Jewish, while the other superintended the heathen, converts. But the question itself can now possess so little importance in the mind of any reasonable being, that we care not to leave it in uncertainty. However, it is undisputed, that in the fifth and the following ages a vast accession of honour and sanctity accrued to the See of Rome from its perseverance in that claim. In times when the particular protection of heaven was believed to attend the possession of the meanest relic of the most obscure martyr; when stupendous prodigies were performed by the fragment of the garment of some nameless saint, or the dust which had been brought from his tomb, was it strange that a peculiar impression of holiness should attach to that spot where the chief of the Apostles had suffered a barbarous death, and where his bones still lay unviolated in sacred repose? But this was not all—the martyr of Christ had been at the same time the Bishop of Rome; and the *keys* which had been confided to his inspired wisdom were still preserved, through a long and uninterrupted chain, to the Bishops his successors. Such assertions were first advanced about this period, or very soon afterwards; and it is one of the most certain proofs of the credit they obtained, that applications now began very commonly to be made, from many parts of Europe, for counsel or opinion, on points of discipline or faith to the Roman See. It might, indeed, not rarely happen, that its rescripts were not obeyed or respected; but still the appeal was becoming customary, and each suc-

cessive reference confirmed a practice which could not fail in time to give some *authority* to the decision. These are some of the leading circumstances which were so far improved by the genius of two among the Popes, and the perseverance of almost all, that, at the death of Gregory the Great, the Bishop of Rome, though he might in vain dispute the name or universal supremacy with the Patriarch of Constantinople, was unquestionably acknowledged to be the leading member of the ecclesiastical aristocracy of Europe, the spiritual head or president of the Western hierarchy*.

III. An account of the general changes which took place in the Church, during the two centuries between Grégory to Charlemagne, has been given in a preceding chapter; and in *From Gregory to Charlemagne.* respect to particular abuses in belief or discipline, it appears not that any remarkable novelty presented itself during this period. Among its leading features, we have observed, *first*, an increasing dissimilarity in character and institutions between the Eastern and Western Churches, which gradually loosened the bonds of their union, and prepared them for dissolution. The alterations which caused the distinction originated for the most part in the West, and are chiefly to be ascribed to the entire social revolution which was effected by the barbarian conquests: whereas, in the East, the undisputed supremacy of the civil power and the unvarying character of the government prevented any important innovations. They prevailed, indeed, to such an extent, that even the divisions which during this period disturbed the Oriental Communion,—those respecting the ‘two wills of Christ,’ and the ‘worship of images,’—received in both instances their first impulse from the throne. In the West the subdivision of the empire into numerous and variously-constituted kingdoms, the peculiar institutions, the superstitions and the ignorance of the people, opened an extensive field for ecclesiastical exertion. That many among the clergy availed themselves of these circumstances for personal or professional aggrandizement, the voice of history is ever forward to proclaim to us; but the private piety of the more numerous and obscure members of that order, who interposed, not ineffectually, their religious offices to alleviate the wretchedness and soften the barbarism of those dreary times, is slightly and incidentally recorded, though better deserving of celebrity, since its claims are on the gratitude of the latest posterity.

The *second* characteristic of this period (and we here confine ourselves to the Western Church) was the continued and even inordinate growth of episcopal authority. A great number of causes contributed to that result, some of which had been in continual operation since the establishment of Christianity; others had grown up in later ages. The most direct and effectual were the extensive and increasing domains of the Bishops; the judicial and even municipal power which they exercised in their metropolis; their political influence in the great national assemblies; the exclusive possession of a contracted learning, which still was mistaken for wisdom in an age nearly destitute of both. To these we may add the

* Still it is not asserted that his *authority* was generally acknowledged even in the West. Fleury (lib. xxxv. s. 19.) fairly admits that Gregory exercised no definite jurisdiction beyond the Churches which immediately depended on the Holy See, and were therefore called Suburbicarian (Giannon. Stor. di Nap. lib. ii. c. 8.) those of the South of Italy, Sicily, and some other islands. It is true that the Bishop of Arles was his vicar in Gaul, as that of Thessalonica was in Western Illyria; and that he exercised some inspection over the Churches of Africa for the assembling of Councils and the observation of the canons; but he possessed no ordinary official authority over those Churches, nor did they yet acknowledge any direct positive dependence on Rome.

removal of some restraints. The superintendence of the metropolitans was abolished, and it was supplied by no other; for the civil governments were then too weak and unstable to enforce a disputed authority, while that of the Pope was distant and indefinite, even where it was acknowledged to be rightful*. On the other hand, the degraded condition of the priesthood and the independence conferred on the prelate by the disuse of popular election, placed him above any apprehension of opposition or censure from the lower ranks of the clergy. And since the Councils, to whose legislation he was liable, were entirely composed of his own order, he had little reason to expect severity from that quarter. We have observed into what great license that unbridled episcopal power was carried.

Thirdly. The Bishop of Rome failed not to profit, at least in an equal degree, by the various causes which conspired to the exaltation of his brethren; and let us add to these, since we can add it with truth, that the conduct of the Popes during this period was for the most part such as inspired respect, and even commanded gratitude. If they were stained with the superstitions of the day, they lost nothing in popular opinion by that failing; born at Rome and at once elevated from the native priesthood, not translated from a foreign See, they began with some claims on the attachment of their subjects, and they maintained them by the severe and uncorrupted sanctity of their morals. But besides these circumstances, we should also recollect that two events occurred in the eighth century, which exclusively promoted the advancement of that See—the political separation of Rome from the Eastern empire, and the donation of Pepin. During the short republic which followed the former, the nations (as Gibbon has remarked) began once more ‘to seek, on the banks of the Tiber, the kings, the laws, and the oracles of their fate;’ and the solid power conferred by the latter, and confirmed by Charlemagne, did much more than compensate for the loss of a recent and precarious independence. Once more associated as a powerful member of the Western empire, Rome reoccupied the proper field of her ambition and her triumphs. It is true that the nature of her warfare, and the character of her weapons, were now wholly changed; nevertheless, the temporalities so profusely conferred upon her, failed not to give great additional efficacy to her spiritual claims—claims which she had already advanced with some boldness, but which she was now qualified to press, if disposed so to press them, to the last extremity of usurpation.

Before we take leave of this period, it is proper to mention, that the first appearance of the Creed, commonly called Athanasian, is ascribed to it with great probability.† There can be no doubt that this exposition of faith was composed in the West, and in Latin; but the exact date of its composition has been the subject of much difference. The very definite terms, in which it expresses the Church doctrine of the Incarnation, are sufficient to prove it posterior to the Councils of Ephesus

*The Athanasian
Creed.*

* It would scarcely appear, for instance, that the Pope had any official communication with the Church of Gaul between Gregory I. and Gregory II., *i. e.* for about a hundred and ten years. Yet the Bishop of Arles presided over that Church in the character, or rather under the name, of his Vicar. See Guizot, *Hist. de la Civil. de la France*, leçon xix.

† Bishop Pearson, Archbishop Usher, Hamond, L’Estrange, Dr. Cave, Schelstrate, Pagi, and Du Pin, are all of opinion that this creed was composed, not by Athanasius, but by a later and a Latin writer. Vossius, Quesnel, and others, go so far as to ascribe it to Vigilius Tapsensis, an African Bishop, who lived at the end of the fifth century. This last position, however, is not indisputable; though Vigilius certainly published some writings under the name of Athanasius, with which this creed is frequently joined.

sus and Chalcedon, or later than the middle of the fifth century. Again, if we are to consider the doctrine of the *double* procession of the Holy Spirit as being expressly declared in it since that mystery was scarcely made matter of public controversy until the eighth century, it might seem difficult to refer a creed, positively asserting the more recent doctrine, to an earlier age. But the historical monuments of the Church do not quite support this supposition; the Creed, such probably as it now exists, is mentioned by the Council of Autun* in the year 670, and its faithful repetition by the Clergy enjoined; and we find the same injunction repeated in the beginning of the ninth age. Thus it gradually gained ground; nevertheless, there seems to be great reason for the opinion, that it was not universally received even in the Western Church until nearly two centuries afterwards.

Considered as an exposition of doctrine, the Athanasian creed contains a faithful summary of the high mysteries of Christianity as interpreted by the Church of Rome. Considered as a rule of necessary faith enforced by the penalty of eternal condemnation, the same creed again expresses one of the most rigid principles of the same Church. The Unity of the Church comprehended unity of belief: there could be no salvation out of it; nor any hope for those who deviated even from the most mysterious among its tenets. And thus, by constant familiarity with the declaration of an exclusive faith, the heart of many a Romish priest may have been closed against the sufferings of the heretic, rescued (as he might think) by the merciful chastisement of the Church from the flames which are never quenched!

It would be irrelevant in this work, and wholly unprofitable, to inquire, how far any temporary circumstances may have justified the introduction of the Athanasian creed into the Liturgy of our own Church—constructed as that Church is on the very opposite principle of universal charity. But we cannot forbear to offer one remark, naturally suggested by the character and history of this creed, that if, at any future time, it, should be judged expedient to expunge it, there is no reason, there is scarcely any prejudice, which could be offended by such erasure. † The sublime truths which it contains are not expressed in the language of Holy Scripture; nor could they possibly have been so expressed, since the inspired writers were not studious minutely to expound inscrutable mysteries. Neither can it plead any

* ‘Siquis Presbyter, Diaconus, Subdiaconus, vel Clericus, Symbolum, quod inspirante S. Spiritu Apostoli tradiderant, vel *Fidem S. Athanasii Præsulis* irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit ab Episcopo condemnetur.’ Conc. Augustodun. Can. ult., as cited by Bingham. At a Council, held at Toledo in 675, an exposition of this Trinitarian doctrine was published, very nearly resembling that contained in the Athanasian Creed. (Semler. Cent. vii. cap. iii.) In 794 Theodulphus Aurelianensis again mentions the Creed as Athanasius’s.

† The opinions of some of our own Churchmen on this subject, are collected by Clarke in his Book on the Trinity. The expression of Bishop Tomline cannot be too generally known—‘We know (he says) that different persons have deduced different and even opposite doctrines from the words of Scripture, and consequently there must be many errors among Christians; but since the Gospel nowhere informs us what degree of error will exclude from eternal happiness, I am ready to acknowledge that in my judgment, notwithstanding the authority of former times, our Church would have acted more wisely and more consistently with its general principles of mildness and toleration, if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. Though I firmly believe that the doctrines themselves of this Creed are all founded in Scripture, I cannot but conceive it to be both unnecessary and presumptuous to say, that “except every one do keep them whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.”’ Exposition, part iii. art. viii.

sanctity from high antiquity or even traditional authority; since it was composed many centuries after the time of the apostles, in a very corrupt age of a corrupt Church, and composed in so much obscurity, that the very pen from which it proceeded is not certainly known to us. The inventions of men, when they have been associated for ages with the exercise of religion, should indeed be touched with respect and discretion; but it is a dangerous error to treat them as inviolable; and it is something worse than error to confound them in holiness and reverence with the words and things of God.

IV. There are two subjects which we have hitherto refrained from noticing, notwithstanding their great importance—the Jurisdiction and Judicial Immunities of the Clergy, and the Revenues of the Church. We have purposely deferred them until this occasion; because both were deeply influenced by the ecclesiastical policy of Charlemagne; and the former can scarcely be said to have assumed any definite or tangible form before his reign. United, they constituted the temporal power of the Clergy; and that object will be so constantly before our eyes in the future pages of this History, that we must no longer delay to examine the materials which formed it.

The arbitrate of the Primitive Bishops was tolerated or overlooked by the Pagan Emperors; if it received no direct discouragement from the civil power, it was never aided nor even recognized by it. It reached of course only those who voluntarily sought it, and was binding upon none who chose to appeal from it to the secular courts. The ecclesiastical offences of Bishops were subject to the decision of provincial councils; but in respect to all temporal matters, they were on the same footing with the other subjects of the empire.

The arbitration of the Bishops was ratified by Constantine; and the magistrates were instructed to execute the episcopal decrees*. At the same time it seems certain that this power was for some time confined (1.) to spiritual differences and offences; (2.) to such questions of a temporal nature as were brought before the Bishop by the joint reference of both parties; (3.) to civil suits, in which both parties were Clerks. And it is even probable, that, in the second of these, the decision of the Bishop was then liable to an appeal to the civil tribunals. The succeeding Emperors, for nearly two hundred years, were contented to publish such occasional edicts, as seem rather intended to check any encroachments by which the ecclesiastical privileges may have gained or suffered, than to alter the nature of the laws on that subject. For instance, in the year 398, Honorius proclaimed that it was permitted to those who desired it, to plead before the Bishop, but in civil matters only; and in 408, he ordered the arbitrate sentence of the Bishop to be executed without appeal to the civil officers. In 456, Marcian ordained, that a plaintiff who should object to bring a Clerk before the Archbishop had no resource, except to summon him before the Prætorian Prefect, which he might do. In 452, Valentinian III. declared, that the Bishop had no power to judge even Clerks, unless by their own consent, and in virtue of a compromise; because ecclesiastics had no tribunal established by law, nor any legal cognizance, except of religious matters. There were constitutions of Arcadius and Honorius and of

* Gibbon (who quotes Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 27; and Sozom. i. 9) has treated this subject in his twentieth chapter; but in the following account we have chiefly followed Fleury, in his Seventh Discourse; and Giannone, Storia di Napoli, l. ii. c. 8; l. iii. c. 6; l. vi. c. 7.

Theodosius to the same effect. Thus far, then, it seems clear, that the Episcopal Courts (if we are to give them that name) possessed no coercive authority over laymen, nor indeed any which could properly be designated jurisdiction.

The first change was introduced by Justinian; and it is important to observe exactly to what extent it went. That legislator, willing to enlarge the privileges of the Church, enacted (1.), That in Civil actions Monks and Clerks should, in the first instance, go before the Bishop, who should decide the difference without any publicity or judicial parade; still, if either party, within ten days, declared himself discontented with the decision, that the civil magistrate should take cognizance of the cause, not as a superior, in form of appeal, but as an equal, examining a new question. Their agreement was conclusive; if they differed, an appeal was open to the Imperial court. (2.) In criminal causes a Clerk might be sued either before the Bishop or in the ordinary Courts; but if the defendant should be found guilty by a lay judge, still the sentence could not be executed, nor the priest degraded, without the approbation of the Bishop. In case that was refused, there was a direct appeal to the Emperor. (3.) The Bishops were entirely exempted from lay jurisdiction. It may seem scarcely necessary to add, that all cognizance of spiritual matters, from the crime of Heresy down to what were held the more venial offences of Simony, clerical insubordination, and even the violation of the ecclesiastical discipline *by laymen*, was confided, as it had always been, to the unrestricted authority of the Church. Still we should observe, that as temporal power was yet entrusted to the spiritual judges for the enforcement of their sentence, the penalties which they could immediately inflict were censure, suspension, deposition, fasting, penance, excommunication—penalties which, in those ages, not only inspired terror, but involved much positive suffering—but to touch the person or property of the culprit the aid of the secular authority was still necessary.

After the time of Justinian, we are not informed that any material change was introduced into this department of the constitution of the Eastern Church; in fact and practice it is not probable that the Clergy then encroached with any success on the civil, which was so nearly identified with the imperial, power, and which at all times was jealously maintained. In the West, during the period of dark confusion which divided Justinian from Charlemagne, some additions were made to the immunities of the Clergy in most of the provinces, and especially in Gaul; but neither were these universally acknowledged, nor securely enjoyed; and it was not till the great restorer of the Western Empire had leisure to legislate for the happiness (as he believed) of his subjects, that the character of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and immunity was wholly and permanently altered. Charlemagne voluntarily conceded to the Church (1.) that the jurisdiction of the Bishop should extend to all causes which either of the parties, whether Clerks or not, chose to refer to it, and that there should be no appeal from his decision*; (2.) that the whole body of the Clergy should be entirely exempt from secular jurisdiction. The enormous extent of power † conferred by the first of these Capitularies was confirmed

* The testimony of one bishop was received in every cause as conclusive.

† By the Council held at Arles in 813, the edicts of which were confirmed by Charlemagne, it was ordained, "that, if judges and people in power do not pay deference to the bishop's instructions, he shall give information thereof to the king. All the people shall obey the bishop, even the counts and judges; and they shall act in concert for the maintenance of peace and justice." See Fleury, H. E. l. 46, sect. ii.

by the right of imprisonment (the *Jus Carceris*), which was also granted to the episcopal Judge; so that the means which he thus possessed of executing his own decisions, rendered him, in a great degree, independent of the civil authorities. The effect of the second was to widen the distinction, already too broad, which subsisted between Clerks and Laymen, and to increase the distrust with which the sacred orders already began to be regarded, by entirely withdrawing their offences from the cognizance of secular justice. It seems, indeed, to be true, that Charlemagne thus granted to the Clergy both greater power and greater immunity, than the existing state of society permitted them to exert or enjoy. Such, nevertheless, were become their rights; and in so far as the mere possession of them was the object of the struggles which they maintained in after ages, we cannot justly censure them. Neither ought we to forget, that a different, and even a more solid groundwork of judicial authority began to fall into their occupation during this period. Many of the Sees were already enriched with large territorial endowments, and consequently exercised all the rights in those days annexed to them; and not the least valuable among these was the administration of justice. By this circumstance the character of the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction became inextricably complicated; and the lines, by which it was separated from the authority of the civil tribunals, were rendered so indistinct even where they really existed, that incessant and unavoidable occasions were afforded for artful encroachment on the one hand, and violent aggression on the other. But these were the evils of after ages; the design of Charlemagne was probably no more, than to vest extensive judicial power in the most enlightened body in his empire; and no doubt he trusted to prevent its abuse by the vigorous exercise of his own supremacy.

— In the mean time, while the Episcopal order was thus generally strengthened and aggrandized, the particular interests of the Bishop of Rome were especially promoted. Adrian I., a man of great talents and much influence with the French King, occupied the Papal Chair at this crisis; and while he profited, as he was justified in doing, by the voluntary and legitimate donations of that Monarch, he also adopted (as some historians think) a less ingenuous method of exalting his own See. So much, at least, is certain, that two instruments, now denominated the ‘False Decretals,’ and the ‘Donation of Constantine,’ the two most celebrated monuments of human imposture and credulity, were put forth about the conclusion of the eighth century, and immediately and universally received as genuine. Probably they were the composition of some monk or scribe of that age*. Their direct object was the unlimited advancement of the Roman See; and for that purpose, the Decretals furnished the spiritual, the donation the temporal, authority; the former, professing to be a compilation of the epistles and decrees of primitive Popes and early Emperors, derived from the first ages the ghostly omnipotence of Rome†.

* See Mosh. Cent. viii. p. ii. chap. ii. The former of these forgeries is frequently called the ‘Decretals of Isidore.’ There was a celebrated Bishop of Seville of that name in the sixth century, and it was probably thought, that it would add some authority to the *Collection*, if it could be received as his work. But, unfortunately, it contains some mention of the Sixth General Council, which was later than the death of that Isidore. The clumsiness of the fabrication is acknowledged and exposed by Fleury, liv. xlv. sect. 22.

† The false Decretals advanced to this end, to the great detriment both of Church and State, chiefly by three methods: (1.) They diminished the frequency of provincial councils by asserting for the Pope the exclusive right to summon them; and those councils contributed very usefully both to the discipline and independence of the Church. (2.) They gave great encouragement to Episcopal license by subjecting the Bishops to Papal

While the latter proclaimed no less than that Constantine, on removing the seat of government to the East, had consigned the Western Empire to the temporal as well as spiritual government of the Bishop of Rome—unbounded dominion over Churches, and nations, and kings, was delegated to the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ. It was asserted that the original deed of the Emperor had been recently discovered: the monstrous forgery went forth, and spread itself through the world without confutation, seemingly without suspicion; and it continued for above six hundred years to form the most prominent, and not the least solid, among the bulwarks of Papacy.

If, indeed, Charlemagne shared in this matter the credulity of his subjects, we may reasonably infer the very narrow extent of his own learning, and his little familiarity with the annals of the preceding ages. That he did so is not impossible; at least, it appears certain, that his capitulary respecting Episcopal jurisdiction was in part founded on another forgery—a Constitution which was for many ages attached, under the name of Constantine, to the Theodosian Code, but which has long been condemned as a production of the eighth or preceding century. The credit of this preliminary fraud may have emboldened its patrons to make a more audacious attempt on his facility. Upon the whole, however, we are very far from attributing so decided a course of policy in so great a Prince to the success of an ecclesiastical imposture. Without any knowledge of the pretensions or existence of those fabrications, these were reasons sufficient why Charlemagne should be willing to aggrandize a Prelate whose interests were closely connected with his own; and to propitiate an order* of which the power was very considerable, and the influence still greater than the power; from which he was receiving and expecting eminent personal as well as political services; which he considered as a counterpoise to the licentiousness of his nobles, and to which he looked for the gradual improvement and civilization of his subjects. It should be remembered, too, that during the whole of his long reign he maintained the royal authority indisputably paramount to every other, and that if his posterity, some of whom were the feeblest of the human race, had inherited any share of his talent or vigour, the subsequent usurpations of the Clergy could not have been accomplished, and might not have been meditated; while the advantages, which Charlemagne reasonably anticipated for the State from their subordinate co-operation with the Prince, would have been certainly and splendidly realized.

V. During the three first centuries the clergy were supported by the voluntary oblations of the faithful; these were, in the first instance, daily or weekly: they were offered on the altar, and for the most part by communicants. This example led at an early period to the payment of monthly offerings, which were placed in the treasury of the Church. ‘Every one’

authority only, and thus offering them a fair prospect of impunity. (3.) They disturbed the course, and diverted the efficacy, of justice, by promoting the practice of appeal to the Roman See.

* The increase of Papal power was very fairly balanced *within* the Church by the general augmentation of Episcopal authority and influence which accompanied it. The entire Ecclesiastical body was exceedingly aggrandized, but in such measure that the head did not immediately exceed the proportion of the other principal members. It is true that, by the seeds then sown, the disease of after ages was engendered; but time was required to give them efficacy, and during the century which followed Charlemagne, the power of the Bishops, or (as they called it) their *independence*, was boldly and not uncommonly asserted.

(says Tertullian*) 'brings a moderate contribution once a month, or when he chooses, and only if he chooses and is able; for there is no compulsion, but the gift is spontaneous—being, as it were, the deposit of piety.' The sums which were thus presented by the generous devotion of the converts, and which, in the third century at least, were far from inconsiderable, were entrusted to the administration of the Bishop; and employed in the maintenance of the clergy†, in the support of public worship, in the relief of widows and orphans, and persons suffering persecution. It also appears, that, before the reign of Diocletian, the Church had become possessed of some fixed property, which that Emperor confiscated; we do not learn whether it was obtained by purchase or donation‡; in either case it must have borne a very trifling proportion to the revenues derived from customary oblation.

Constantine restored and confirmed to the Church such property as it had acquired under the heathen Emperors, and then enacted laws to permit and encourage its increase. Thus the sources of ecclesiastical wealth were varied and multiplied, and the work which was begun by Constantine was somewhat advanced by his immediate successors. Occasional allowances were advanced from the exchequer; the estates of martyrs and confessors dying without heirs were settled on the Church; presently those of all clergymen so dying were similarly disposed of§; and while some Princes transferred to the Christian establishment the temples of the Heathen and their revenues, there were others who extended the same principle to the Churches of the heretics. At the same time, the original oblations continued to be abundantly supplied; and a still broader field was opened by the general and unlimited permission which was given to bestow real property upon the Church, both by donation and legacy. The disposition not uncommonly existing to act on that permission was encouraged by the baser portion of the clergy; and their persuasions were sometimes conducted with so little decency, that it became necessary to impose a legal restraint || upon

* Apolog. c. 29. His words are these—'Neque pretio ulla res Dei constat. Etiam siquod Arcæ genus est, non de oneraria summa quasi redemptæ religionis congregatur: modicam unusquisque *stipem* menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo velit et si modo possit, apponit. Nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt.' The term (*stipem*) is borrowed from the use of the heathen in the collections made by them for religious purposes. Tertullian proceeds to enumerate several charitable objects to which the Christian offerings were applied. 'Egenis alendis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re et parentibus destitutis, ætateque domitis senibus, item naufragis et si qui in metallis et si qui in insulis vel in custodiis duntaxat ex causa Dei sectæ alumni confessionis suæ fiunt.'

† The monthly salaries given to the Ministers of the Gospel are mentioned by Cyprian by the name of *Mensuræ Divisiones*.

‡ Padre Paolo (Hist. Eccles. Benefices) ascribes it to donations made during the confusion which prevailed in the empire after the imprisonment of Valerian, when the general Roman law, which forbade the bequeathing of real estates to any college, society, or corporation, without the approbation of the Senate or the Prince, may have been violated with safety.

§ The former by a law of Constantine, the latter by one of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. See Bingham's *Antiq.* book v. ch. iv.

|| There is a remarkable law of Valentinian (made in 370, and particularly addressed to Damasus, Bishop of Rome), which forbids Churchmen to frequent the houses of widows and orphans, or to receive any gifts, directly or indirectly, by will or donation, from women to whom they might have attached themselves under pretext of religion. 'Ecclesiastici aut ex ecclesiasticis viduarum et pupillorum domus non adeant, sed publicis exterminentur judiciis, si eos affines eorum vel propinqui putaverint deferendos. Censemus etiam ut memorati nihil de ejus mulieris, cui se privatim sub pretextu religionis adjunxerint, liberalitate quacunque vel extremo judicio possint adipisci, et omne in tantum inefficax sit quod alicui horum ab his fuerit derelictum, ut nec per subjectam personam valeant aliquid v'

their cupidity. Nevertheless, in spite of occasional interruption, the tide flowed onward; the partial derelictions of the ecclesiastical body were forgotten in their general power, their dignity, and their virtues*; and, before the close of the fifth century, the Church had very amply profited by the pious generosity of the faithful.

The increase of the ecclesiastical revenues was further aided by certain exemptions granted to the clergy by the first Christian Emperors. These, though not so general as some have supposed, were numerous and important. It appears certain that Church lands were liable to the ordinary tax (*census agrorum*) or canonical tribute†; and also, that they continued subject after donation to all burdens which might have been previously charged upon them; but a law of Theodosius II. exempted them from all extraordinary impositions. Moreover, ecclesiastics were not liable, even from the time of Constantine, to the *census capitum* or capitation tax; they were also excepted (by Honorius and Theodosius II.) from the payment of a number of occasional imposts, many of which are specified by Bingham; and it was not a trifling privilege, even in a pecuniary view, that they were relieved from the discharge of all the civil offices of whatsoever degree, which were attached to the possession of fixed property. So studious were those early princes to observe the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal character, and, while they prevented the encroachments of the clergy on that which did not belong to them, to give them the full benefit of that which was peculiarly their own.

The ancient manner of dispensing the revenues of the Church was for some time maintained without any remarkable alteration. All alms and incomes arising from real‡ estates were yet in common, under the immediate care of Deacons and Subdeacons, but under the control and at the discretion of the Bishop, who ordered all the distributions. The whole of the clergy in every Church was maintained from the general funds of that Church; and in many places we find that great multitudes of poor were nourished by the same resources.

We are not informed that any material change in the application of its revenues at any time took place in the Eastern Church; and we may even

donatione vel testamento recipere.' (*Lege 20. Cod. Theod. de Episc. et Eccles.*) This was presently (in 390) followed by another to the same effect, but more generally expressed. The former would not seem to preclude gifts to the Church, as a body, only to individual ministers; the latter goes so far as to ordain 'nullam Ecclesiam, nullum Clericum, nullum pauperem scribat hæredes.' We may here also observe, that Charlemagne made a law to prevent the Church from receiving any gifts which disinherited children and kindred. See Padre Paolo, ch. vi.

* The most pious among the Fathers raised their voices very early against the practice of making over fixed property to the Church. St. Chrysostom (*Homil. 86 in Matth.*) attributes the great corruption of the Bishops and other Churchmen to the possession of lands and fixed revenues; since they forsook their spiritual occupations to sell their corn and wine, to increase the value of their property, or to defend it in courts of law. He looks back with admiration on the Apostolical purity of the Church, when it was nourished only by oblation and charity. It is likewise related of St. Augustin, that he would neither purchase land, nor even accept inheritances which were left to the Church; also maintaining, that the system of oblation and tithe would be better calculated to preserve the peculiar character of the clergy. P. Simon observes that the possession of any great wealth was for a long time confined to the Churches of the principal cities. The opulence of the Bishop of Rome, as mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus (*lib. xxvii.*), must have been derived almost entirely from oblation; but towards the end of the sixth century we find that Prelate in enjoyment of ample 'Patrimonies,' not in Italy only, but far beyond its limits. See Fleury, *liv. xxxv. sect. 15.*

† See Bingham, book v. ch. iii.

‡ See Padre Paolo, *Eccles. Benef. ch. vi.*

be allowed to doubt, whether its property received any very great augmentation after the fifth or sixth century. At least such increase was incessantly watched by a powerful and jealous Sovereign*; and the political revolutions, which finally raised the hierarchy of the West to such inordinate opulence, extended neither in act nor influence beyond the Adriatic. The prevalence of the monastic spirit did not fail, indeed, to create new establishments, enriched by new endowments; but even that spirit, after two or three centuries from the days of St. Basil, blazed with little comparative ardour in the East, where it was neither renovated by perpetual reformations, nor nourished and diversified by the interested patronage of Papacy.

But in the West, the confusion introduced by the invaders made it necessary, even in the fifth century, to legislate more expressly respecting the revenues of the Church. It was discovered that the confidence, placed from the earliest ages in the discretion of the Bishop, was now occasionally abused, and began to require the restraint of some canonical regulations. It was, therefore, ordained about the year 470† that the revenue should be divided into four parts; the first for the Bishop, the second for the rest of the Clergy, the third for the fabric of the Church, the fourth for the poor. The duties of hospitality, which included the entertainment of indigent strangers, were annexed to the Episcopal office. This distribution related only to the income of the several Churches: the funds whence they proceeded, whether immoveables, oblations, or alms, continued, as heretofore, the common property of the body. In the mean time, it would be incorrect to suppose that the above division was necessarily made into four equal portions: the great variation in the number of the clergy and of the poor, in the size and splendour of the fabrics, in the extent of the diocese, must have subjected so very broad a rule to very frequent modification.

During the tumultuous ages which followed, it is asserted, without any improbability, that the bishops and clergy in many places enlarged their own portions to the neglect of the sacred buildings and the destitution of the poor; that the minister frequently converted to his own use the offerings deposited in his own church; and, in some places, that the lands themselves were divided for the usufruct of particular individuals. These innovations may have gained footing insensibly at different times, in different places; and the last was ultimately absorbed in that great change in the nature and distribution of church property which was introduced by the system of feudalities.

Those estates, which the Franks and Lombards called Fiefs, were, by the Latins, designated *Beneficia*, as being held by the bounty of the Prince. This term was originally confined to baronial or military tenures, and thence it afterwards passed into the service of the church. To the endow-

* At an early period stewards were appointed to superintend the temporalities of the Churches, and were chosen by the Bishop. But as abuses were found to proceed from this arrangement, the Council of Chalcedon decreed, that the stewards should for the future be chosen from among the clergy, and that the administration of the revenues should no longer be left in the power of the Bishop. That office became afterwards so considerable in the Church of Constantinople, that the Emperors took from the clergy the nomination of the stewards into their own hands. This practice lasted till the time of Isaac Comnenus, who remitted that right to the discretion of the Patriarch. See P. Simon's History of Ecclesiastical Revenues.

† We follow the probable conclusion of Padre Paolo, without being ignorant that this division has been sometimes ascribed to Pope Sylvester (who lived one hundred and fifty years before), on the faith of some writings falsely attributed to him.

ments of sees or churches, in those times so commonly made by princes, the word 'Benefice' was applied, perhaps without impropriety; it was easily extended to such dignities as were conferred by the bishops with the permission of the princes; and thus it became common to all the separate portions of the ecclesiastical estates. These alterations, though not completed till a much later period*, were in gradual process during the seventh and eighth centuries; in the mean time the territorial possessions of the Church were spreading widely; and they had already swelled to a bulk too great for their security, when Charlemagne ascended the throne of the Western empire.

Some portion of those possessions was unquestionably acquired by methods disgraceful to individual churchmen, or through the corruptions of the Church itself; and this was more especially the case (for reasons which we have already given) in the Latin communion. As to the former means—the gross ignorance of the barbarian conquerors, and their hereditary reverence for the ministers of religion, offered irresistible temptation to the astute avarice of the French and Italian clergy: for thus, besides that general abuse of spiritual influence for the spoliation of weak, or superstitious, or dying persons, which was common to them with their Eastern brethren, peculiar facilities and invitations to imposture were almost pressed upon them by the popular credulity. The efficacy of gifts to expiate offences was a profitable principle, for which the minds of the converts were already prepared by their previous prejudices: the wild rapacity of the savage is usually associated with reckless profusion; and we cannot doubt that many individuals of the sacred order successfully availed themselves of dispositions so favourable to their own temporal interests. Respecting the corruptions of the Church, it would probably be too much to assert, that masses for the release of souls and the fruitful fable of Purgatory were actually *invented* for the purpose of enriching that body; but we need not hesitate to assign that among the leading causes of the encouragement which was given to them. The pernicious swarm of superstitious practices, such as the worship of images, the adoration of Saints, and, above all, the demoralizing custom of pilgrimage †, was nourished and multiplied principally with that object; and the state of the Church at that period affords just grounds for the melancholy reflection, that the grossest perversions of religious truth were carefully fostered, if they were not actually produced, by the most sordid of human motives.

* Some footsteps of the foundations of Benefices and the right of patronage may perhaps be discovered in the 10th Canon of the First Council of Orange, held in 441:—'But the custom of that time (as P. Simon remarks) was far different from the present practice.' Again, about the year 500, under Pope Symmachus, it appears that to some Churchmen portions of land were assigned to be enjoyed by them for life; this appears from an Epistle of that Pope to Cæsarius, where he prohibits the alienation of Church lands, unless it should be in favour of Clerks meriting such reward—'nisi Clericis honorem meritis, aut Monasteriis, religionis intuitu, aut certe peregrinis necessitas largiri suaserit—sic tamen ut hæc ipsa non perpetuo, sed temporaliter, donec vixerint, perfruantur.' But the establishment of the modern system of Benefices is not commonly referred to an earlier period than the end of the tenth, or the beginning of the eleventh century.

† Pilgrimages, chiefly to the shrines of St. Peter at Rome, and St. Martin at Tours, were, in the eighth age, so common, that it is made a matter almost of reproach to Charlemagne himself (by his historian Eginhart), that in the course of his long reign he had undertaken only four. The Council of Chalons (in 813) acknowledges the *abuses* of pilgrimage. 'The clergy pretend thereby to purge themselves from sin, and to be restored to their functions; the laity to acquire impunity for sins past or future; the powerful convert them into a pretext of extortion, the poor of mendicity. Still, we praise the devotion of those, who, to accomplish the penance which their priest has imposed on them, make such pilgrimages accompanied by prayer, alms, and correction of morals.' Fleury, H. E., l. xlvi., sect. v.

The Monastic orders did not lag behind their secular competitors in the race of avarice; it appears indeed that a great proportion of the rewards, at least during the seventh and eighth centuries, flowed into their establishments; and though their members did not possess the same facilities of private acquisition, the communities have obtained their full share of the profits of ecclesiastical corruption in all ages of the Church.

It would be unjust, however, to suppose that any very material part of the property of the Church was amassed by the shameful methods which we have mentioned; they have contributed, indeed, somewhat to swell its treasures and greatly to soil its reputation; but the most solid, and by far the largest portion of its riches was derived from sources not only lawful but honourable. The most abundant of these was the pious or politic munificence of those Princes who employed the Clergy as the means of improving, or of governing, their people. Such were extremely common during the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries; and the respect and preference which they thus demonstrated for the sacred order, evince its moral as well as intellectual superiority over other classes of their subjects. Again, the voluntary donations of wealthy individuals were not always made from superstitious hope or idle persuasion; but much more frequently, because the Church was the only channel through which the charity of the rich could effectually relieve the poor. This object was connected with many even of the earliest donations, and is conspicuous in the numerous monuments of the eighth and ninth centuries*; and the large sums which were thus entrusted to religious persons or establishments for that purpose, while they multiplied and maintained the indigent dependents of the Church, became the safest and the noblest ground of its influence and popularity. Again, a great proportion of the territorial endowments of the cathedrals and monasteries consisted of unappropriated and uncultivated lands: These were gradually brought to fertility by the superior skill and industry of their new possessors; and they thus acquired the most substantial right of possession by labours which were beneficial to society. Lastly—the abundance of some establishments and the economy of others frequently enabled the community to amass sums which were expended from time to time in the purchase of additional estates. These were annexed to the original patrimony; and since, in the general insecurity of property prevailing in turbulent ages, there were few individuals who exercised foresight or economy, these virtues, almost peculiar to the ecclesiastical establishments, were a sure and effective instrument of their prosperity.

On the other hand, they were peculiarly exposed to the evils of that turbulence, both by their wealth and their defencelessness. Amidst the tumults of unsettled governments and uncivilized society, what had been lavished by the bounty of one was frequently torn away by the rapacity of another; and not the nobles only, and other powerful subjects engaged in the work of spoliation, but even princes † would sometimes reward their greedy followers by grants of Church property. By such injustice its increasing dimensions were restrained; and if we have sufficient reason to lament

* See Muratori's Dissert. xxxvii. De Hospitalibus, &c.; and also his lvith, De Religione per Italiam, post ann. 500.

† Charles Martel, for instance, very amply compensated his military followers for their successful defence of Christianity by the monasteries and other ecclesiastical endowments, which he distributed among them. He thus incurred the indignation of St. Ponce; but as to the celebrated vision of Pulcherius, there seems great reason to doubt whether the Bishop did not *precede* the Prince in the race of mortality. See Baron. apud Selden, ch. v.

that the means by which it was acquired were not *all* without reproach, there may at least be room for reasonable doubt, whether, upon the whole, the Church did not suffer as much by violence as it gained by fraud, in ages equally favourable to the exercise of both.

There is another source of ecclesiastical wealth which we have not yet mentioned, because it acquired no certain existence before the reign of Charlemagne—the possession of Tithes; but it is here proper to employ a few sentences on that subject. It seems quite clear that no sort of tithe was paid to the ante-Nicene Church, nor imposed by any of its councils, nor even directly claimed by its leading ministers. The Levitical institution is indeed mentioned both by Cyprian and Origen; by the former * slightly and almost incidentally; by the latter with rather more fulness †, in a homily respecting the first-fruits in the law. But even Origen goes no farther in his conclusion, than ‘that the command concerning the *first fruits* of corn and cattle should still be observed according to the letter;’ and we have no evidence to persuade us that even that limited position was carried into general practice.

In the records of Constantine’s generosity to the new establishment there is no mention made of tithes: nevertheless, the expressions both of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine on this subject forbid us to doubt, that such payment was voluntarily, though perhaps very partially made, at least in the Western Church, before the end of the fourth century. St. Ambrose boldly claims it as due by the law of God—‘It is not enough that we bear the name of Christians, if we do not Christian works: the Lord exacts of us the annual tithe of all our corn, cattle,’ &c. &c. ‘Whosoever is conscious that he hath not faithfully given his tithes, let him supply what is deficient; and what *is* the faithful payment of tithes, except to offer to God neither more nor less than that portion, whether of your corn or your wine, or the fruit of your trees, or your cattle, or of the produce of your garden, your business, or your hunting? Of all substance which God has given to man, he has reserved the tenth part to himself, and, therefore, man may not retain that which God has appropriated to his own use.’ St. Augustine, in a homily on that subject, presses the same right to the same extent ‡, in terms not less positive; with this difference, however, that he puts forward more zealously the charitable purpose of the institution. About the same time St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome added their exhortations to the same effect, though they did not specify so exactly the nature of the contribution, nor insist so strongly on the divine obligation. There can be no question that the exertions of individual ministers effectually influenced the more devout amongst their listeners, especially in the Western nations, and in somewhat later ages: accord-

* Epist. 66. De Unitat. Eccles. sec. xxiii. In the former place he is reproaching one Geminus Faustinus, a priest, for having undertaken the discharge of a secular office—‘*quæ nunc ratio et forma in Clero tenetur, ut qui in Ecclesia Domini ad ordinationem Clericalem promoventur, nullo modo ab administratione divina avocentur, sed, in honore sportulantium fratrum, tanquam Decimas ex fructibus accipientes ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant. . . .*’ In the latter, while deploring the lukewarm devotion of the faithful, he complains, ‘*at nunc de patrimonio nec decimas damus.*’ See Selden, chap. 4.

† This may surprise those historians who distinguish Origen from the *Church* writers, and exalt him accordingly. Had Cyprian published a homily to inculcate the divine obligation of paying first-fruits to the priest, he would have been stigmatized as the most avaricious (he is already denounced as the most ambitious) among those early churchmen.

‡ Quodcumque te pascit ingenium Dei est; et inde decimas expetit unde vivis; de militia, de negotio, de artificio redde decimas; aliud enim pro terra dependimus, aliud pro usura vitæ pensamus. Selden appears to share in a doubt which has been raised, whether the Homily in question be really the production of Augustin.

ingly we find that in sundry places Tithes * were paid both to monasteries, to the poor, and to the clergy, by many pious individuals during the four centuries which followed. It has also been asserted (though the evidence is not sufficiently clear) that they already engaged the attention, and even claimed the authority, of one or two provincial † councils. Moreover, it seems probable, that some special endowments of them were made on particular Churches before the time of Charlemagne, though these were few in number, and scarcely earlier than the end of the seventh age. But, on the other hand, it is unquestionably certain that no canon or other law for the purpose of compelling the payment of tithes was generally received before the concluding part of the eighth century. The offerings hitherto contributed under that name were made in compliance with the doctrine which pleaded the divine right, or with the precepts, or perhaps even with the practice of particular Churches, but they were not yet exacted either by civil or ecclesiastical legislation—not even in the West; and in the Eastern Church we have not observed that any law has at any time been promulgated on this subject.

The first strictly legislative act which conferred on the clergy the right to tithe was passed by Charlemagne. In the year 778, the eleventh of his reign over France and Germany, in a general assembly of estates, both spiritual and temporal, held under him, it was ordained, ‘That every one should give his tenth, and that it should be disposed of according to the orders of his bishop †.’ Other constitutions to the same effect were afterwards published by the same prince, and repeated and confirmed by some of his descendants; they were iterated by the canons of numerous provincial councils ‡, and re-echoed from the pulpits of France and Italy. Nevertheless, it was found exceedingly difficult to enforce them †. The

* These may not have been in fact exactly tenths, but some indefinite proportion of things titheable, varying according to the abundance or devotion of the contributor.

† We refer particularly to Selden’s 5th chap., and his remarks on the Council of Maçon (in 586). Thomassin (*Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, P. III. l. i. c. vi.) presses the authority of the Second Council of Tours. At any rate the prelates on that occasion proceeded no farther than exhortation—commonemus,—these of Maçon decree—statuimus et decernimus.

‡ *Ut unusquisque suam decimam donet; atque per jussionem Episcopi sui (or Pontificis, as some copies read) dispensetur.* This must be understood with some limitation, since the tripartite division of tithes seems to be properly ascribed to Charlemagne; that of one share for the bishop, and clergy, a second for the poor, a third for the fabric of the Church. It seems uncertain what part of these was at first intended for the maintenance of a *resident* clergy. Parochial divisions, such as they now exist, were still not very common, though they may be traced to the endowment of churches by individuals as early as the time of Justinian. The rural churches were, in the first instance, chapels dependent on the neighbouring cathedral, and were served by itinerant ministers of the bishop’s appointment. It was some time before any of them obtained the privileges of baptism and burial; but these were indeed accompanied by a fixed share of the tithes, and appear to have implied in each case the independence of the Church and the residence of a minister.

§ The celebrated Council of Francfort (in 794) published a canon for the universal payment of tithes, besides the rents due to the Church for benefices. See Fleury, l. xlv. s. lx. and Thomassin, P. III. l. i. cap. vii.

|| There is an epistle of Alcuin, in which he exhorts his master not yet to impose upon the tender faith of his new converts, the Saxons and Huns, what he calls the ‘yoke of tithes.’ The passage deserves citation—‘*Vestra sanctissima pietas sapienti consilio prævideat, si melius sit rudibus populis in principio fidei jugum imponere Decimarum, ut plena fiat per singulas domus exactio illarum; an apostoli quoque ab ipso Deo Christo edocti et ad prædicandum mundo missi exactiones Decimarum exegissent, vel alicui demandassent dari, considerandum est. Scimus quia Decimatio substantiæ nostræ valdè bona est. Sed melius est illam amittere quam fidem perdere. Nos vero in fide Catholica nati, nutriti et edocti vix consentimus substantiam nostram pleniter decimari; quanto magis tenera fides et infantilis animus et avara mens illorum largitati non consentit?*’ The passage is quoted by Selden in Chapter v.

laity were strongly disposed to disobey such commands as went to diminish their revenues, and the violation of any law was easy in those disordered times. But the long and lawful perseverance of the clergy at length prevailed; and, during a contest of nearly four centuries, they gradually entered into the possession of an unpopular, but unquestioned right.

We can scarcely consider the payment of tithes to have been universally enforced until the end of the twelfth century, when ecclesiastical authority had risen to a great height, through the exaltation of the See of Rome. The first of the *General Councils* which mentions them is the Ninth, that of Lateran, held under Calixtus II., about the year 1119; but even there they are spoken of only as they were received by special consecrations. Nor does it appear that the payment was expressly commanded as 'a duty of common* right' before the Pontifical Council held in the year 1215. It was held under Innocent III.; and in that age, and especially during that pontificate, the canons of the church were not lightly received nor contemned with security.

Such are the principal quarters from which the revenues of the Western church were derived. They varied in fruitfulness in different times and provinces, according to the extent of ecclesiastical influence, or the degree of civil anarchy which prevailed. In the ages *immediately* following the barbarian conquests, they may have lost by the violence of the invaders more than they gained by their piety or superstition; but those losses were afterwards compensated by a liberality which was sometimes heedless, sometimes political; and, upon the whole, in spite of occasional spoliations, the funds of the Church continued to extend themselves. They did not, however, reach any unreasonable extent until the reign of Charlemagne and those of his successors; but thenceforward, as their security increased with their magnitude, they swelled to such inordinate dimensions, and assumed so substantial a shape, that they are not incredibly asserted to have comprehended, in the twelfth century, one half of the cultivated soil of Europe. Nevertheless, it is impossible to dispute, that by far the greater proportion of that property was acquired by just and lawful means; and that we may not depart from this inquiry with the impression, that the prosperity of the Church was either universally abused, or wholly unmerited, it is proper to mention some of the blessings which it conferred upon society, during a period when the condition of man stood most in need of aid and consolation.

We do not here propose to enumerate the beneficial effects of the religion itself, which are scarcely contested by any one; but only to mention some of the good fruits of the *Institution* called the Church—benefits produced in subservience to *Christianity*, in as far as its principles and motives were derived from that source, but in contradistinction to it, in as far as its outward form, government and discipline were of human creation. With all its earthly imperfections and impurities, the Church was still a powerful,

* See Selden, chap. vi. There were various pontifical decrees respecting Tithes by Nicholas II., Alexander II., and Gregory VII. in the eleventh century. Selden mentions the direct command of Nicholas in 1059. 'Præcipimus ut Decimæ et Primitiæ seu oblationes vivorum et mortuorum Ecclesiis Dei fideliter reddantur a Laicis, et ut in dispositione Episcoporum sint: quas qui retinuerint a S. Ecclesiæ Communionem separentur.' Ten years earlier we observe that Leo IX., in his council against Simony, *restored* Tithes to all the Churches, with the admission, 'that no mention was at that time made of them in Apulia, and some other parts of the world.' A double division of them is on that occasion mentioned—between the Bishop, and the Altar, or Minister of the Church. See Wibertus, ap. Pagi, Vit. Leo IX.

if not necessary, instrument for the support of the religion and the diffusion of its principles; and even among those very imperfections there were some which it pleased Providence to turn to its own honour, by converting them to the service of man.

Before the end of the fifth century, the ecclesiastical body was in possession of very considerable dignity and power throughout the whole of Christendom; and in that body the episcopal order had risen into a pre-eminence, not indeed in unison with its ancient humility, but attributable to its activity and its virtues more than to its ambition, and perhaps to the circumstances of the empire even more than to either. In the enjoyment of extensive revenues, of some* municipal authority, of certain judicial privileges and immunities, of high rank and reputation, and of very powerful influence over the people, and united for all grand purposes by common principles and common interests, the hierarchy occupied the first station among the subjects of the empire. Its weight was felt and acknowledged by every rank of society, from the court downwards: the more so, as it formed the only moral tie which bound them together. 'The Unity of the Church' was not *merely* the watchword of bigotry, the signal for injustice and oppression, but also a principle of some effect in maintaining the unity of Christendom. Such was the position of the Church, and such the means at its disposal, when the Western Empire was overthrown and occupied by unbelieving barbarians.

At this crisis it is not too much to assert, that the Church was the instrument of Heaven for the preservation of the Religion. Christianity itself (unless miraculously sustained) would have been swept away from the surface of the West,† had it not been rescued by an established body of ministers, or had that body been less zealous or less influential. Among the conquered, the common people were, for the most part, recent and not always very serious converts from polytheism; the higher classes were neither numerous nor powerful, nor had any interest in the support of Christianity: the clergy alone composed the vital and efficient portion of the aristocracy. Among the conquerors, the rudest soldier brought with him a superstitious reverence for the office and person of a religious minister, which prepared him for adhesion to the religion itself, especially where the ministers were honoured and the ceremonies splendid; and the illiterate prince readily gave attention to the counsels of the bishops, who were the most learned and the most respected among his new subjects. Thence resulted the gradual conversion ‡ of the invaders, by the agency of the visible Church. Without those means—had Christianity then existed as

* See Cod. Justin. l. i., tit. iv. De Episcopali Audientia, s. 26, 30. The superintendance of public works, and of the funds for defraying their expenses, was intrusted to the bishop, together with some of the leading men in the city.

† Guizot—who treats ecclesiastical matters with profoundness, ingenuity, and judgment, and has brought to that subject (a rarer merit) a mind unbiassed by the prejudices of a churchman, or the antipathies of a sectarian or an infidel, and that fearless, uncompromising candour which becomes a philosopher and a historian—Guizot (*Histoire Générale*, &c. Leçon II.) has expressed the same opinion with the same confidence. 'Je ne crois pas trop dire en affirmant qu'à la fin du quatrième et commencement du cinquième siècle, c'est l'Eglise Chrétienne qui a sauvé le Christianisme. C'est l'Eglise, avec ses institutions, ses magistrats, son pouvoir qui s'est défendue vigoureusement contre la dissolution intérieure de l'empire, contre la Barbarie; qui a conquis les barbares, qui est devenue le lien, le moyen, le principe de civilisation entre le monde Romain et le monde barbare,' &c. &c.

‡ That their conversion was, in the first instance, imperfect, perhaps in many cases merely nominal, has been already admitted. Still, where the affair was with a *nation*, and that too a very barbarous nation, it was impossible, humanly speaking, that it could have been otherwise than imperfect.

a mere individual belief, or even under a less vigorous form of human government—the religious society would have possessed neither the energy nor discipline necessary for resistance to the deluge which endangered it.

Let us next inquire, what influence did the Church afterwards exert on the society which it had assembled in the name of Christ? by what exertions, by what habits, did it enforce the principles of the religion which it had preserved? *First*—by the general exercise of charity. The generosity of its benefactors had often been directed, in part at least, to that purpose. That excellent rule which had been received from the earliest ages was not discontinued; the relief of the poor was associated with the ministry of religion; the worldly necessities of the wretched were alleviated by their spiritual Pastors, and the most excellent virtue of Christianity was inculcated by the practice of its Ministers. We intend not to exalt the merit of that body in dispensing among the indigent the funds entrusted to them for that purpose; we only assert its great utility as a channel for the transmission of blessings, which in those ages could not otherwise have reached their object—as a sacred repository, where the treasures of the devout were stored up for the mitigation of misery which had no other resource or hope. *Secondly*—the penitential discipline of the Church was extremely efficacious in enforcing the moral precepts of the religion; and whatsoever advantage may have been conferred on ancient Rome by the venerable office of the Censor, whatsoever restraints may have been imposed on the habits of a high-minded people by the fear of ignominious reproach; awe more deep and lasting must have been impressed upon the superstitious crowd by the terrible denunciations of the Church, by the deep humiliation of the penitent, by his prolonged exposure to public shame, by the bitterness and intensity of his remorse. Without affecting to regret, as some have done, the present disuse of the penitential system in the present enlightened state both of society and religion, we cannot close our eyes against its extraordinary power, as an instrument of moral improvement, in ages when the true spirit of religion was less felt and comprehended; when education furnished very slender means for self-correction; and when even the secular laws were feebly or partially executed. *Thirdly*—After the fifth century the office of Legislation throughout the Western provinces devolved in a great measure on the ecclesiastical body—directly, in so far as they composed, or assisted in, public assemblies; indirectly, as they influenced the councils of Princes and their nobility. Their power was effectually exerted for the improvement of the barbarous system of the invaders, the suppression of absurd practices, and the substitution of reasonable principles. ‘I have already spoken,’ says Guizot, ‘of the difference which may be observed between the laws of the Visigoths, proceeding in a great measure from the Councils of Toledo, and those of the other barbarians. It is impossible to compare them without being struck by the immense superiority in the ideas of the Church in matters of legislation and justice, in all that affects the pursuit of truth and the destiny of man. It is true that the greater part of these ideas were borrowed from the Roman legislation; but if the Church had not preserved and defended them, if it had not laboured to propagate them, they would have perished.’ *Fourthly*—In furtherance of this faithful discharge of its duties to the human race, the Church unceasingly strove to correct the vices of the social system. The worst of these, and the principal object of her hostility, was the abomination of slavery; and if it be too much entirely to attribute its final extirpation to the perseverance of the Church in pressing the principles of

the Faith, and if it has been speciously insinuated that her motives in the contest were not *always* disinterested, at least it is impossible to dispute either her zeal in the righteous cause, or the power and success with which she pleaded it *, or the great probability that, without such advocacy so steadily pursued through so long and hopeless a period, the complete emancipation of the lowest classes would have been accomplished much later, perhaps not wholly accomplished even at this moment. *Fifthly*—The same spirit which was so well directed to improve the internal fabric of society turned itself also to the prevention of civil outrage and even of international warfare. In this attempt, indeed, it had not equal success, since it had to contend with the most intractable of human passions ; but the pages even of profane history abound with proofs of the pacific policy and interpositions of the Church : nor were they entirely suspended even after the fatal moment, when it engaged as a party in the temporal affairs of Europe, and so frequently found its own policy and strength and triumph in the discord, devastation, and misery of its neighbours. *Lastly*—From considerations which are more immediately connected with the happiness of mankind, we may descend to mention a theme of praise which is seldom withheld from the Church by any description of historians—that of having preserved many valuable monuments of ancient genius ; and also of having nourished, even in the worst times, such sort of literary instruction and acquirement as was then perhaps attainable. It is true that these advantages were not generally diffused among the people ; that little desire was evinced by the Clergy to communicate such knowledge, or by the Laity to share in it : still was it a possession useful, as well as honourable, to those who cherished and maintained it, and through them, in some degree, to their fellow-subjects. Some languid rays it must have reflected even at the moment upon the surface of society ; at least it was preserved as a certain pledge of future improvement, as an inviolable and everlasting treasure, consecrated to the brighter destinies of ages to come.

* Il y en a une preuve irrécusable: la plupart des formules d'affranchissement, à diverses époques, se fondent sur un motif religieux ; c'est au nom des idées religieuses, des espérances de l'avenir, de l'égalité religieuse des hommes, que l'affranchissement est presque toujours prononcé.—Guizot, Hist. Générale, Leçon VI.

PART III.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THAT OF POPE GREGORY VII. 814—1085.

CHAPTER XIV.—*On the Government and Projects of the Church during the Ninth and Tenth Centuries.*

Division of the Subject into Three Parts. (I.) Independence of Papal Election—Original Law and Practice—First Violation—Posterity of Charlemagne—Charles the Bald—Otho the Great—Henry III.—Alterations under Nicholas II.—Reflections. (II.) Encroachment of Ecclesiastical on Civil Authority—Indistinct Limits of Temporal and Spiritual Power—Till the time of Charlemagne—After that time—Influence of Feudal System—Kind of Authority conferred by it on the Clergy—Military Service—of Church Vassals—of Clergy—latter forbidden by Charlemagne—Superstitious Methods of Trial—by Hot Iron—the Cross—the Eucharist—Political Offices of the Clergy—Influence from Intellectual Superiority—Plunder of Church Property—Lay Improprators—Advocates—Louisle Débonnaire—his Penance—Council at Paris in 820—Charles the Bald—Council of Aix la Chapelle—Lothaire, King of Lorraine—his Excommunication—Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims—his Conduct on two occasions—Charles the Bald accepts the Empire from the Pope—General Reflections—Robert, King of France—his Excommunication and Submission—Episcopal distinct from Papal Encroachment. (III.) Internal Usurpation of the Roman See—Its Original Dignity—Metropolitan Privileges—Appellant Jurisdiction of Pope—The False Decretals—Contest between Gregory IV. and the French Bishops—between Adrian II. and Hincmar—Character of Hincmar—Consequence of regular Appeals to the Pope—Vicars of the Roman See—Exemption of Monasteries from Episcopal Superintendence—Remarks.

CHAPTER XV.—*On the Opinions, Literature, Discipline, and External Fortunes of the Church.*

(I.) On the Eucharist—Original Opinions of the Church—Doctrine of Paschasius Radbert—Combated by Ratram and John Scotus—Conclusion of the Controversy—Predestination—Opinions and Persecution of Goteschalchus—Millennarianism in the Tenth Century—its strange and general Effect. (II.) Literature—Rabanus Maurus, John Scotus, Alfred—its Progress among the Saracens—Spain—South of Italy—France—Rome—Pope Sylvester II. (III.) Discipline—Conduct of Charlemagne and his Successors—St. Benedict of Aniane. Institution of Canons Regular—Episcopal election—Translations of Bishops prohibited. Pope Stephen VI.—Claudius Bishop of Turin—Penitential System. (IV.) Conversion of the North of Europe—of Denmark, Sweden, Russia—of Poland and Hungary—how accomplished and to what Extent—The Normans—The Turks.

CHAPTER XVI.—*The Life of Gregory VII.*

DIVISION OF THE SUBJECT.—Section I. From Leo IX. to the Accession of Gregory. Section II. The Pontificate of Gregory. Section III. Controversy respecting Transubstantiation and Establishment of the Latin Liturgy.

SECTION I.—Pope Leo IX.—Early History of Hildebrand—Succession of Victor II.—of Stephen IX.—of Nicholas II.—his Measure respecting Papal Election—the College of Cardinals—Imperfection of that Measure—Subsequent and final Regulation—Inconveniences of popular Suffrage—Restriction of the Imperial Right of Confirmation—Homage of Robert Guiscard and the Normans—Dissensions on the Death of Nicholas—Succession of Alexander II.—actual Supremacy of Hildebrand—Measures taken during that Pontificate—Alexander is succeeded by Hildebrand, under the title of Gregory VII.

SECTION II.—Gregory's First Council—its two objects—to prevent (1.) Marriage or Concubinage of the Clergy—(2.) Simonical Sale of Benefices—On the Celibacy of the Clergy—why encouraged by Popes—Leo IX.—Severity and Consequence of Gregory's Edict—Original Method of appointment to Benefices—Usurpations of Princes—how abused—the Question of Investiture—Explained—Pretext for Royal Encroachments—Original form of Consecration by the King and Crown—Right usurped by Otho—State of the Question at the Accession of Gregory—Conduct of Henry—further measures of the Pope—Indifference of Henry—Summoned before a Council at Rome—Council of Worms—Excommunication of the Emperor and Absolution of his Subjects from their Allegiance—Consequence of this Edict—Dissensions in Germany—how suspended—Henry does Penance at Canossa—restored to the Communion of the Church—again takes the field—Rodolphus declared Emperor—Gregory's Neutrality—Remarks on the course of Gregory's Measures—Universality of his temporal Claims—his probable project—Considerations in excuse of his Schemes—partial admission of his Claims—Ground on which he founded them—power to bind and to loose—Means by which he supported them—Excommunication—Interdict—Legates à Latere—Alliance with Matilda—his Norman allies German Rebels—Internal Administration—Effect of his rigorous Measures of Reform—his grand scheme of Supremacy within the Church—False Decretals—Power conferred by them on the Pope—brought into action by Gregory—Appeals to Pope—Generally encouraged and practised—their pernicious Effects—Gregory's Double Scheme of Universal Dominion—Return to Narrative—Clement III. anti-Pope—Death of Rodolphus—Henry twice repulsed from before Rome—finally succeeds—his Coronation by Clement—the Normans restore Gregory—he follows them to Salerno and there dies—his historical importance—his Character—Public—his grand principle in the Administration of the Church—Private—as to Morality—as to Religion.

SECTION III.—(1.) Controversy respecting Transubstantiation—suspended in the Ninth, renewed in the Eleventh Century—Character of Berenger—Council of Leo IX.—of Victor II. at Tours in 1054—Condemnation and conduct of Berenger—Council of Nicholas II.—repeated Retraction and Relapse of Berenger—Alexander II.—Council at Rome under Gregory VII.—Extent of the Concession then required from Berenger—further Requisition of the Bishops—a Second Council assembled—Conduct of Gregory—Berenger again solemnly assents to the Catholic Doctrine, and again returns to his own—his old Age, Remorse, and Death—Remarks on his Conduct—on the Moderation of Gregory. (2.) Latin Liturgy—Gradual Disuse of Latin Language throughout Europe—Adoption of Gothic Missal in Spain—Alfonso proposes to substitute the Roman—Decision by the Judgment of God—by Combat—by Fire—doubtful Result—final Adoption of the Latin Liturgy—its introduction among the Bohemians by Gregory—Motives of the Popes—other instances of Liturgies not performed in the Vulgar Tongue—Usage of the early Christian Church.

CHAPTER XIV.

On the Government and Projects of the Church during the Ninth and Tenth Centuries.

THAT we may avoid the confusion usually attending the compression of a long series of incidents, we shall here endeavour to distinguish the points which chiefly claim our notice, rather than follow chronologically the course of events; and though it may not be possible, nor even desirable, to prevent the occasional encroachments of subjects in some respects similar, yet in others very different, we shall not allow it to perplex our narrative. It is an obscure and melancholy region into which we now enter; but it is not altogether destitute of interest and instruction, since we can discern, through the ambiguous twilight, those misshapen masses and disorderly elements out of which the fabric of Papal despotism presently arose, and even trace the irregular progress of that stupendous structure.

We shall best attain this end by giving a separate consideration to three subjects, which will be found to include the whole ecclesiastical policy of the ninth and tenth centuries. Other matters relating to that period, and possessing perhaps even greater general importance, will be treated in the next chapter; but at present we shall confine our inquiry to the following objects:—I. The endeavours of the Popes to free their own election from Imperial interference of every description, whether to nominate or to confirm. II. The efforts of the Church to usurp dominion over the Western empire; and generally to advance the spiritual as loftier and more legitimate than the highest temporal authority. III. The exertions of the See of Rome to subdue to itself the ecclesiastical body, and thus to establish a despotism *within* the Church. In the two first of these objects we may regard the Church as waging for the most part an external warfare; the last occasioned her intestine or domestic struggles; and the examination of them will necessarily lead to some mention of the peculiarities introduced by the feudal system; of its influence on the manners, morals, and property of the clergy.

I. *On the independency of Papal election.* The original law and practice in this matter had passed, with some variations but little lasting alteration, through the succession both of the Greek and barbarian sovereigns of Rome, from the time of Constantine to that of Charlemagne, and that Prince also transmitted it unchanged to his posterity. It was this—that the Pope should be elected by the priests, nobles, and people of Rome, but that he should not be consecrated without the consent of the Emperor. This arrangement was found, for above eight centuries, to be consistent with the dignity of the Roman Bishop, and it was not till his spiritual pride had been inflated by temporal power, that it was discovered to be *doubly* objectionable—it was no longer to be endured, either that laymen should interfere in the election of the Pope, or the Emperor in his consecration. Both these restraints became offensive to the lofty principles of ecclesiastical independence; but the latter was that which it was first attempted to remove.

Charlemagne was succeeded by his son Lewis, commonly called the Meek, a feeble and superstitious monarch; and of these defects both Stephen V.* and Pascal I. so far availed themselves, as to exercise the

* Generally called Stephen IV. See Baron. ann. 816. s. 96.

pontifical functions without awaiting his confirmation. But when Eugene II. would have followed their example, Lothaire, who was associated to the empire, complained of the usurpation and resumed the Imperial right. Lewis died in 840, and was succeeded on the throne of France by Charles the Bald.

That Prince reigned for thirty-seven years with scarcely greater vigour than his predecessor; but his reign is on several accounts important in the history of Popery, and chiefly on the following. Two years before his death the Imperial throne became vacant. Charles was ambitious to possess it; he went to Rome, accepted it at the hands of John VIII.; and then, that he might make a worthy return for this office, he released the See from the necessity of Imperial consent to the consecration of its Bishop. The claims which were derived by subsequent Popes from John's assumed donation of the empire will be mentioned hereafter, and it will appear on how slight a ground they rested; but the interference of the Emperor in papal elections was on this occasion directly and unequivocally withdrawn.

Neither the interests nor the honour of the See gained any thing by its independence. From that time (the event took place in 875) till 960, the most disgraceful confusion prevailed in the elections, and clearly proved that the restraint heretofore imposed by civil superintendance, had been salutary; and if the emperors during that stormy period did not reclaim their former right, we should rather attribute the neglect to their weakness than to their acknowledged cession of it. For in the year 960, Otho the Great, on the invitation of John XII., resumed the Imperial authority in Italy, and exercised, as long as he lived, the most arbitrary discretion in the election, and even appointment, of the Pontiff. He presently degraded John, and substituted in his place Leo VIII.; and under that Pope (or anti-Pope—for it is disputed) a Lateran council* was held in 964, which conferred on Otho and all his successors not merely the kingdom of Italy, but the regulation of the Holy See and the arbitrary election of its bishops. And for the guidance of their successors, Otho left an edict prohibiting the election of any Pope without the *previous*† knowledge and consent of the emperor, which was enforced during the next eighty years by all who possessed the power to do so. But in the century following, in the year 1047, we observe that the same right was once more *conceded* to an emperor, Henry III.; and on this occasion an artful distinction was drawn by the Italians, which led, no doubt, to the ultimate independence of election: the privilege of nominating the Pope was granted to Henry *personally*‡, not to the throne.

This important advantage was followed almost immediately by another of still greater consequence. Nicholas II., under the direction of Hildebrand, found means to restore the original principle of election, modified as follows: the right of appointment was vested in the College of cardinals, with the consent of the people, and the approbation of the emperor. But the last mentioned restriction was expressly understood to extend only to the emperor of the time being, and to such of his successors as should personally obtain the privilege. This grand measure was accomplished in a council held at Rome in 1059, fourteen years before the accession of Gregory VII.; and so the matter rested, when he took possession of the chair.

We observe from this short account, that, after an interrupted struggle

* Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. viii., cap. vi.

† Mosheim, Cent. x., p. ii., c. ii.

‡ He had occasion to exert it three times. See below, chap. xvi.

of two hundred and fifty years, an absolute independence of election was not yet confessedly effected. The contest had fluctuated very considerably; the first advantages were entirely on the side of the Pope; in fact, at the death of Charles the Bald, the victory seemed perfectly secure: and the century which followed was so clouded by the mutual dissensions of the princes; it was marked by such positive weakness in their states, such vices in their personal character and internal administration, as to be in the highest degree favourable to the confirmation and extension of papal privileges. Why then was it, that the privilege in question was not at that time extended nor even permanently confirmed? Why was it even that the next interference of the emperor took place at the solicitation of a Pope? Chiefly because the removal of Imperial superintendence had thrown the election entirely into the hands of an unprincipled nobility*, an intriguing clergy, and a venal populace, whose united fraud and violence usually favoured the most flagitious candidate, and promoted his success by means the most shameful. And, therefore, through this lawless period we read of Popes tumultuously chosen and hastily deposed; hurried from the monastery to the chair, from the chair to prison or to death. Their reigns were usually short and wasted in fruitless endeavours to prolong them; their sacred duties were forgotten or despised, and their personal characters were even more detestable than those of the princes their contemporaries. Further, we may observe, that when the Church began to recover from the delirium of the tenth century; when one great man did at length arise within it, Hildebrand, the future Gregory, his influence was immediately exerted, not only against Imperial interference to confirm, but against popular licence to elect: for he had learnt from long and late experience, that no scheme for the universal extension of Papal authority could be made effective, until the Popes themselves were secured from the capricious insolence of a domestic tyrant. If things had not been thus—if Papal elections had been regularly and conscientiously conducted when the civil governments of Europe were at the lowest point of contentious and stupid imbecility—the æra of Pontifical despotism would have been anticipated by nearly three centuries, and the empire of opinion would have been more oppressive and more lasting, as the age was more deeply immersed in ignorance and barbarism.

* From the deposition of the last Carolingian king to the reign of Otho the Great, (a space of nearly fifty years,) the authority of the princes who held the imperial title was always vacillating and contested. In the mean time the city of Rome was no part of the kingdom of Italy, but depended on the imperial crown only; so that during the vacancy of the empire it recovered its independence, and thus fell under the turbulent oligarchy of its own nobles. These provided the candidates for the pontifical throne; and whosoever among them succeeded in obtaining it, secured, by means of the church revenues, a great preponderance over all the others, and became as it were the chiefs of the republic. (See Sismondi, *Repub. Ital.* chap. iii.; to whose work we are compelled to refer the reader for the few facts which are ascertained respecting the revolutions of the Roman Government during this period.) For the further degradation of the Roman See the influence of female arts and charms was triumphantly exerted. 'Jamais les femmes n'eurent autant de crédit sur aucun gouvernement que celles de Rome en obtinrent, dans le dixième siècle, sur celui de leur patrie. Or auroit dit que la beauté avoit succédé à tous les droits de l'empire.' The names and scandals of Theodora and Marozia are distinguished in the ecclesiastical annals of the tenth century. In the rapid succession of popes, those most marked by disgrace or misfortune may have been Leo V., John X., John XI., John XII., Benedict VI., John XIV.; but to pursue the details of their history would be alike painful and unprofitable: for their crimes would teach us no lessons, and even their sufferings would scarcely raise our compassion.

II. We proceed to examine the encroachments of Church upon State during the same period; and this part of our subject might again be subdivided under three heads—the general usurpations of the See of Rome on any temporal rights—the particular usurpations of national councils of Bishops on the civil authorities—and the individual usurpations of the episcopal office on that of the secular magistrate. But, not to perplex this matter by an attempt at exceeding minuteness, we shall rather follow the course of events and illustrate them with such observations as they may appear severally to demand. The first edict which permitted legal jurisdiction to the Episcopal order, and supported its decisions by civil authority, sowed the seeds of that confusion which afterwards involved and nearly obliterated the limits of temporal and spiritual power. There is scarcely any crime which an ingenious casuist might not construe into an offence against religion, and subject to Ecclesiastical cognizance, in a rude and illiterate age; while, on the other hand, the best defined and most certain rights of an unarmed and dependent authority were liable to continual outrage either from a sovereign possessing no fixed principles of government, or from a lawless aristocracy more powerful than the sovereign. In the Eastern empire, indeed, this evil was greatly neutralized by the decided and unvarying supremacy of the civil power, nor was it immediately felt even in the West; at least we read little or nothing about the usurpation of the Clergy, until after the death of Charlemagne. The Popes, it is true, had displayed, from a very early period, great anxiety to enlarge their authority; but the efforts of Leo and even of Gregory were confined to the acquisition of some privilege from their own Metropolitans, or some title or province from their rival at Constantinople. The dream of universal empire seems at no time to have warmed the imagination of those more moderate Pontiffs. It is not that we may not occasionally discover both in the writings and in the conduct of the prelates of earlier days an abundance of spiritual zeal ever ready to overflow its just bounds, and gain somewhat upon the secular empire. The latter, too, found its occasions to retort; but we may remark, that while its operations were generally violent and interrupted, those of the clergy were more systematic and continuous. In the mean time the distinction between the two parties was becoming wider, and their differences were approaching near to dissension, before, and even during, the reign of Charlemagne: howbeit, the vigorous grasp of that monarch so firmly wielded the double sceptre, that the rent which was beginning to divide it* was

* In the 'Capitularies of Interrogations' proposed by Charlemagne, three years before his death,—'First,' (he says) 'I will separate the bishops, the abbots, and the secular nobles, and speak to them in private. I will ask them why they are not willing to assist each other, whether at home or in the camp, when the interests of their country demand it? Whence come those frequent complaints which I hear, either concerning their property or the vassals which pass from the one to the other? In what the ecclesiastics impede the service of the laity, the laity that of the ecclesiastics? To what extent a bishop or abbot ought to interfere in secular affairs; or a count or other layman in ecclesiastical matters,' &c. (Fleury, H. Eccl. l. xiv. sect. 51. Guizot, Hist. Mod. Legon 21.) Soon afterwards, in 826, the Council of Paris, after proposing some very extravagant episcopal claims, observes, as one great obstacle to harmony, that the princes have long mixed too much in ecclesiastical matters, and that the clergy, whether through avarice or ignorance, take unbecoming interest in secular matters. Again, at the second of Aix-la-Chapelle (in 836) all the evils of the time are expressly attributed to the mutual encroachments of the spiritual and secular powers.

barely perceptible, when it fell from his hand ; but scarcely had it begun to tremble with the feeble touch of Lewis his son, when its ill-cemented materials exhibited a wide and irreparable incoherence.

The extraordinary change which had taken place in the institutions of the Western Empire during the two preceding, and which was progressive during the two present, centuries, greatly increased both to church and state the facility of mutual encroachment. Until the permanent settlement of the northern nations generally introduced the feudal system of government, the Clergy, though enjoying great immunities and ample possessions, yet, as they lived under absolute rule, had little real, and no independent power, excepting such as indirectly accrued to them through their influence. If they had lands, no jurisdiction was necessarily annexed to them ; they had no place in legislative assemblies ; they had no control, as a body, in the direction of the state.

The devout spirit of the Barbarians presently increased the extent of their landed possessions without withholding from them any of the rights which, according to their system, were inseparable from land ; and thus they entered upon temporal jurisdiction co-extensive with their estates. By these means the Episcopal Courts became possessed of a double jurisdiction—over the Clergy and Laity of their diocese for the cognizance of crimes against the ecclesiastical law, and over the vassals of their barony as lords paramount ; and these two departments they frequently so far confounded as to use the spiritual weapon of excommunication to enforce the judgments of both*. In the next place the Clergy became an order *in the state*, and thus entered into the enjoyment of privileges entirely unconnected with their spiritual character. Yet the necessary effect of the union of ecclesiastical with secular dignities was to blend two powers in the same person almost undistinguishably ; and to confound, by indiscriminate use, the prerogatives of the bishop with those of the baron. Again, the Bishops being once established as feudal lords, had great advantages in increasing their possessions, owing to the influence which necessarily devolved on them, not only from their greater virtues and knowledge, but also from the command of spiritual authority. And as the vassals of the Church grew gradually to be better secured from oppression and outrage than those of the lay nobility, its protection was more courted and its patrimonial domain more amply extended.

At the first establishment of the system, vassalage to an ecclesiastic conferred exemption from military service ; but, among rude and warlike nations, when the greater force was generally the better law, this privilege could not possibly be of long duration. It was withdrawn universally, at different times, by different princes, according to their power or their necessities. The Church fiefdoms thus assumed a very different appearance, and the spirituality of the sacred character became still further corrupted ; for, as soon as the vassals became military, it was found difficult to hold them in subjection to an unarmed lord, and the Clergy were, in

* This subject is treated clearly, though shortly, by Burke, in his Abridgment of English History. Mosheim, who ascribes the secular encroachments of the Bishops to their acquisition of secular titles, denies that such titles were conferred on them before the tenth age. Louis Thomassin (*De Disciplin. Eccles. Vet. et Nova*) endeavours to trace the practice to the ninth and even to the eighth century. Whatever may be the fact respecting the titles, the jurisdiction certainly gained great ground during the ninth age ; more, perhaps, through the superstition of the people, and the weakness of the princes, than by its own legitimacy.

many instances, obliged to descend from their peaceful condition, assume the sword and helmet, and conduct their subjects into battle: in many instances they did so without any such obligation*. This direct dereliction of the pastoral character became the immediate means of securing their property† and increasing their power; but, notwithstanding the contempt to which the peaceful virtues are occasionally exposed among rude and military nations, it is probable that they lost, thereby as much in influence as they gained in power.

Again, the strange and irrational method of Trials which even now came generally into use, must have tended, by the intermixture of superstition, to enlarge the dominion of ecclesiastical influence. The ordinary proofs by fire, by water, by hot iron, indicate some imposture perhaps only practicable by the more informed craft of the clergy. The proofs of the Cross and the Eucharist bear more obvious marks of sacerdotal superintendence‡. The clergy disgraced themselves by upholding such abuses of their judicial authority, and they divide that disgrace with the Kings and the civil magistrates of the time; but they had not the crime of introducing them. They received and executed them as they were handed down from a remote and blind antiquity; and it is but justice to add, that they made frequent attempts to abolish them§.

Moreover, through the free spirit which formed the only merit of the feudal system, the affairs of the state were more or less regulated by public assemblies, and the higher ranks of the clergy found a place in these. Thus, again, were they placed in contact with the great temporal interests of their country, and invited to examine and direct them; and no doubt their feudal temporalities, as well as their spiritual influence, added weight and authority to their counsel. But, besides these, which some might overbear and others might affect to despise, their political consideration was derived from another—a more honourable and a more certain instrument of power—their intellectual superiority. The learning of the age con-

* The practice crept, without the same excuse, and of course with much less frequency, into the Greek Church. In the year 713 a Subdeacon commanded the troops of Naples; and the Admiral of the Emperor's fleet was a Deacon. (Fleury, ix. 172, &c.) But the low ecclesiastical rank which these officers held would prove, if it were necessary, that they did not take the field as feudal lords. In the West this practice appears to have commenced soon after the admission of barbarians to the clerical order; which, if we are to judge by names, scarcely took place before the seventh century.

† In the address (already mentioned) which was presented on this subject to Charlemagne by his people, it is remarkable that the petitioners felt it necessary to offer a solemn assurance, that their motive for disarming the Clergy was not (as might, it seems, have been suspected) a design to plunder their property. We may add, that the indecent violation of the sacerdotal character is a reason, which seems to have been overlooked by both parties.

‡ Even the trial by Duel, which seems the farthest removed from priestly interference, was preceded by some religious forms; great precautions were taken to prevent the arms from being enchanted; and in case of any injustice a miracle was constantly expected to remedy it.

§ A council held at Attigni, probably in 822, under Lewis the Meek, especially prohibited the Trial by the Cross; according to which, the two parties stood up before a cross, and whichever of them fell first lost his cause. Again, at the Council of Worms (in 829), these judgments were strongly discouraged. Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, an influential prelate, had written expressly against them. The Council of Valence, held in 855, published the following canon. 'Duels shall not be suffered, though authorised by custom. He who shall have slain his adversary shall be subject to the penance of homicide; he who shall have been slain, shall be deprived of the prayers and sepulture of the church. The Emperor shall be prayed to abolish that abuse by public ordinance.' See Fleury, l. xlvii., s. 48. l. xlviii., s. 30. l. xlix., s. 25.

tinued still to be confined to their order* ; few among the laity could even read, and therefore few were qualified for any public duty, and thus the various offices requiring any degree of literature fell necessarily into the hands of the clergy. Those who consider their advance to such offices as usurpations do not sufficiently weigh the circumstances of the times ; they do not reflect that there are moral as well as physical necessities, and that a state of society is not even possible, in which the only persons at all qualified to fill the offices of the state should be the only persons excluded from them. It is far from our intention to advocate any general departure from the spiritual character in the sacred orders ; and the divines of the ninth and tenth centuries would undoubtedly have been great gainers both in virtue and in happiness, had they preserved that character pure and uncontaminated. But it was made impossible by the political system under which they lived, that it could be so ; and without seeking any excuse for the individual misconduct of thousands among them, we cannot avoid perceiving, that their interference in temporal affairs, to a certain extent, was absolutely unavoidable—and where and by whom, in those unsettled ages, were the limits of that interference to be drawn and preserved ?

If the clergy were in many respects gainers by the imperfection of civil government, it would be partial to conceal, that they were sufferers by it also. In times of confusion (and those days were seldom tranquil) the property of the Church was the constant object of cupidity and invasion. † On such occasions no inconsiderable portion of its revenues passed into the hands of lay impropiators, who employed curates at the cheapest rate. ‡ And both Bishops and Monasteries were obliged to invest powerful lay protectors, under the name of Advocates, with considerable fiefs, as the price of their protection against depredators. But those Advocates became themselves too often the spoilers, and oppressed the helpless ecclesiastics for whose defence they had been engaged.

We have thought it right, though at the risk of some repetition, to premise this general view of the relative situation of the clergy and laity during the period which we are describing ; otherwise it would be difficult to form any just and impartial views, or even any very definite notions, of the real character of the events which it contains.

In the civil war which took place in the year 833 between Lewis the

* In many of the councils held during the ninth century, canons were enacted enjoining the Bishop to suspend a Priest for ignorance, and to promote and regulate the schools which were established for the education of the clergy.

† The councils of the ninth century abound with complaints of the spoliation of Church property by laymen, who are frequently specified ; and new Capitularies were continually enacted to prevent or allay differences between the Clergy and the laity. The confusion generally prevalent is proved by the capitularies published at Quercy (in 857), by which every diocesan is exhorted to preach against pillage and violence, as well as by the Letters of Hincmar published in 859, and that of the Bishops of France to King Lewis, attributed to the same prelate. The frequency too of personal assaults on the Clergy is evinced by various regulations for their protection, and even more so, perhaps, by the slight punishment attached to such offences. Some promulgated in France (probably in 822) ordain as follows—‘the murderer of a Deacon or Priest is condemned to a penance of twelve years and a fine of 900 sous ; the murderer of a Bishop is to abstain from flesh and wine for the whole of his life, to quit the profession of arms, and abstain from marriage.’ Yet the confirmation of this canon was thought highly important by the episcopal order. Fleury l. xlvi, s. 48 ; l. xlix, s. 40.

‡ An abuse (as Mr. Hallam remarks) which has never ceased in the Church. Middle Ages, chap. vii. We take this opportunity of acknowledging various obligations to that historian.

*Penance of Lewis
the Meek.*

Meek * and his sons, Pope Gregory IV. presented himself in France at the camp of the rebels. The motive which he pretended was to reconcile the combatants and terminate a dissension † so scandalous to Christendom; and such really may have been his design. At least it is certain that his interference was a single and inconsequent act, unaccompanied by any insolence of pretension; the Pope offered his mediation, and, though we may suspect his impartiality, he advanced no claim of apostolical authority to dispose of the crown. We shall, therefore, pass on from this event to one which immediately followed it, and which French historians consider as the first instance of ecclesiastical aggression on the rights of their sovereign. Lewis was betrayed by his soldiers into the hands of his sons, who immediately deposed him and divided the empire amongst themselves: but fearing that he might hereafter be restored by popular favour, they determined to inflict upon him a still deeper and even hopeless humiliation. An assembly held at Compiègne condemned him to perform public penance, and he submitted with some reluctance to the sentence. Having received a paper containing the list of his pretended crimes, and confessed his guilt, he prostrated himself on a rough mat at the foot of the altar, cast aside his baldric, his sword, and his secular vestments, and assumed the garb of a penitent. And, after the Bishops had placed their hands on him, and the customary psalms and prayers had been performed, he was conducted in sackcloth to the cell assigned for his perpetual residence. It was intended by those who condemned him to this ignominy, thereby to disqualify their former sovereign for every office both civil and military. But neither does it appear that such was the necessary consequence of canonical penance, unless when imposed for life ‡; nor could they have forgotten that eleven years previously the same monarch had already performed a public penance, for certain political offences then charged on him. It proved then, as might have been expected, that the ceremony described had no more important effect than the temporary humiliation of the royal person. Probably his popularity was increased by the show of persecution; and, as soon as political circumstances changed in his favour, the Bishops immediately reconciled the penitent to the Church, and replaced him on the throne §.

This stretch of episcopal power is blamed by many Roman Catholic historians, who, at the same time, are careful to show that it was simply an act of penance, not of deposition, justified by the memorable submission of Theodosius to ecclesiastical discipline. Nevertheless, we cannot in justice otherwise consider it, than as a daring outrage committed on the highest temporal authority, with the intention of perpetuating the de-

* Charlemagne died in 814; Lewis the Meek in 840, and his successor, Charles the Bald, in 877. The empire passed from Charlemagne's descendants to the German Conrad just a century after his death; and in 987 his dynasty was extinguished in France by the accession of Hugh Capet.

† Baron., ann. 833, s. v. Gregory held the See from 828 to 844. It was made a complaint against the Emperor by Agobard, the Archbishop of Lyons (ap. Baron., ann. 833, s. vi.) that he did not address the Pope with the due expressions of respect—since he saluted him, in a letter, *Brother* and *Papa* indiscriminately: the paternal appellation should alone, it seems, have been adopted.

‡ The prohibition to carry arms or discharge civil offices did not extend beyond the duration of the penance. See Fleury, l. xlvii, s. 40. Baron. ann. 882. s. i.; ann. 833. s. xix.

§ We read in Baronius (ann. 834, s. i.), that, during the time of his deposition, violent and unseasonable tempests prevailed, which instantly dispersed at his restoration.

position of Lewis by the pretext of penance. Yet it had been surpassed in an earlier age and in a different country, by a measure of episcopal usurpation which is less generally recorded. At the twelfth Council of Toledo, in 682, the bishops undertook to decide on the succession to the crown. Vamba, king of the Visigoths, having done penance and assumed the monastic habit, formally abdicated in favour of Ervigius; on which matter the prelates pronounced as follows—‘We have read this act and think right to give it our confirmation. Wherefore we declare that the *people is absolved from all obligation and oath* by which it was engaged to Vamba, and that it should recognize for its only master Ervigius, whom God has chosen, whom his predecessor has appointed, and, what is still more, whom the whole people desires*.’ Still we may observe that, even in this instance, the prelates did not professedly proceed to the whole length of deposition, though such was unquestionably the real nature of the measure. We may also remind the reader, that the aggressions which have been thus far mentioned were entirely the work of the episcopal order, not in any way directed or influenced by the See of Rome. It is very true that they may have prepared the way for the more extensive usurpations of Papacy, and the authority which had been insulted by provincial bishops could scarcely hope to be long held sacred by the Chief of the whole body: still the Pope had not yet found himself sufficiently powerful to engage in the enterprise.

The long reign of Charles the Bald furnishes more numerous instances of the exercise of ecclesiastical influence in affairs of state, some of which deserve our notice. That prince *Charles the Bald* and Lewis of Bavaria being desirous to dispossess their brother Lothaire of a portion of his dominions, did not presume, notwithstanding great military advantages which they had obtained over him, to proceed in their design without the sanction of the Clergy. To that end they summoned a Council of Bishops and Priests † at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 842, and submitted the question to their consideration. The assembly condemned the crimes and incapacity of Lothaire, and declared that God had justly withdrawn his protection from him; but it would not permit his brothers to occupy his kingdom until they had made a public vow to govern it, not after the example of Lothaire, but according to the will of God. The Bishops then pronounced their final decision in these words—‘Receive the kingdom by the authority of God, and govern it according to his will; we counsel, we exhort, we command you to do so.’ The effect of this sentence was not, indeed, the entire spoliation of Lothaire, who retained his throne to the end of his life; but certain provinces, already in the occupation of the conquerors, were immediately, and, as it would seem, permanently transferred to their sceptre, in consequence of the episcopal award.

In the year 859 Charles presented to the Council of Savonières a formal complaint against Vénilo, Archbishop of Sens, which breathes the lowest spirit of humiliation. ‘By his own election’ (the King says), ‘and that of the other Bishops, and by the will and consent and acclamation of the rest of my subjects, Vénilo, with the other Bishops and Archbishops, consecrated me King, according to the tradition of the Church, and anointed me to the kingdom with the holy chrism, and raised me to the throne with the diadem and sceptre. After which consecration and

* It is the first canon of the Council, and is cited by Fleury, l. xl. s. 29.

† Fleury, II. E. l. xlviii. s. 11. Baron, ann. 842. s. 1, 2, 3.

‘regal elevation I ought to have been degraded by no one *without the hearing and judgment of the Bishops*, by whose ministry I was consecrated to royalty, who are called the thrones of God. In them God sits; by them he makes known his judgments; and to their paternal corrections and penal authority I was prepared to subject myself, and am now subject*.’ These words (as Fleury admits) are remarkable in the mouth of a king, and especially of a king of France; but the example of his predecessor, enforced by his own misfortunes† and feebleness, may have reduced Charles to the necessity of such degradation. But, on the other hand, can we feel astonishment that the Hierarchy took advantage of what appeared the voluntary and gratuitous prostration of royalty? When we blame the ambition of those who received the offering, should we forget the weakness and pusillanimity of those who presented it?

A year or two afterwards, Lothaire, King of Lorraine, grandson of Lewis the Meek, divorced his wife in order to espouse his concubine. It appears that no less than three Councils of Bishops sanctioned the act of their monarch; nevertheless the repudiated queen made her appeal to Rome. Nicholas I. was then Pope, and he interfered in her favour with his usual vehemence and perseverance: the threat of excommunication was long suspended over the king, who employed submissive language and persisted in disobedience. There is some † reason to believe that the Pope, towards the end of his life, executed his menace; and if so, it may seem a strange return for the generosity of Charlemagne to the Holy See, that the first discharge of its deadliest bolt should have been directed, within fifty years from his death, against one of his own descendants. But he had in some degree secured this retribution by his own imprudence: for it was his custom to engage the Bishops to pervert the ecclesiastical censures to the service of the civil government. The confusion between the two powers was thus augmented; and the misapplication of the great spiritual weapon to the purposes of the state naturally led to the second abuse, which turned it, for Church purposes, against the state.

On the death of Lothaire, Adrian II. endeavoured to exclude Charles the Bald from the succession to his states, and to confer them on the Emperor Lewis. To effect this object he addressed one letter to the nobles of the kingdom of Lothaire, in which he exhorted them to adhere to the Emperor on pain of anathema and excommunication; and a second to the subjects of Charles, in which he eulogized the Emperor, and repeated the same menaces. He continued to the following purpose:—‘If any one shall oppose himself to the just pretensions of the Emperor, let him know that the Holy See is in favour of that Prince, and that the arms which God has placed in our hands are prepared for his defence.’ We may consider this as the first attempt of papal ambition to regulate

* The original is cited by Baronius, ann. 859. s. xxvi. The Bishops had a very simple process of reasoning, by which they proved their supremacy. A Bishop can consecrate a King, but a King cannot consecrate a Bishop: therefore a Bishop is superior to a King. We might well wonder that any serious attention should ever have been paid to such undisguised nonsense, if we did not recollect what undue weight is always attached to *ceremony* in ignorant ages.

† It should also be recollected that this was the crisis of the general dissolution of government and society into the feudal form.

‡ Fleury (l. li. s. 7.) collects the fact from the Pope’s letter to Charles, in favour of Heltrude, widow of Count Berenger, and sister of Lothaire. But many historians are silent respecting it, and in the first intercourse between Lothaire and Adrian II. the successor of Nicholas, we can discover no proof that the King was then lying under the sentence.

the successions of princes. It was 'unsuccessful; Charles, with the aid of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and other Prelates, had already placed himself in possession of the throne when the legates of Adrian arrived; and the subsequent efforts of the Pontiff to oblige him to abdication were repelled with courage and constancy both by the king and his metropolitan*.

These events took place about the year 870; and ten years afterwards the same Hincmar was equally firm in defending the rights of the Church when they were in opposition to the claims of the king, Lewis III. That Prince was desirous to intrude into the See of Beauvais an unworthy minister, and pressed his appointment by supplication and menace. Hincmar defended the original liberty of elections which had been restored by Lewis the Meek, and the independence of the Church. 'That you are the master of the elections, and of the ecclesiastical property, are assertions proceeding from hell and from the mouth of the serpent. Remember the promise which you made at your consecration, which you subscribed with your hand, and presented to God on the altar in the presence of the Bishops. Reconsider it with the aid of your Council, and pretend not to introduce into the Church that which the mighty Emperors, your predecessors, pretended not in their time. I trust that I shall always preserve towards you the fidelity and devotion which are due; I laboured much for your election; do not then return me evil for good by persuading me to abandon in my old age the holy regulations which I have followed, through the grace of God, during six and thirty years of episcopacy.....' A subsequent letter by the same Prelate contained even stronger expressions to the following effect—'It is not you who have chosen me to govern the Church; but it is I and my colleagues and the rest of the faithful who have chosen you to govern the kingdom, on the condition of observing the laws. We fear not to give account of our conduct before the Bishops, because we have not violated the Canons. But as to you, if you change not what you have ill done, God will redress it in his own good time. The Emperor Lewis lived not so long as his father Charles; your grandfather Charles lived not so long as his father, nor your father †

*Lewis III. and
Hincmar of
Rheims.*

* The Pope commanded Hincmar to abstain from the communion of Charles, if he continued refractory. The Archbishop (professedly in the name of his fellow-subjects) replied, among other matters,—'Let the Pope consider that he is not at the same time king and bishop; that his predecessors have regulated the Church, which is their concern—not the State, which is the heritage of kings; and consequently that he should neither command us to obey a king too distant to protect us against the sudden attacks of the Pagans, nor pretend to subjugate us—us who are Franks. . . . If a Bishop excommunicates a Christian, contrary to rule, he abuses his power; but he can deprive no one of eternal life who is not deprived of it by his sins. It is improper in a Bishop to say that any man not incorrigible should be separated from the Christian name and consigned to condemnation; and that too, not on account of his crimes, but for the sake of withholding or conferring a temporal sovereignty. If then the Pope is really desirous to establish concord, let him not attempt it by fomenting dissensions; for he will never persuade us that we cannot arrive at the kingdom of Heaven except by receiving the king whom he may choose to give us on earth.' Again, in an answer of Charles to an epistle of Adrian, that Prince argues respecting the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual power, and also alleges the peculiar supremacy of the kings of France. To prove these and similar points, he refers not only to the Archives of the Roman Church, but to the writings of St. Gelasius, St. Leo, St. Gregory, and even St. Augustin himself. (See *Hist. Littéraire de la France*. Fleury, l. iii., s. 8, 22.) Hincmar wrote many of that king's letters, and may probably have been the author of this.

† Lewis the Stammerer.

as his father; and when you are at Compiègne, where they repose, cast down your eyes and look where lies your father and where your grandfather is buried; and presume not to exalt yourself in the presence of Him who died for you and for us all, and who was raised again, and dies no more. You will pass away speedily; but the Holy Church and its ministers under Jesus Christ their Chief will subsist eternally according to his promise.' This vain menace of temporal retribution (for as such it was obviously intended) was however singularly accomplished; Lewis, in the vigour of youth, died in the following year; and the strange coincidence may have encouraged future Prelates to indulge in similar predictions which proved not equally fortunate.

We have already mentioned that Charles the Bald, about fifteen years after his contest with Pope Nicholas, condescended to accept the vacant empire as the donation of John VIII. The immediate result of this act was, that the government of Italy and the Imperial throne were, for some years afterwards, placed in a great measure at the disposal of the Pope, who shamelessly abused his influence*. But it had a more lasting and still more pernicious consequence, in so far as it furnished to the more powerful Pontiffs of after ages one of their pretexts for interference in the succession to the Imperial throne. The ceremony of coronation to which Charlemagne had consented to submit at Rome was their only foundation for the pretension that the empire had been transferred from the Greeks to the Latins by papal authority; and on the same ground it was subsequently transferred by the same agency from the French to the Italians, from the Italians to Otho I. and the Germans. The mere act of ministry in a customary, and, as was then thought, a necessary solemnity, was exalted into a display of superiority and an exercise of power; and many among the ignorant vulgar were really led to believe that the rights of sovereignty were conferred by the form of consecration. But the condescension of Charles the Bald, though conceding no very definite privilege, nor any which could be reasonably binding on his successors, yet furnished a pretence which was somewhat more substantial than a mere ceremony †.

On a review of this short narrative, we perceive that the Prelates of the ninth century advanced, for the first time, claims of temporal authority; that such claims were asserted by national assemblies of Bishops even more daringly than by the Popes; and that they were so immoderate as to be inconsistent with the necessary rights of Princes, and the vigour and stability of civil government. We observe, moreover, that the Hierarchy, though on some particular occasions their efforts were frustrated, had made, during the period of sixty-three years from the death of Charlemagne to that of Charles the Bald, very considerable strides in the advancement of their power and privileges. The immediate successor of Charles, Louis the Stammerer, was consecrated to the throne of France by the Pope; and a Council of Bishops assembled at Troyes

* See Mosh. Cent. ix. p. ii. c. ii. Giannone, Stor. Nap. lib. viii. Introdect.

† Some of the expressions of the Pope delivered on this occasion should be cited. 'Unde nos, tantis indicibus divinitus incumbentibus, luce clarius agnitis, superni decreti consilium manifestè cognovimus. Et quia pridem Apostolicæ memoriæ Decessori nostro Papæ Nicolao idipsum jam inspiratione divina revelatum fuisse comperimus, *elegimus* merito et *approbavimus* una cum annisu et voto omnium Fratrum et Coepiscoporum nostrorum et aliorum Sanctæ Rom. Ecclesiæ Ministrorum, amplique senatus, totiusque Rom. populi gentisque togatæ, et secundum prisam consuetudinem, solemniter ad *Imperii Romani Sceptra proveximus*, et Augustali nomine decoravimus, ungentes eum oleo extrinsecus, ut interioris quoque Spiritus Sancti unctionis monstrarem virtutem, &c.' See Baron. Ann. 876, s. 6.

about the same time (in 878), published, as the first Canon, 'that the Powers of the world should treat the Bishops with every sort of respect, and that no one should presume to sit down in their presence unless by their command;' as the last, 'that all those Canons be observed, under pain of deposition for clerks, and privation of all dignity for laymen.' The Pope and the King were both present at this Council, and the latter appears to have sanctioned the very bold usurpation contained in the last clause.

Soon after this period the Popes became so much embarrassed by domestic inquietude and disorder, that they had little leisure to extend their conquests abroad; and thus for above a century the thunders of the Vatican murmured with extreme faintness, or altogether slept. But the principle of ecclesiastical supremacy, and the disposition to submit to it were not extinguished in the tumults of the tenth age; and the storm, when it again broke forth, seemed even to have gained strength from the sullen repose which had preceded it. The occasion was this—Robert, King of France, had married a relative, four degrees removed, indeed, but still too near akin for the severity of canonical morality. Gregory V. in a Council of Italian Bishops, held at Rome in the year 998, launched a peremptory order, that the king should put away his wife, and both parties perform seven years of penance. The king resisted; but so united was the Church at that time, and so powerful, that he was presently excommunicated by his own Prelates, and shunned by his nobles and people. At length, after some ineffectual struggles, he submitted to anathemas so generally respected and enforced*, and complied with both the injunctions of the Pontiff. This is the third instance of an authoritative interference on the part of the Popes in the concerns of sovereigns which we have had occasion to mention, and we may here remind the reader that two of them were on the ground of uncanonical marriages.

It is not our intention to enumerate the many trifling occasions on which the claims of the Church were brought into collision with the rights or dignity of monarchs: the instances which have been produced are the most important, and they are worthy of more particular reflection than can here be bestowed on them. But at present it must suffice to have noticed, even thus briefly, the earliest movements by which the spirit of ecclesiastical ambition pressed towards universal domination, and to have called some attention to those bold, but irregular, encroachments, which furnished to after ages precedents for wider and more systematic usurpation.

III. We have already mentioned that, from a very early period, the Bishop of Rome possessed the first rank among the rulers of the Church; and if, after the Council of Chalcedon, it was disputed with him by the Patriarch of Constantinople, it was at no time contested (at least after the time of Constantine) in the western Churches. It is equally true, that his pre-eminence in rank was unattended by any sort of authority beyond the limits of his own diocese; and the sort of

* Petrus Damiani, who wrote about sixty years afterwards, relates, that the ecclesiastical censure was so exactly observed, that no one would hold any communion with the king, excepting two servants who carried him the necessaries of life, and that even these burnt the vessels which he had used. But that author throws suspicion on a narration not improbable, by adding that the fruit of the marriage was a monster which had the head and neck of a goose. See Fleury, l. lvii., s. 57.

superintendence which it might seem his duty to exercise over ecclesiastical affairs, was confined to the simple right of remonstrance. More than this is not asserted by moderate Catholics, nor can an impartial Protestant concede less.

We have also noticed some of the steps which were taken by early Popes, not only to extend the boundaries of their jurisdiction, but to establish an absolute authority within them. Their earliest success was the transfer to the Holy See of the Metropolitan privileges throughout the diocese. Among these the most important were the consecration of bishops, the convocation of synods, and the ultimate decision of appeals—privileges which might obviously be applied to restrain the power and independence of the bishops. During the fifth and sixth centuries some little progress was made towards that object. Valentinian III. made to Leo I. some concessions which were valuable, though that Pope had no means of enforcing them; but the acquisitions of Gregory the Great were more substantial, and that most especially so was the establishment of the appellat jurisdiction of the see. A more general subjection of Metropolitan to Papal authority was introduced by the Council of Frankfort; and such was the relative situation of the parties on the accession of Charlemagne to the empire. But presently afterwards, as if impatient of the tedious progress of gradual usurpation, the Spirit of Papacy called into existence, by an effort of amazing audacity, a new system of government, and a new code of principles, which led by a single step to the most absolute power. The false Decretals were imposed on the credulity* of mankind. Still the moment was not yet arrived in which it was possible to enforce all the rights so boldly claimed on their authority; and though some ground was gained by Pope Nicholas I., their efforts were not brought into full operation till the pontificate of Gregory VII.

In recording some instances of the temporal interference of the Church, we have remarked the success of episcopal, as distinct from papal presumption, and observed the independence, as well as the force, with which the Councils of Bishops acted against the secular powers. The ninth has been peculiarly characterized as the Age of the Bishops; it becomes therefore more important to examine the relation in which they then stood, even in the moment of their highest glory, to the power which was now spreading in every direction from Rome. It has been mentioned that when the sons of Lewis the Meek were in revolt against their father, Pope Gregory IV. presented himself (as has been mentioned) at the camp of the rebels, and under pretence of mediation, favoured (as was thought) their party. On this occasion, certain French prelates, who remained faithful to Lewis, addressed an epistle to the Pope, wherein they accused him of having violated the oath which he had taken to the Emperor; they denied his power to excommunicate any person, or make any disposition in their dioceses, without their permission; they boldly declared that if he came with the intention of excommunicating them, he should return himself excommunicated; and even proceeded so far as to threaten him with deposition. The Pope was alarmed; but, on the assurance of his attendants that he had received power from God to superintend the affairs of all nations and the concord of all Churches, and that, with authority to judge every one, he was not himself subject to any judgment, he wrote in an-

* Hincmar was not, indeed, blindly submissive to the Decretals; but it was their authority which he questioned rather than their authenticity—proving that his national or episcopal spirit of independence was greater than his critical sagacity.

swer, that ecclesiastical is placed high above secular power, and that the obedience of the Bishops was due to him rather than to the Emperor; that he could not better discharge his oath than by restoring concord; and that none could withdraw themselves from the Church of Rome without incurring the guilt of schism. The irritation of the parties is sufficiently discovered in their letters; but their firmness was not put to trial; for the rebels obtained by treachery a temporary success, and the Pope returned to Italy without either pronouncing or receiving excommunication.

The occurrence which we shall next mention took place thirty years afterwards; and it is the more remarkable, because the two greatest ecclesiastics of that age, Nicholas I. and Hincmar of Rheims, were placed in direct opposition to each other. The circumstances were nearly the following. A Bishop of Soissons, named Rothadus, incurred the displeasure of Hincmar, and after being condemned in two Councils held at Soissons in 862, under the direction of the Metropolitan, was first excommunicated, and very soon afterwards deposed and imprisoned. Rothadus, on the first sentence, appealed to the see of Rome, and found a very willing and probably partial judge in Nicholas. The Pope instantly despatched to Hincmar a peremptory order, either to restore Rothadus within thirty days, or to appear at Rome in person or by legate for the determination of the difference, on pain of suspension from his ministry. In the year following, Hincmar sent Odo, Bishop of Beauvais, to Rome, with the commission to request the Pope's confirmation of the acts of the synod of Soissons. But Nicholas, on the contrary, rescinded its decisions, and demanded, with repeated menaces, the immediate liberation of Rothadus, in order to the personal prosecution of his appeal at Rome. Through the interference of Charles the Bald, the prisoner was released; and after some delays, the deputies of Hincmar also appeared before the pontifical tribunal. The decision was such as all probably anticipated: all the charges against Rothadus were ascribed to the malice and perfidy of his enemy; he was ordered to resume the episcopal vestments, and a legate was sent to escort him on his return to his country and his see. It does not appear, from the particulars* of this contest, that Hincmar and the Bishops who supported him went so far as to deny the right of a deposed Bishop to appeal to Rome against the sentence of his Metropolitan; indeed, they rested their defence on much lower ground, and thus conceded that which was most important. At any rate, the triumph of Nicholas was complete; and though the right in question was first advanced by him, and on no more solid authority than the (forged) 'Decretals of the Ancient Pontiffs,' he prevailed with scarcely any difficulty against the most learned canonist and the most independent ecclesiastic of those days.

About five years after the restoration of Rothadus, Hincmar found himself once more in contest with the Holy See †; and his zeal on this

* Besides the ecclesiastical historians, see the Life of Nicholas in the *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* R. P. Francisci Pagi, tome ii. That Pope, in his Epistle 'Ad universos Galliæ Episcopos,' admits, however, that the authority of the Decretals was not yet universally received in the Gallican Church. We read in the same author, that Adrian II. commanded the Gallican Bishops to raise Actardus of Nantes to the first Metropolitan see which might be vacant; and that, in the year 871, he was raised to that of Tours, but with the addition—*Rege, clero, ac populo postulantibus.*

† In 853, Hincmar had deposed a number of Clerks ordained by his predecessor, whose canonical right to the See was disputed. In 866, Pope Nicholas ordered a revision of that affair; Hincmar maintained the sentence vigorously; but Nicholas, having

occasion may possibly have been animated by the recollection of his former humiliation. His vigorous opposition to Adrian II., respecting the succession to the crown of Lorraine, has been already noticed; and if he failed when he would have vindicated the independence of the Church of France from Roman superintendence, his success was even more remarkable when he defended the rights of the throne from similar invasion.

The visit of John VIII. to France, during the year 878, certainly confirmed, and probably extended, papal authority in that country. Before the Council had assembled at Troyes, he obtained the consent of the king to some regulations, one of which was, that no metropolitan should be permitted to ordain, until he had received the pallium or vest from Rome. During the Session of the Council we observe the following declaration to have been made by Hincmar himself:—‘In obedience to the Holy Canons, I condemn those whom the Holy See has condemned, and receive those whom it receives, and hold that which it holds in conformity with Scripture and the Canons.’ The Bishops who were present professed the strictest unanimity with the Pontiff; and the good understanding which was then, perhaps, established between the Churches of Rome and France, and which assumed the inferiority*, if not the dependance of the latter, appears to have subsisted long, with no material interruption.

Hincmar died a few years afterwards. He was descended from a noble family; and the early part of his life he so divided between the Court and the Cloister, and displayed so much ability and enthusiasm in the discharge of the duties attached to either situation, as to combine the practical penetration of a Statesman with the rigour of a zealous Ecclesiastic. He was raised to the See of Rheims in the year 845, at the age of thirty-nine, and filled it for nearly forty years with firmness and vigour. In the ninth century, when the mightiest events were brought about by ecclesiastical guidance, he stands among the leading characters, if, indeed, we should not rather consider him as the most eminent. He was the great Churchman of the age: on all public occasions of weighty deliberation, at all public ceremonies of coronation or consecration, Hincmar is invariably to be found as the active and directing spirit. His great knowledge of canonical law enabled him to rule the Councils of the Clergy; his universal talents rendered him necessary to the state, and gave him more influence in political affairs than any other subject: while his correspondence † attests his close intercourse with all the leading characters

Charles on his side, obtained once more a complete triumph, and restored the Ecclesiastics to their rank in the Church. In both these disputes it would appear that the popular voice was against Hincmar.

* The following is the substance of an Address to the Pope, made by the Bishops at this Council—the original may be found in Baronius. Ann. 878, s. 17, &c.: ‘We, the Bishops of Gaul and Belgium, your sons, servants, and disciples, deeply suffer through the wounds which have been inflicted upon our Holy Mother, the mistress of all Churches, and unanimously repeat the sentence which you have launched against your enemies, excommunicating those whom you have excommunicated, and anathematizing those whom you have anathematized. . . . And since we also have matter for lamentation in our own Churches, we humbly supplicate you to assist us with your authority, and promulgate an ordinance (Capitulum) to show in what manner we ought to act against the spoliators of the Church; that, being fortified by the censure of the Apostolical See, we may be more powerful and confident,’ &c.

† Frodoard mentions 423 letters of Hincmar, besides many others not specified. He was present at thirty-nine important Councils, at most of which he presided. His history and character are very well illustrated by Guizot in his 28th *Leçon de la Civil. en France*.

of his age. In the management of his Diocese, he was no less careful to instruct and enlighten than strict to regulate; and while he issued and enforced his Capitularies of Discipline with the air and authority of a civil despot, he waged incessant warfare with ignorance. It is indeed probable that he possessed less theological learning than his less celebrated contemporary, Rabanus Maurus; but he had much more of that active energy of character so seldom associated with contemplative habits. It is also true that he was crafty, imperious, and intolerant; that he paid his sedulous devotions to the Virgin*, and was infected with other superstitions of his age. His occasional resistance to the see of Rome has acquired for him much of his celebrity; but if Divine Providence had so disposed, that Hincmar had been Bishop of Rome for as long a space as he was Primate of France, he would unquestionably have exalted papal supremacy with more courage, consistency, and success, than he opposed it.

We have observed that one of the most successful means of papal usurpation within the Church was the encouragement of appeals to Rome. It is indeed scarcely possible to measure the advantages which the see derived from *Popish usurpations.* that practice; and perhaps we do not value it too highly when we ascribe to it chiefly a vague notion of the Pope's *omnipotence*, which seems to have made some impression among the laity during the ninth century. Before we quit this subject, we should mention a remonstrance from the pen of Hincmar, which was addressed to the Pope under the name of Charles the Bald, and towards the end of his life. In this letter the Emperor is made to complain, that it is no longer deemed sufficient that Bishops, condemned by their Metropolitans, should cross the Alps for redress, but that every Priest, who has been canonically sentenced by his Bishop, now hurries to Rome for a repeal of the sentence. The origin of appeals to Rome is traced to the Council of Sardica; but by that authority they were properly liable to two restrictions—they were permitted to Bishops only, and were necessarily determined on the spot. The inferior orders were amenable to their respective Bishops, who judged in conjunction with their Clergy; and the only lawful appeal from the decision was to a Provincial Council. The second restriction had been confirmed by the Canons of the African Church, which in former days had defended its independence against the aggressions of Rome, and which now furnished weapons to the Prelates of Gaul, invaded after so long an interval by the persevering ambition of the same adversary.

Another method of papal encroachment was the appointment of a Vicar in distant provinces, to whom the Pope delegated his assumed authority, and by whose acknowledgment the existence of that authority was in fact admitted.

In the year 876, John VIII. designated the Archbishop of Sens as Primate of the Gauls and Germany, and Vicar of the Pope for the Convocation of Councils and other ecclesiastical affairs; and especially to promulgate the pontifical edicts, and superintend their execution. The Bishops of France hesitated to receive the yoke so manifestly prepared for them; and on this occasion we again observe Hincmar of Rheims defending and directing their opposition. He protested before the assembled Council, that this attempt was contrary to the Holy Canons; he appealed to the regulations of Nice, which subjected every province to its own

* This appears from his epitaph, written by himself, in some very indifferent hexameter and pentameter verses.

Metropolitan, and confirmed the original privileges of the Churches; he fortified the decisions of Nice by the authority of St. Leo and other Popes; he denied that the particular jurisdiction which the Pontiff confessedly exercised over certain distant provinces (as Macedonia and parts of Illyria) absorbed the rights of the Metropolitans; and, while he admitted that the Popes had more than once established their Vicars in Gaul itself, he contended that the office was temporary, instituted for occasional and specific purposes, such as the prevention of simony, the conversion of unbelievers, the restoration of discipline, and that it ceased with the particular abuses which had made it necessary*. The weight of antiquity, which furnishes a conclusive argument in ignorant ages, was, without question, on the side of Hincmar. On the other hand, the Pope had engaged the Emperor in the defence of his claims; and, as it was one part of his policy to coalesce with the national hierarchy whenever the rights of princes could be assailed with advantage, so was it another to draw the princes into his own designs against the power and independence of their Clergy.

And here it is proper to notice another privilege, which, though its origin may be traced to Gregory the Great, was little exercised by the Popes until the ninth, or the beginning of the tenth age. Hitherto the monasteries, with very few exceptions, were subject to the Bishop of the diocese in which they stood, and who in many cases had been their founders. Exemptions from episcopal jurisdiction were now granted with some frequency, and the establishments thus privileged acknowledged a direct dependence on the Pope. He had many motives for this policy, but that which most concerns our present subject is the following. To secure his triumph over the liberties of the Church, it was necessary to divide it; and his scheme of reducing the higher ranks of the Clergy was amply promoted by a practice which curtailed their authority in a very important branch, which transferred that authority to himself, and at the same time created lasting jealousy and dissension between the regular and secular orders.

Two other objects may be mentioned to which the ambition of Rome was steadily and effectually directed—to establish the principle that Bishops derived their power entirely from the Pope, and to prevent the convocation of Councils without his express command. Towards the accomplishment of the second, very great though very gradual progress was made during the ninth age by a series of usurpations, of which the earliest served as precedents whereon to found the practice. The greater obscurity and confusion of the tenth century were more favourable to the success of the first †; and if it be true that, even after that time, there were to be found some bolder Prelates, both in France and Germany, who disputed these and others among the pontifical claims, it cannot be questioned that they had then acquired so much prevalence, and had struck so deeply into the prejudices and habits of men, that a powerful hand alone was wanted to call them into light and action, and to give them the most fatal efficacy.

The preceding pages have presented to us a variety of incidents hitherto nearly novel in the history of the Church, but with which experience will presently render us familiar. We have been astonished by the arrogant claims of the Episcopal Order and the extent of political power

* Fleury, H. E. lib. lii., s. 33. Frodoardus (in a passage cited by Baronius, Ann. 876. s. 24) admits the powerful resistance of Hincmar on this occasion.

† See Mosheim, Cent. x., p. 2, c. 2.

which it actually possessed, and shocked by the ill purpose to which it sometimes applied that power. But our most thoughtful attention has still been fixed upon the proceedings of the Pope. We have observed him, in the first place, contending with the Emperor for the independence of his own election with a great degree of success; next we have beheld him engaged in occasional contests with the most powerful Sovereigns of the age, not only in those domestic concerns which might seem to give some plea for ecclesiastical interference, but about affairs strictly secular, and the very successions to their thrones; and, lastly, we have noticed the movements of that more confined, but scarcely more legitimate ambition, which pretended to depress the superior ranks of the Clergy, to despoil them of their privileges, and to remove them to so humble a distance from the Roman See, that the Pope might seem to concentrate (if it were possible) in his own person the entire authority of the ecclesiastical order. The particular facts by which these designs were manifested belong, for the most part, to the ninth century; but the grand pontifical principles, if they suffered a partial suspension, yet lost none of their force and vitality during that which followed. And upon the whole it is a true and unavoidable observation, that the period during which the mighty scheme first grew and developed itself, embraced that portion of papal history which, above all others, is most scandalously eminent for the disorders* of the See, and for the weakness and undisguised profligacy of those who occupied it†.

CHAPTER XV.

On the Opinions, Literature, Discipline, and External Fortunes of the Church.

I. On the Eucharist—Original Opinions of the Church—Doctrine of Paschasius Radbert combated by Ratram and John Scotus—Conclusion of the Controversy—Predestination—Opinions and Persecution of Goteschalchus—Millennarianism in the Tenth Century—its strange and general Effect. II. Literature—Rabanus Maurus, John Scotus, Alfred—its Progress among the Saracens—Spain—South of Italy—France—Rome—Pope Sylvester II. III. Discipline of the Church—Conduct of Charlemagne and his Successors—St. Benedict of Aniane. Institution of Canons regular—Episcopal election—Translations by Bishops prohibited. Pope Stephen VI.—Claudius Bishop of Turin—Penitential System. IV. Conversion of the North of Europe—of Denmark, Sweden, Russia—of Poland and Hungary—how accomplished and to what Extent—The Normans—The Turks.

THE particulars contained in the preceding Chapter present an imperfect picture of the condition of Religion during the ninth and tenth cen-

* This is more particularly true of the tenth century, but even the ninth was not exempt from the same charge. To this age belongs the popular story of the female Pope; the pontificate of Joan is recorded to have commenced on the death of Leo IV., in 855, and to have lasted for about two years. Historians agree that very great confusion prevailed at Rome respecting the election of Leo's successor, and that Benedict III. did not prevail without a severe and tumultuous struggle with a rival named Anastasius. The rule of Pope Joan is now indeed generally discredited; but the early invention of the tale, and the belief so long attached to it, attest a condition of things which made it at least possible.

† The Lives of the Popes (*Liber Pontificalis*) were written by Anastasius, a librarian, who died before 882; they reach as far as the death of Nicholas I. in 867. The lives of some other Popes, as far as 889, were added by another librarian named Guillaume. From 889 to 1050 (where the Collection of Cardinal d'Aragon begins) there is a suspension of pontifical biography.

turies. They are sufficient, perhaps, to exhibit the outlines of the visible Church, as it was gradually changing its shape and constitution, and passing through a region of disorder and darkness, from a state of contested rights and restricted authority to a situation of acknowledged might and unbounded pretension. They may also have discovered to us, in some manner, the process of the change, and certain of the less obvious means and causes through which it was accomplished: still the inquiry has been confined to the external Church; it has gone to examine a human and perishable institution—no farther; it has illustrated the outworks which man had thrown up for the protection (as he imagined) of God's fortress—nothing more. It remains, then, to complete the task, and to notice some circumstances in the history of this period unconnected with the ambitious struggles of Popes or Bishops.

It is observable that, during the seventh and eighth ages, Religion lost much of its vigour and efficacy in France and Italy, while it took root and spread in Britain; during the ninth, it arose, through the institutions of Charlemagne, with renovated power in France; in the course of the tenth, its progress in Germany made some amends for its general degradation. These fluctuations corresponded, upon the whole, with the literary revolutions of those countries. Learning was, in those days, the only faithful ally and support of religion, and the causes which withered the one never failed to blight the other. Indeed, as learning was then almost wholly confined to the Clergy, it naturally partook of a theological character; and as the season of scholastic sophistry had not yet set in, the theology did not so commonly obscure, it even commonly illustrated, the religion.

Religious zeal, when informed by imperfect education, and unrestrained by a moderate and charitable temper, is rarely unattended by religious dissension; and thus it happened, that, while the intellectual torpor of the tenth century was little or nothing agitated by such disputes, the ninth, which was partially enlightened, witnessed three important controversies. The first was that which Photius carried on with the Roman See, regarding Image worship and other differences, the work of preceding generations; and it has been already treated. The other two respected the manner of Christ's presence at the Eucharist, and the doctrine of Salvation by Grace, and they shall now be noticed: it will afterwards be necessary to say a few words on the Discipline of the Church; and we shall then observe the progress of Christianity among distant and barbarous nations, as well as the severe reverse which afflicted it.

I. Mosheim* asserts without hesitation, that it had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the Church, that the body and blood of Christ were really administered to those who received the Sacrament, and that they were consequently *present* at the administration, but that the sentiments of Christians concerning the *nature* and manner of this presence were various and contradictory. No Council had yet determined with precision the manner in which that presence was to be understood; both reason and folly were hitherto left free in this matter; nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or controlled the extravagance of the other. The Historian's first position is laid down, perhaps, somewhat too peremptorily; for though many passages may be adduced from very ancient fathers in affirmation of the bodily presence, the obscurity or different tendency of others would rather persuade us, that even

* Cent. ix, p. 2, c. 3.

that doctrine was also left a good deal to individual judgment. The second is strictly true ; and the question which had escaped the vain and intrusive curiosity of oriental theologians, was at length engendered in a Convent in Gaul. In the year 831, Paschasius Radbert, a Benedictine Monk, afterwards Abbot of Corbie, published a treatise ‘concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,’ which he presented, fifteen years afterwards, carefully revised and augmented, to Charles the Bald. The doctrine advanced by Paschasius may be expressed in the two following propositions :—First, that after the consecration of the bread and wine, nothing remains of those symbols except the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present. Secondly, that the body of Christ, thus present, is the same body which was born of the Virgin, which suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead*. Charles appears decidedly to have disapproved of this doctrine. And it might perhaps have been expected that, after the example of so many princes, he would have summoned a Council, stigmatized it as heresy, and persecuted its author. He did not do so ; but, on the contrary, adopted a method of opposition worthy of a wiser Prince and a more enlightened age. He commissioned two of the ablest writers of the day, Ratramn † and Johannes Scotus ‡, to investigate by arguments the suspicious opinion. The composition of the former is still extant, and has exercised the ingenuity of the learned even in recent times ; but they

* Paschasius derived three consequences from his doctrine. 1. That Jesus Christ was immolated anew every day, in reality but in mystery. 2. That the Eucharist is both truth and figure together. 3. That it is not liable to the consequences of digestion. The first of these positions assumes a new and express creation on every occasion of the celebration of the Sacrament. The disputes arising from the third afterwards gave birth to the heresy named Stercoranism.—Fleury, l. xlvii., s. 35. Semler (sec. ix. cap. iii.) is willing to deduce Paschasius’ doctrine from the Monophysite Controversy, and the opinions respecting ‘one incarnate nature of Christ,’ which had still some prevalence in the East.

† A monk of Corbie. His book was long received under the name of Bertram ; and some have even supposed it to be the work of John Scotus on the same subject, but clearly without reason. Dupin, Hist. Eccl., Cent. ix. c. vii. Fleury, l. xlix., s. 52, 53. Semler, loc. cit. Ratramn proposes the subject in the following manner :—“Your Majesty inquires whether the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which is received in the Church by the mouth of the faithful, is made in mystery—that is, if it contains anything secret which only appears to the eyes of faith—or if, without any veil of mystery, the eyes of the body perceive without, that which the view of the spirit perceives within ; so that all which is made is manifestly apparent. You inquire besides, whether it is the same body which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered, died, and was buried ; and which, after its resurrection, ascended to Heaven, and sat on the right hand of the Father.” Respecting the second question, the opinion of Ratramn was in direct opposition to that of Paschasius ; but, in the treatment of the first, it would be difficult certainly to pronounce on what they differed, or indeed on what they agreed. There is moreover extant an anonymous composition, which combats the second proposition of Paschasius—first in itself, and then in its consequence—that Jesus Christ *suffers* anew on every occasion that mass is celebrated. The writer acknowledges the real presence as a necessary tenet. ‘Every Christian’ (thus he commences) ‘ought to believe and confess that the body and blood of the Lord is true flesh and true blood ; whoever denies this proves himself to be without faith.’ It appears indeed true that Paschasius’ second proposition gave much more general offence than the first.

‡ John Scotus Erigena (i. e. John the Irishman) was a layman of great acuteness and much profane learning, and irreproachable moral character. He was in high estimation at the court of Charles the Bald, and honoured by the personal partiality of that prince. He is described in the Hist. Litt. de la France, to have been of ‘très petite taille, vif, pénétrant, et enjoué.’ Fleury (l. xlvi., s. 48) disputes the great extent of his theological acquirements, and perhaps with justice. His book on the Eucharist was burnt about two hundred years afterwards by the hand of his disciple Berenger, on ecclesiastical compulsion.

have not succeeded in extricating from the perplexities of his reasoning, and, perhaps, the uncertainty of his belief, the real opinions of the author. The work of Johannes Scotus is lost; but we learn that his arguments were more direct, and his sentiments more perspicuous and consistent; he plainly declared, that the bread and wine were no more than symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ, and memorials of the last supper. Other theologians engaged in the dispute, and a decided superiority, both in number and talents*, was opposed to the doctrine of Paschasius—yet so opposed, that there was little unanimity among its adversaries, and no very perfect consistency even in their several writings†.

The controversy died away before the end of the ninth century, without having occasioned any great mischief, and the subject was left open to individual inquiry or neglect, as it had ever been. The intellectual lethargy of the century following was not to be disturbed by an argument demanding some acuteness, and susceptible of much sophistry; and an age of entire ignorance has at least this advantage over one of superficial learning‡, that it suffers nothing from the abuse of the human understanding. But very early in the eleventh century, the dispute was again awakened: it assumed, under different circumstances and other principles, another aspect and character, and closed in a very different termination. But as this event belongs more properly to the life of Gregory VII. we shall not anticipate the triumph of that Pontiff, nor deprive his name of any ray of that ambiguous splendour which illustrates it.

The subject of *Predestination* and *Divine Grace*, which had already § been controverted in France with some acuteness, and, what is much better, with candour and charity, was subjected to another investigation in the ninth century. Godeschalvus, otherwise called Fulgentius, was a native of Germany, and a monk of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons. He was admitted to orders, during the vacancy of the See, by the Chor-episcopus—a circumstance to which the subsequent animosity of Hinemar is sometimes attributed. He possessed considerable learning, but a mind withal too prone to pursue abstruse and unprofitable inquiries. Early in life he consulted Lupus, Abbot of Ferrara, on the question, whether, after the resurrection, the blessed shall see God with the eyes of the body? The Abbot concluded a reluctant reply to the following effect:—‘I exhort you, my venerable brother, no longer to weary your spirit with suchlike speculations, lest, through too great devotion to them, you become incapacitated for examining and teaching things more useful. Why waste so many researches on matters, which it is not yet, perhaps, expedient that we should know? Let us rather exercise our talents in the spacious fields of Holy Writ; let us apply entirely to that meditation, and let prayer be associated to our studies. God will not fail in his goodness to manifest himself in the manner which shall be best for us, though we should cease to pry into things which are placed above us.’ The specu-

* Hinemar appears to have held the doctrine of the real presence; and it is difficult to pronounce whether or not he confined his meaning to a spiritual presence.

† The *worship* of the elements is not mentioned by any of the disputants—it was an extravagance of superstition too violent for the controversialists of the ninth century.

‡ As early as the conclusion of the eighth century, a heresy respecting the nature of Jesus Christ appeared in the Western Church—that of the Adoptians. It was condemned by Charlemagne in three Councils, between the years 790 and 800, and presently disappeared.

§ In the fifth century.—See chap. xi.

lations of Godeschalvus were diverted by this judicious rebuke, but not repressed; and the books of Scripture were still rivalled or superseded in his attention by those of Augustin. Accordingly he involved himself deeply and inextricably in the mazes of fatalism. About the year 846, he made a pilgrimage to Rome, and on his return, soon afterwards, he expressed his opinions on that subject very publicly in the diocese of Verona. Information was instantly conveyed to Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence, the most profound theologian of the age. That Prelate immediately replied; and in combating the error of a professed Augustinian, protected himself also by the authority of Augustin*.

Happy had it been for the author of the controversy, if his adversary had allowed it to remain on that footing; but the doctrine was becoming too popular, and threatened moral effects too pernicious† to be overlooked by the Church. Rabanus assembled, in 848, a Council at Mayence, at which the king was present, and Godeschalvus was summoned before it. Here he defended, in a written treatise, the doctrine of *double* predestination—that of the elect, to eternal life by the free Grace of God—that of the wicked, to everlasting damnation through their own sins. His explanations did not satisfy the Council, and the tenet was rejected and condemned; but its advocate was not considered amenable to that tribunal, as he had been ordained in the diocese of Rheims; wherefore Rabanus consigned him to the final custody of Hincmar, who then held that See.

The unfortunate heretic (he had now deserved that appellation) profited nothing by this change in jurisdiction. Hincmar, in the following year, caused him to be accused before the Council of Quiercy sur Oise, when he was pronounced incorrigible, and deposed from the priesthood. Moreover, as the penalty of his insolence and contumacy, he was condemned to public flagellation and perpetual imprisonment. The sentence was rigidly executed, and Charles was not ashamed to countenance it by his royal presence. It is affirmed, that under the prolonged agony of severe torture, the sufferer yielded so far as to commit to the flames the Texts which he had collected in defence of his opinions; and if he did so, it was human and excusable weakness‡. But it is certain that he was confined to the walls of a convent for almost twenty§ years, and that at length,

* Rabanus was the most profound divine in the ninth century, as Augustin was in the fifth, but the spirit of the one age was original thought and reasoning—that of the other, blind and servile imitation: therefore Rabanus was contented to cite and explain Augustin; and the controversy descended from lofty philosophical investigation to logical, and even critical subtilty. The object in the fifth age was, to solve an abstruse and difficult question; that in the ninth, to penetrate the real opinions of an ancient writer.

† In one of the letters written on this subject, Rabanus asserts that the doctrine of Godeschalvus had already driven many to despair, and that several began to inquire—‘Wherefore should I strive and labour for my salvation? In what does it profit me to be righteous, if I am not predestined to happiness? What evil may I not safely commit, if I am surely predestined to life eternal?’ This natural inference, however disavowed by the more ingenious teachers of the doctrine, is very liable to be drawn by the people, even in ages much more enlightened than the ninth.

‡ Godeschalvus solicited permission to maintain the truth of his doctrine in the presence of the King, the Clergy, and the whole people, by passing through four barrels filled with boiling water and oil and pitch, and afterwards through a large fire. If he should come out unhurt, let the doctrine be acknowledged and received; if otherwise, let the flames take their course. Milner, whose account of this Controversy should be mentioned with praise, can scarcely pardon this desire of his persecuted favourite—as if the champion of Predestination had been less liable than his neighbours to the superstitious contagion of his age. In this case, however, his imperfection was peculiarly excused by the more deliberate absurdity of Hincmar himself, who had so far degraded his genius as to write a serious treatise on ‘Trials by Hot and Cold Water.’ See Hist. Litt de la France.

§ His death is usually referred to the year 866. We should observe that his sufferings

during the agonies of his latest moments, he was required to subscribe a formulary of faith, as the only condition of reconciliation with the Church—that he disdained to make any sacrifice, even at that moment, to that consideration, and that his corpse was deprived of Christian sepulture by the unrelenting bigotry of Hincmar.

The precise extent* of Godeschalvus's errors is, according to the usual history of such controversies, a matter of difference, and for the usual reason, that consequences were imputed by his adversaries which his followers disclaimed. But it is certain that his proselytes multiplied during the continuance of his imprisonment, and that some provincial Councils declared in his favour; and it is probable that his doctrines have been uninterruptedly perpetuated, not by sects only, but by individuals in the bosom of the Church, from that age to the present.

The dispute, however, did not long survive its author, and seems to have expired before the end of the century; and during the concluding part of that which followed,—in the absence of political talent, of piety, of knowledge, of industry, of every virtue, and every motive which might give energy to the human character—in the suppression even of the narrow controversial spirit which enlivens the understanding, however it may sometimes pervert the principles,—a very wild and extraordinary delusion arose and spread itself, and at length so far prevailed as not only to subdue the reason, but to actuate the conduct of vast multitudes. It proceeded from the misinterpretation of a well-known passage in the Revelations †. 'And he laid hold on the Dragon, that old Serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him *a thousand years*, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled; And *after that* he must be loosed a little season.' It does not appear that the earlier Divines derived from this prophecy that specific expectation respecting the moment of the world's dissolution, which now became general; nor do we learn that the people

did not escape the compassion of some of his contemporaries. Remy, who succeeded Amolon in the see of Lyons, wrote on the subject with some warmth. 'It is an unprecedented instance of cruelty, which has filled the world with horror, that he was lacerated with stripes, as eye-witnesses attest, until he cast into the fire a memorial containing the passages from scripture and the fathers which he drew up to present to the Council; while all former heretics have been convicted by words and reasons. The long and inhuman detention of that wretched man ought at least to be tempered by some consolation, so as rather to win by charity a brother for whom Jesus Christ died, than to overwhelm him with misery.'—See Fleury, l. xlix., s. 5.

* Godeschalvus appears to have propounded three leading questions to Rabanus and the other Doctors. (1.) Whether it could be said that there was any predestination to evil. (2.) Concerning the will and death of Christ for all men; whether God has a true will to save any but those which are saved. (3.) Concerning free will. . . . The theologians of Mayence, however, very prudently confined their attention to the first—'Whether it can be said that God predestinates the wicked to damnation?' (Dupin, H. E., Cen. ix.) About four years afterwards, Amolon, Archbishop of Lyons, in a letter addressed to Hincmar, reduced (or rather expanded) the errors to seven; one of them being the following—'that God and the Saints *rejoice* in the fall of the reprov'd.' (Fleury, H. E. lib. xlviii., s. 59.) This was obviously a *consequence*; and no doubt the heretic had easy means of getting rid of it. For a full and perhaps faithful account of the whole controversy, see Hist. Litter. de la France, Cen. ix., vol. iv. p. 263. It is, however, worth remarking, that the Divines on both sides alike professed to support the doctrine of the Church, as taught by the Fathers, and especially St. Augustin; whose authority on this question was universally admitted, while his real opinion was disputed.

† Chap. xx. 2 and 3.

before this time much busied themselves about a matter which could not possibly affect their own generation; but about the year 960, as the season approached nearer, one Bernhard, a hermit of Thuringia, a person not destitute of knowledge, boldly promulgated (on the faith of a particular revelation from God) the certain assurance, that at the end of the thousandth year the fetters of Satan were to be broken; and, after the reign of Antichrist should be terminated, that the world would be consumed by sudden conflagration. There was something plausible in the doctrine, and it was peculiarly suited to the gloomy superstition of the age; the Clergy adopted it without delay; the pulpits loudly resounded with it*; it was diffused in every direction with astonishing rapidity, and embraced with an ardour proportioned to the obscurity of the subject, and the greediness of human credulity. The belief pervaded and possessed every rank † of society, not as a cold and indifferent assent, but as a motive for the most important undertakings. Many abandoned their friends and their families, and hastened to the shores of Palestine, with the pious persuasion that Mount Sion would be the throne of Christ when he should descend to judge the world; and these, in order to secure a more partial sentence from the God of mercy and charity, usually made over their property, before they departed, to some adjacent Church or Monastery. Others, whose pecuniary means were thought, perhaps, insufficient to bribe the justice of Heaven, devoted their personal service to the same establishments, and resigned their very liberty to those holy mediators, whose pleadings, they doubted not, would find favour at the eternal judgment seat. Others permitted their lands to lie waste, and their houses to decay; or, terrified by some unusual phenomenon in the Heaven, betook themselves in hasty flight to the shelter of rocks and caverns ‡, as if the temples of Nature were destined to preservation amidst the wreck of man and his works.

The year of terror arrived, and passed away without any extraordinary convulsion; and at present it is chiefly remarkable as having terminated the most shameful century in the annals of Christianity. The people returned to their homes, and repaired their buildings, and resumed their former occupations; and the only lasting effect of this stupendous panic was the augmentation of the temporal prosperity of the Church §.

The intellectual energy of Europe (if we except perhaps the British Islands ||) was in a condition of gradual decay from the fifth till the middle of the seventh and eighth *State of Learning*. century ¶; and it was then that the progress of igno-

* Hist. Litt. de la France, x. Siècle. Mosheim (Cen. x., p. 2, c. iii.) cites a passage from the Apologeticum of Abbo, Abbot of Fleury—'De fine quoque mundi populo sermonem in Ecclesia Parisiorum adolescentulus audivi, quod statim finito mille annorum numero Anti-Christus adveniret, et non longo post tempore universale judicium succederet; cui prædicationi ex Evangeliiis ac Apocalypsi et libro Danielis, qua potui virtute restiti, &c.'

† Not Nobles only, but Princes, and even Bishops, are mentioned as having made a pilgrimage to Palestine on this occasion.

‡ An opportune eclipse of the sun produced this effect on the army of Otho the Great.

§ Almost all the donations which were made to the Church in this century proceeded from this avowed motive. 'Appropinquante jam mundi termino, &c. Since the end of the world is now at hand.' Mosh., Cen. x., p. 2, ch. iii. These monuments sufficiently attest the generality of the delusion.

|| The Venerable Bede flourished in the early part of the eighth century. He brought down his Ecclesiastical History as far as 731, and appears to have died four years afterwards.

¶ This decline is very commonly imputed to the despotism of the Church, and the

rance reached its widest and darkest boundaries. It was arrested by the genius of Charlemagne; and the beacon which was set up by his mighty hand shone forth even upon his degenerate descendants, some of whom lighted their torches at its embers. Thus, during the whole of the ninth century, the western world, and France especially, was animated by much literary exertion, and enlightened even by the ill-directed talents of many learned men. The name of Alcuin was not disgraced by those of his successors, Rabanus, Eginhard, Claudius, Godeschalcus, Paschasius, Ratramn, Hincmar, and Johannes Scotus*. The theological works of the first of these were so highly esteemed, as not only to furnish materials for contemporary instruction, but also to maintain great authority in the religious discussions of the four following centuries; and the last, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, displayed an accuracy of philosophical induction, and a freedom and boldness of original thought, which would have subjected him, in a somewhat later age, to ecclesiastical persecution. We should mention, too, that in the same age in which the genius of an Irishman instructed the Court of France, the foundations of English learning were deeply fixed and substantially constructed by the wisdom and piety of Alfred. The comparative languor of Italy was excited by the disputes at that time so warmly waged between the Roman and Eastern Churches, and which served to sharpen the ingenuity, while they degraded the principles, of both.

At Constantinople, the Emperor Theophilus, and his son, Michael III., made some endeavours towards the revival of letters in the ninth age; but the scattered rays which may have illustrated the East at that time, were overpowered by the pre-eminence of Photius, so that little has reached posterity excepting his celebrity. It is true that, in the century following, while the advance of learning was almost wholly suspended in Europe, and its growing power paralyzed, Constantine Porphyrogeneta made some zealous attempts to revive the industry of his country; but as his encouragement was directed rather to the imitation of ancient models than to the development of original thought, the impulse was faintly felt; and, so far from creating any strong and lasting effect, it failed to excite even the momentary energy of the Greeks.

But, during the same period, there occurred in the Eastern world a phenomenon which is among the most remarkable in the history of literature, and which no penetration could possibly have foreseen. We have recounted that, in the seventh century, the companions and successors of Mahomet desolated the face of the earth with their arms, and darkened it by their ignorance; and the acts of barbarism ascribed to them, and whe-

triumph of the papal principle of a blind faith, and absolute submission over the independence of reason. But this is a mistake proceeding from an imperfect knowledge of ecclesiastical history. At the period in question, the Church had not by any means attained the degree of authority necessary for that purpose: it was not yet sufficiently organized, nor even sufficiently united, to possess any power of universal individual tyranny; the *Romish* system was still only in its infancy; the Episcopal system, which was predominant, was full of disorder and disunion—the principle in question was certainly to be found in the archives of the Church, but the day was not yet arrived to enforce it. It came indeed into full effect in the twelfth and following ages, and not earlier than the twelfth; but learning then revived in despite of it, and grew up to overthrow it. The truth is, that the degradation of the sixth and seventh centuries are sufficiently accounted for by the political confusion, or rather anarchy, then so generally prevalent, as to make any moral excellence almost impossible, and to debase the Church in common with every thing else.

* Guizot has selected Hincmar and Johannes Scotus as the two representatives of the

ther truly ascribed or not*, generally credited, attest at least their contempt of learning, and their aversion for the monuments which they are stated to have destroyed. In the eighth century, the conquerors settled with tranquillity in the countries which they had subdued, which, in most instances, they converted, and which they continued to possess and govern. In the ninth, under the auspices of a wise and munificent Caliph, they applied the same ardour to the pursuit of literature which had heretofore been confined to the exercise of arms. Ample schools were founded in the principal cities of Asia†, Bagdad, and Cufa, and Bassora; numerous libraries were formed with care and diligence, and men of learning and science were solicitously invited to the splendid court of Almamunis. Greece, which had civilized the Roman republic, and was destined, in a much later age, to enlighten the extremities of the West, was now called upon to turn the stream of her lore into the barren bosom of Asia: for Greece was still the only land possessing an original national literature. Her noblest productions were now translated into the ruling language of the East, and the Arabians took pleasure in pursuing the speculations, or submitting to the rules, of her philosophy. The impulse thus given to the genius and industry of Asia was communicated with inconceivable rapidity, along the shores of Egypt and Africa, to the schools of Seville and Cordova; and the shock was not felt least sensibly by those who last received it. Henceforward the genius of learning accompanied even the arms of the Saracens. They conquered Sicily; from Sicily they invaded the Southern Provinces of Italy; and, as if to complete the eccentric revolution of Grecian literature, the wisdom of Pythagoras was restored to the land of its origin by the descendants of an Arabian warrior.

The adopted literature of that ingenious people, augmented by some original discoveries, passed with a more pacific progress from Spain into France, from France into Italy, even to the pontifical chair. In the year 999, Gerbert, a Frenchman, was raised to that eminence under the title of Sylvester II. This eminent person, whose talents, though peculiarly calculated for the comprehension of the abstract sciences, were not disqualified for less severe application, steadily devoted his industry, his intelligence, and his power to the acquirement, the amplification‡, and the diffusion of knowledge. Among the vulgar, indeed, he obtained a formidable reputation for magical skill; but he was honoured by the wise and the great even of his own days; and of Sylvester *that* may be more justly affirmed, which a Roman Catholic writer has rather chosen to predicate of the *papal* energy of Leo. IX., ‘that he undertook to repair the ruins of the tenth century.’

III. At no former period had the Western Church suffered such complete disorganization as during the first half of the eighth century: the

learning of the age—the former as the centre of the theological movement; the latter as the philosopher of his day. It is, indeed, impossible to convey any faithful notion of the literature of any age without entering into some such detail.

* The burning of the Alexandrian Library by the Saracens stands on authority about as good as the similar Vandalism charged on Gregory the Great.

† Contemporary with the foundation of Oxford; and where are *they* now? The history and character of the *Turks* can answer that question.

‡ Some ingenious inventions of Gerbert are mentioned in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*. His various virtues are highly extolled in the same work; and the only fault which his eulogists can find in his character is, ‘that he used too much flattery in making his court to the great.’ The *grandees* of the tenth century appear to have pardoned him this imperfection.

longer it was connected with the barbarous political system of the conquerors—the more closely it became associated with their institutions, their habits, and their persons; as they were gradually admitted to ecclesiastical dignities—the more shameful was the license, the deeper the corruption which pervaded it. The progress of the malady was arrested by Charlemagne—not with a reluctant or irresolute hand, but with the vigour which the occasion required, and which was justified by his noble designs. He repressed the disorders of the Bishops; he assembled numerous Councils, and he enforced the observance of their canons; thus he infused sudden energies into a body too torpid for self-reform; and he endeavoured to perpetuate the impulse by promoting education and rewarding literature. The last, in truth, was that which gave his other measures their efficacy; for above sixty years after his death, under the feeble sceptres of Lewis and Charles, the spirit sent forth by Charlemagne continued to animate the Church. Very general activity and superior intelligence distinguished the Clergy, especially the higher orders; and the frequency with which they assembled their Councils, and the important regulations which they enacted, evinced a zeal for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, which was not wholly without effect. Lewis was probably sincere in his co-operation for that purpose; but the merit of having directed, or even vigorously stimulated, the exertions of his prelates cannot justly be ascribed to so weak a prince. Respecting Charles, there seems reason to suspect, that he, as well as his nobles, regarded with some jealousy the progress of reform, and that the attempts, so numerous during his reign, should rather be attributed to the perseverance of the Bishops, and especially of Hincmar, than to the virtue or wisdom of the secular government. In proof of this opinion (which, if true, is not without importance) we may mention the following circumstance. In the year 844, Councils were held at Thionville and Verneuil* for the remedy of abuses both in Church and State; their regulations were confirmed and amplified in the year following at Meaux, and after that at Paris; and on this last occasion the prelates recurred with some impatience to the exhortations which they had frequently and ineffectually addressed to the Throne, and to that neglect they presumed to ascribe the temporal calamities which then afflicted the country. Presently afterwards, in an assembly of Barons held at Epernay, the Canons of Meaux and Paris were taken into consideration; and while those which restricted ecclesiastics received the King's assent, others which touched the vices of the nobility were entirely rejected †. Nevertheless, Councils continued to meet with great frequency ‡ during this reign; but we must not suppose that all of them had the same grand object; some were convoked to arrange the disputes of the Bishops, either among themselves, or with the Pope, or with the King; others met to restrain, had it been possible, the general licentious-

* It appears from one of the Canons here published, that, in contempt of Charlemagne's Capitulary, the military service of the Bishops was already renewed, if indeed it was ever wholly discontinued.

† Fleury, l. xlviij., s. 35.

‡ France was at this time the principal scene of ecclesiastical exertion. During the forty-six years of Charlemagne's reign, the number of Councils which met in France was thirty-five. Lewis, in twenty-six years, held twenty-nine; but no less than sixty-nine were assembled during the thirty-seven years of Charles the Bald. Their frequency then gradually decreased; and in the following hundred and ten years, to the accession of Hugh Capet, we observe no more than fifty-six.

ness of the times *; and of many it was the principal purpose to launch excommunication and anathema against the spoliators of ecclesiastical property, and to protect the persons of clerks and monks and nuns from the violence of the laity.

It is not easy either to specify any particular changes introduced into the discipline of the Church during these ages, or precisely to determine the rigour of that discipline; for such innovations are for the most part of slow and almost insensible growth; and, though the canonical regulations are in themselves sufficiently explicit, their enforcement depended in each diocese on the authority or character of the Bishop. If, indeed, it had been possible at once to force into full operation the principles of the 'False Decretals,' the sudden revolution thus occasioned would have been perceptible to the eye of the most careless historian; but the pretensions which they contained were utterly disproportioned to the power which the See then possessed of asserting them. Their tacit acknowledgment led to their *gradual* adoption; and in the patient progress of this usurpation every step that was gained gave fresh vigour, as well as loftier ground, to the usurper; but in the ninth century the French were too independent entirely to submit to the servitude intended for them, and in the tenth the Popes were too weak and contemptible effectually to impose it. Nevertheless, time and ignorance were steadily engaged in sanctifying the imposture, and preparing it for more mischievous service in the hand of Hildebrand.

Though we propose to defer a little longer any general account of the Monastic Order, it is proper here to notice that very powerful renovation of the system which was accomplished about this time by Benedict of Aniane—a venerable name, which yields to none save Benedict of Nursia, in the reverence of monkish annalists. He was contemporary with Charlemagne and his successor, and was called in 817 to preside at the Council assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle for the reform of monastic abuses. The regulations which were then enacted, though they offended the simplicity of the primitive rule by many frivolous injunctions, were still useful in recalling to some form of discipline the broken ranks of the regular clergy. We should also mention, that the institution of Canons Regular, by Chrodegand, Bishop of Metz, was undertaken during the same period, and was completed under Lewis the Meek in a Council, also held at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 826.

The original form of Episcopal election had been habitually violated by the barbarian kings; and if it was nominally restored by Charlemagne, it still appears that he continued in practice to profit by the usurpation of

* The disorders of the age are vividly depicted in the prefatory Exposition of the Council of Mayence in 888. 'Behold the magnificent edifices, which the servants of God were wont to inhabit, destroyed and burnt to ashes; the altars overthrown and trampled under foot, the most precious ornaments of the Churches dispersed or consumed; the Bishops, Priests, and other Clerks, together with Laymen of every age and sex, overtaken by sword or fire, or some other manner of massacre, &c.' Similar calamities are even more particularly detailed by the Council of Trosle in 909, attended with some charges of spiritual negligence in the Bishops themselves. (See Fleury, l. liv., s. 2 and 44.) In 865, Pope Nicholas addressed some strong pacific exhortations to the princes of France:—'Parcite gladio: humanum fundere sanguinem formidolosius exhorrescite; cesset ira, sedentur odia, sopiantur jurgia, et omnis ex vobis simultas radicitus evellatur. . . . Non in vobis vanæ gloriæ typos, non alterius usurpandi terminos ambitio, sed justitia, charitas, et concordia regnet et summum pax inter vos teneat omnino fastigium.' But such general addresses had probably little effect; and the first authoritative interference of the Church for the partial restoration of peace, and the institution of the Trêve de Dieu, took place in the first half of the eleventh century.

his predecessors, and to fill up vacant sees by his own direct appointment. Lewis, however, had not been long on the throne, when he published (seemingly at the Parliament of Attigni in 822) a capitulary to reinstate the Church in her pristine rights. Nor was this concession merely formal; on the contrary, it was brought into immediate force, and for some time actually directed the form of election. For instance, we observe that, in the year 845, Hincmar was raised to the See of Rheims 'by the Clergy and people of Rheims, by the Bishops of the province, with the consent of the Archbishop of Sens, the Bishop of Paris, and the Abbot of St. Denis his superior, and with the approbation of the King;' and from several monuments of that age, and especially the letters of Hincmar* himself, we learn, that, at least during the reign of Charles, the Church continued in the recovered possession of her original liberty.

The translation of Bishops continued to be prohibited during the ninth century, according to the ancient canons; and though the rule might be occasionally violated by the interference of the Prince, and though the Pope did occasionally, though rarely, exercise that pernicious power which the Decretals, false as they were, and fatal to ecclesiastical discipline, nevertheless gave him, the clergy and the people laboured to maintain the ancient and salutary practice. It appears, however, from a very strange occurrence, which is related to have passed in this age, that the Bishops of Rome, however willing to exert their groundless authority elsewhere, were extremely jealous of any translation to their own See. In the year 892, Formosus was raised from the See of Porto to that of Rome; he was a prelate of great piety and considerable attainments, but he offered the first instance of the elevation of a foreign Bishop to the throne of St. Peter. He held it for about four years, and died in possession of it. But scarcely were his ashes cold, when his successor, Stephen VI.,—a name which has earned peculiar distinction even among the pontifical barbarians of those days,—summoned a Council to sit in judgment on the deceased. Formosus was dragged from his grave and introduced into the midst of the assembly. He was then solemnly reinvested with the ornaments of office, and placed in the Apostolical chair, and the mockery of an advocate to plead in his defence was added. Then Stephen inquired of his senseless predecessor—'Wherefore, Bishop of Porto, hast thou urged thy ambition so far, as to usurp the See of Rome?' The Council immediately passed the sentence of deposition; and the condemned carcase, after being stripped of the sacred vestments and brutally mutilated, was cast contemptuously into the Tiber. But the day of retribution was near at hand, for, in the order of Providence, the most revolting offences are sometimes

* It appears that, as soon as the vacancy was declared, the King appointed from among the Bishops a visitor to the vacant see, who presided at the election. The only persons eligible (or very nearly so) were the Clergy of the diocese; but they were not the only electors; the monasteries and the Curates, or parochial Clergy, sent their deputies. Nor were the noble laymen or the citizens of the city excluded—on the principle 'that all should assist in the election of one whom all were bound to obey.' (See Fleury, l. xlvi., s. 47; l. xlvi., s. 38; l. liii., s. 33.) Still it would appear, even from the expression of Hincmar, in an epistle to Charles on this subject, as well as from a Canon of the Council of Valence held in 855, that the Church exercised the privilege rather as an indulgence from the Sovereign, than by its own original and lawful right. 'The Prince shall be petitioned to leave to the Clergy and People the liberty of election. The Bishop shall be chosen from the Clergy of the Cathedral or of the Diocese, or at least of its immediate neighbourhood. If a Clerk attached to the service of the Prince is proposed, his capacity and his morals shall be rigorously examined, &c.'—Council of Valence.

overtaken by the swiftest calamities. Only a few weeks elapsed, and Stephen himself was seized, and driven from the See and thrown into an obscure dungeon, loaded with chains, where he was presently strangled.

It had been hitherto the practice of the Bishop of Rome to retain on his election the name by which he had been previously known: the first exception to this rule took place in the tenth century. In 956, Octavianus, a noble Roman, was raised to the See at the age of eighteen, and expressed his determination to assume the name of John XII.* It does not appear that his boyish inclination was opposed; and it is certain that the precedent was very soon and very generally followed. Neither was the example of Formosus forgotten in succeeding elections, though it was not so commonly imitated; but before the end of this age we find that Gerbert, Archbishop of Ravenna, became, by a double change, Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, without any offence or reproach.

Among the inferior clergy, the canonical discipline was extremely rigid: it was strictly forbidden to undertake the charge of two churches, to hold a prebend † in a monastery with a parochial cure, or even to exchange one church for another. That these regulations were sometimes, perhaps generally, enforced, appears from the earnestness with which they are pressed by Hincmar; and it is from his Synodal Statutes ‡, even more than from the Canons of Councils, that we learn the practice of the Gallican Church during the ninth century: that of the Churches of Italy was probably less severe.

The practice of Auricular Confession, which, though generally prevalent, was not universally received in the time of Charlemagne, may be said to have completed its establishment during the two following ages. We observe, too, in the annals of those times, that the transfer § of relics

*Claudius, Bishop
of Turin.*

* See Pagi. Breviar. Gest. Rom. Pont. Vit. Johan. XII.

† A Prebend then signified the dividend *afforded* to a Canon for his subsistence. The prohibition was repeated in 889 by the Council of Metz; which seems to prove that it was either not generally received, or imperfectly obeyed.

‡ We have very little space for quotations, but the following are curious:—‘I have often notified to you respecting the poor who are inscribed in the Books of the Church, how you ought to treat them and distribute to them a part of the tithe. I have forbidden you to receive, in return for their portion (called *matricula*), either present or service, in the house or elsewhere. I persist in forbidding it; since such conduct is to sell charity. I declare to you, that the priest who does so, shall be deposed, and even the portion of the tithe which is given to other paupers shall be refused to him.’ Again—‘I learn that some among you neglect their churches and buy private property which they cultivate, and build houses there in which women reside; and that they do not bestow their property to the Church, according to the Canons, but to their relatives or others. Be informed that I shall punish with the utmost rigour of the Rules those whom I shall find guilty of this abuse.’ It was another of Hincmar’s meritorious endeavours to restrict the abuse of private patronage, by refusing ordination to every unworthy candidate. See Fleury, l. lii., s. 28.

§ The travels of St. Vitus from Leucadia to Rome, from Rome to Saxony, may not perhaps deserve to be traced by us; but we may be excused for pursuing the history of a pious prelate, whose living virtues we found occasion to mention—St. Martin of Tours. About the middle of the ninth century, the approach of the Normans made it expedient to remove the venerable relics of that Saint from Tours to Auxerre, where he was confided, as a temporary deposit, to the care of the Bishop. During one-and-thirty years of exile, St. Martin continued to perform the most stupendous miracles; and thus he became so valuable to the Bishop of Auxerre, that when restitution was demanded, that prelate at once refused it. Hereupon the Archbishop of Tours prevailed upon a powerful Baron, whose domains were adjacent, to avenge the perfidy and to recover the treasure by force. Thus St. Martin returned triumphantly to his native city, escorted by a band of six thousand soldiers. The story is told in the last chapter of Fleury, Book liii. Again, in the year 826, two holy Abbots set out from France to Rome, in order to bring away

from place to place was carried on with extraordinary ardour, proportioned to the sanctity attached to them, and to the wonders which they are recorded to have wrought. This superstition was, indeed, boldly assailed by one real Christian,—Claudius, Bishop of Turin*, the Protestant of the ninth century. ‘Wherefore (he indignantly exclaimed) do not the worshippers of the wood of the Cross, in conformity with their new principles, adore chaplets of thorns, because Christ was crowned with thorns,—or cradles, linen, or boats, because he made use of them,—or spears, because he was pierced with that weapon? Or why do they not fall down before the image of an ass, because he rode on that animal? Christ Jesus did not command us to worship the Cross, but to bear it—to renounce the world and ourselves.’ The *inconsistency* which the pious Bishop objected to his Church was indeed, to a great extent, removed by the multiplied corruptions of after ages†; but the remonstrances of the Reformer roused the indignation of his contemporaries; his endeavour to distinguish the corruptions from the substance of the system brought down upon him the usual reproaches of hostility and schism from the more rigid Churchmen of the day; and had he lived in an age in which the secular power was subservient to their principles, he would have been variously known to posterity, as a chastised heretic or as a blessed martyr.

During this same period the penitential system of the Church underwent a more regular organization; ecclesiastical ‡ punishments were adjusted with more discrimination to the offence of the penitent, and greater uniformity of practice was established in the different dioceses. The Liturgy received several improvements; indeed it assumed at this time the form in which it was transmitted, with very slight, if any, variation to the more splendid ages of the Roman Church. The celebration of the religious offices, their rules, and their history employed the diligence of the learned||,

the bodies of St. Sebastian, and even of St. Gregory himself. They returned triumphant—the former had been solemnly granted to the Emperor by the Pope; the latter they had stolen away by a pious artifice. Their success is recorded by Eginhard, or Einhard, the contemporary biographer of Charlemagne. But the loss has never been acknowledged by the Romans, nor is it probable that they ever sustained it.

* He was a native of Spain, and died in his diocese of Turin, about the year 840. His vigorous opposition to the worship of images could not be so generally unpopular on the other side of the Alps as in Italy; yet we observe that one of his principal opponents was Jonas, a Bishop of Orleans. It was another of his errors that he denied that the power of the priesthood, to bind and loose, extended beyond this world; and the last, and probably the greatest, that he asserted the term *Apostolical Father* to be properly applied, not to him who filled the chair of the Apostle, but to him who discharged the duties attached to it. The works for which Claudius was particularly celebrated, were his Commentaries on Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament.

† See Gilly’s Introduction to the History of the Waldenses.

‡ The following passage (from Hincmar’s Instructions to his Clergy, published about 857) shows the extent to which the arm of the Clergy then reached, as well as the manner in which it acted. ‘As soon as a homicide, or any other public crime, shall have been committed, the curate (the resident clergyman) shall signify to the culprit to present himself before the Doyen and the other curates, and to submit to penance; and they shall send information to their superiors, who reside in the city, so that, in the course of a fortnight, the offender may appear before us and receive public penance with imposition of hands. The day on which the crime was committed shall be carefully noted down, as well as that on which the penance was imposed. When the curates shall assemble at the calends they shall confer together respecting their penitents, to inform us in what manner each performs his penance, that we may judge when he ought to be reconciled to the Church. If the criminal does not submit to the penance within the days specified, he shall be excommunicated until he does submit.’

|| Amalarius, a disciple of Alcuin, clerk of the church of Metz, was, among these, the

and received elaborate and useful illustrations. The credit of these exertions belongs indeed entirely to the theologians of the ninth century; but the works which they raised, after resisting the tempests which followed, continued to constitute an important portion of the ecclesiastical edifice.

IV. During the period which we have now described, while the centre and heart of Christendom was for the most part cold and corrupted, the vital stream was ceaselessly flowing *External progress of Christianity.* towards the northern extremities of Europe. It would be an attractive, and it might be a profitable employment to trace the feeble and sometimes ineffectual missions, which introduced our holy religion among the Pagans of Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and Norway, and to observe the other circumstances which, in conjunction with their pious perseverance, finally established it there. This mighty success we may consider to have been obtained before the middle of the eleventh century: not, perhaps, that the faith of Christ was universally embraced by the lowest classes, still less was it thoroughly comprehended or practised; but it had gained such deep and general footing, as to secure its final and perfect triumph.

We shall concisely mention some of the leading circumstances by which this great event was accomplished. Heriold, King of Denmark, an exile and a suppliant at the court of Lewis *Denmark and Sweden.* the Meek, was there prevailed upon to adopt the Christian religion. But as this conversion did not seem calculated to facilitate his restoration to his throne, Lewis presented him with an estate in Friesland, for which he departed. He was accompanied to that retreat by a monk of Corbie, named Anscuire or Ansgarius, a young and fearless enthusiast, ardent for the toils of a missionary and the glory of a martyr. His first exertions were made in Denmark; presently afterwards (in 830) he advanced into Sweden; and such promise of success attended him, that Lewis determined to establish an Archiepiscopal See at Hamburg, as the centre of future operations. Gregory IV. gave his consent, and bestowed the pallium, together with the dignity of Pontifical Legate, upon Ansgarius. Thus exalted and strengthened, he persevered in his enterprise, encouraging the exertions of others, and not sparing his own. And whatsoever degree of credit* we may find it possible to attach to the stories of supernatural assistance, continually vouchsafed both to him and his ministers, we may be assured that the character, with which he was occasionally invested, of Ambassador from the Emperor of the West, together with the fame of his private sanctity, gave additional efficacy to his religious labours. The account of Anscuire's successful expedition into Sweden (in the year 854), as it is transmitted to us from early days, contains much that is curious, and nothing that is improbable. When the Bishop arrived at the capital, he communicated to the King, Olef or

most celebrated. His corrected 'Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Offices' was published, under the auspices of Lewis, in the year 831; and it is highly valued by Roman Catholic writers as proving the very high antiquity of the greater part of the services of their Church. Fleury gives a short account of this work in l. xlvii., s. 36.

* After relating some extraordinary prodigies (l. xlix., s. 19), Fleury observes—'These miracles deserve belief, if ever there were any which did so, since they are related in the Life of St. Anscuire by Rembert, his disciple and successor; and if we are permitted to assert, that there is any occasion on which God might be expected to perform miracles it is doubtless in support of his infant Churches,'—a religious and pious observation, to which we give our full assent. But the work of Rembert is lost, and our only accounts of Ansgarius are derived from the ancient chronicles.—See Baronius, Ann. 858, s. 14, 15, &c.; and Fleury, l. xlix., s. 21, and l. lv., s. 19.

Olave, the object of his mission. The King replied—‘ I would willingly consent to your desire, but I can accord nothing until I have consulted our gods by the lot, and till I know the will of the people, who have more influence in public affairs than I have.’ Olef first consulted his nobles, and, after the customary probation by lot, the gods were ascertained to be favourable to the proposal. The General Assembly of the people was then convoked; and the King caused a herald to proclaim the object of the imperial embassy. The people murmured loudly; and while they were yet divided in their opinions as to the reception of the religion of Christ, an old man rose up among them and said—‘ King and people! listen to me. We are already acquainted with the service of that God, and he has been found of great assistance to those who invoke him. There are many among us who have experienced it in perils by sea and on other occasions; why, then, should we reject Him? Formerly there were some who travelled to Dorstadt for the sake of embracing that religion of which they well knew the utility: why, then, should we now refuse that blessing, when it is here proposed and presented to us?’ The people were convinced by this discourse, and unanimously consented to the establishment of the Christian religion, and the residence of its ministers among them. Anscarius died ten years afterwards; and the footsteps which he had traced in that rude soil were greatly defaced during the following century, though it is too much to assert that they were wholly obliterated.

Some exertions were made for the conversion of the Slavonians about the middle of the ninth age; but that event was not finally accomplished until the conquest of Bohemia by Otho, in *Russia, Poland and Hungary.* the year 950. In the same manner Basil, the Emperor of the East, in conjunction with his Patriarch Ignatius, endeavoured to introduce into the heart of Russia the knowledge of the Gospel. An Archbishop was purposely ordained and sent on that mission; and a miracle, which was performed in the presence of the prince and his people, obtained a partial reception for the new religion. This event occurred in 871; but the faith made little consequent progress, and its ministers were subjected to insult and persecution; nor are we justified in ascribing the complete conversion of that nation to a period earlier than the end of the tenth century. In 989 Vladimer, Prince of the Russians, espoused the sister of the Emperors Basil and Constantine, and embraced, in consequence, the Christian belief. He lived to an extreme old age, and during a long reign found many imitators; his faith became the rule of their worship; and the knowledge of its principles and the practice of its precepts were preceded, as in so many other instances, by its bare nominal* profession. About twenty years earlier the Duke of Poland, whose conversion is also attributed to the influence of a Christian Queen, promoted the spiritual regeneration of his subjects; and, during the first year of the following age, Stephen, King or Duke of Hungary, undertook, with still greater zeal and success, the same holy enterprise.

The above facts, though so briefly stated, are perhaps sufficient to prove to us (and could we pursue them more deeply into detail the inference

* We are not to suppose that even the general profession of the faith was immediate: in fact we observe that a pious missionary of the Roman Church, named Bruno or Boniface, was massacred in the year 1009, with several associates, by certain Russians whom he would have converted. His ardour for martyrdom was roused by the sight of a church, dedicated at Rome to the ancient martyr Boniface.—See Petrus Damiani ap. Baron. Ann. 996, s. 33.

would be still clearer) that, in those days, the public preaching of pious individuals was extremely uncertain in its effect upon the mass of the community, unless when supported by the example or authority of chiefs and princes. Nor is this surprising; for to nations wholly uncivilized and uninstructed it is almost hopeless to address the revelations of truth or the persuasions of reason. And accordingly we observe, that the little perceptible success which attended those missionaries in their direct intercourse with the people is usually ascribed to their miraculous powers, or possibly to the sanctity of their character; seldom to their arguments or their eloquence. But it would have been the greatest of all miracles had this been otherwise; the barbarians were too deeply plunged in ignorance and superstition long to listen to any admonitions which were not addressed to them by the voice of *power*. And thus, when it pleased God in due season to bring them over to his own service, it may be that He vouchsafed to them some faint and occasional manifestations of his own omnipotence; but it was certainly from amongst the powers and principalities of this world, that he selected his most efficient earthly instruments.

In the mean time, during the accomplishment of these gradual and distant conquests, the Saracens had wasted the south of Italy, and approached the very walls of the pontifical city. *The Normans* On the other side, for their chastisement and expulsion, *and Turks.* a new and vigorous race presented itself, recently sent forth from the extremities of the North. And (what, besides, is a strange coincidence, and deserving of more curious observation than we can here bestow upon it) while the Norman Pagans were overspreading some of the fairest provinces of the West with fire and relentless desolation, the Turkish Pagans of the East were entering, even at the same moment, on their pestilential career of conquest. The former adopted the religion of the vanquished, and then, by the infusion of their own vigorous character, they made some compensation to Christendom for the wrongs which they had inflicted. In like manner did the Turks embrace the religion, while they overthrew the dynasty of the Arabs, who preceded them—and not their dynasty only, but their arts, their industry, and their genius. And, in the place of these, they substituted a savage and sullen despotism, alike destructive to the character and the faculties, since its firmest principles are founded in superstition, and bigotry is the legitimate spirit by which it is warmed and animated. It is, indeed, true, that the Arabian invaders had devastated many flourishing Christian countries without justice and without mercy; but it was no mild or insufficient retribution, which so soon subjected them to the deadly scourge of Turkish oppression.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Life of Gregory VII.

WE shall divide this long and important chapter into three sections. The first will contain the principal events which were brought about by the Popes who immediately preceded Gregory and acted under his influence. The second will describe the great ecclesiastical and political occurrences of his pontificate. In the third we shall consider separately the controversy concerning Berenger, and the general establishment of the Latin Liturgy.

SECTION I.

Pope Leo IX.—Early History of Hildebrand—Succession of Victor [II.—of Stephen IX.—of Nicholas II.—his Measure respecting Papal Election—the College of Cardinals—Imperfection of that Measure—Subsequent and final Regulation—Inconveniences of popular Suffrage—Restriction of the Imperial Right of Confirmation—Homage of Robert Guiscard and the Normans—Dissensions on the Death of Nicholas—Succession of Alexander II.—actual Supremacy of Hildebrand—Measures taken during that Pontificate—Alexander is succeeded by Hildebrand, under the title of Gregory VII.

GREAT hopes were entertained that the disorders of Italy and the calamities of the Church would find some respite, if not a final termination, on the accession of Leo IX. This Pope (Bruno, Bishop of Toul), a native of Germany and of splendid reputation, as well for learning as for piety, was appointed by the Emperor Henry III. at the request of the Romans, and ascended the chair in the year 1049; and the dignity of his royal connexion confirmed the hopes which his personal virtues had excited. We are informed* that while he was proceeding through France into Italy in his pontifical vestments, he became acquainted at Cluni with a monk named Hildebrand; who prevailed upon him to lay aside those ornaments which he had prematurely assumed, to enter Rome in the dress of a pilgrim, and there to receive from the Clergy and people that apostolical office which no layman had the right to confer. The Pope was struck by the talents and character of this Monk, and carried him along with him to Rome.

Hildebrand was probably a native of Saona, in Tuscany, and (so at least it is generally asserted) of low origin †; yet he became early in life the disciple of Laurence, Archbishop of Melpha; presently he gained the notice and even the confidence of Benedict IX. and Gregory VI., and it was not till the death of the latter that he retired to the monastery of Cluni. From a retreat so little suited to his restless spirit he was finally called by Leo IX. to that vast theatre of ecclesiastical ambition, in which so extraordinary a part was destined to himself.

Leo presided over the Church for five years: his reign was distinguished by some attempts at salutary reform, and especially by the famous Council which he held at Rheims with that purpose (or under that pretext), in defiance of the royal authority ‡. On his death the election of a successor was confided by the clergy of Rome to the judgment and address of Hildebrand. He selected Victor II., and obtained, by a difficult negotiation §, his confirmation from the Emperor. During this Pontificate he was sent into France as legate, and vigorously ¶ maintained the authority

* Giannoni, *Storia di Napoli*, l. ix., s. 3. Muratori, *Vit. Rom. Pontif.*, t. iii., p. 2. The earliest authority for this story seems to be Otho Frisingensis, who flourished in the middle of the following century. Wibertus, who was Leo's archdeacon and biographer, does not mention it. However, the two facts that Hildebrand accompanied him to Rome, and that he entered that city in the habit of a pilgrim, are not disputed. See Pagi, *Breviar. Vit. Leo. IX.*

† Both these facts are contested. In the Chronicle of Hugo Flaviniacensis it is expressly asserted that he was a Roman, born of Roman citizens; and Papenbrochius thinks it probable that he was of a noble family. Pagi (*Vit. Greg. VII.* s. 8.) admits that the truth cannot be clearly ascertained.

‡ He made an unsuccessful campaign against the Normans, and was defeated by them in person the year before his death. On this occasion Hildebrand may have learnt the policy of cultivating their friendship.

§ Leo Ostiensis, lib. ii., cap. 90. The Emperor professed extreme reluctance to part with his counsellor and favourite.

¶ He deposed six Bishops on various charges 'by the authority of the Roman See.' Respecting one of these it is recorded by several writers, that having been guilty of si-

of the Holy See. Victor was succeeded in 1057 by Stephen IX., and on his death, in the year following, a violent division arose among the electors. The nobles of Rome were for the most part united, and appear to have made a hasty and illegal choice; but several Cardinals, who had no share in this transaction, assembled at Siena and chose another * candidate, who was finally confirmed and placed in possession of the See by the Empress, the mother of Henry IV. This candidate was Nicholas II.: and the difficulties which had attended his own election probably led him, under the guidance of Hildebrand, his counsellor and patron, to that measure, which was the foundation of Papal independence.

In a late chapter we briefly mentioned what that measure was, and we shall now add a few remarks in illustration of it. 'We have thought proper to enact (says the Pontiff) that, upon the decease of the Bishop of this Roman Universal Church, the affair of the election be treated first and with most diligent consideration by the Cardinal Bishops; who shall afterwards call into their council the Cardinal Clerks; and finally require the consent of the rest of the Clergy and people †.' The term Cardinal had hitherto been adopted with very great and indefinite latitude in all the Latin Churches, and even applied to the regular orders, as well as to the secular Clergy; but by this edict it was restrained to the seven Bishops who presided in the city and territory of Rome, and to the twenty-eight Clerks or Presbyters, who were the ministers of the twenty-eight Roman parishes or principal Churches. These five-and-thirty persons constituted the College of Cardinals. The previous examination of the claims of the candidates rested with the Bishops, but they could not proceed to election except in conjunction with the Presbyters. The rest of the Clergy, the nobility, and the people, were excluded from any positive share in the election, but were allowed a negative suffrage in giving or withholding their consent. It was obvious, that this last provision would produce frequent disorder and confusion, and that those, who had been so suddenly deprived of the most substantial part of their rights, would lose no opportunity of abusing that which remained to them. And it is probable that Hildebrand, when he counselled a measure of imperfect reform, was obliged to confine himself to what was at the moment practicable, reserving the completion of his design to some more favourable period.

And so, indeed, it proved; the nobles, the Clergy, and the populace continued very frequently to disturb the elections which they gradually lost the power to influence; and it was not till the century following that Alexander III. found means to perfect the scheme of Hildebrand, and finally purify them from all such interference. Thenceforward the right of election was vested in the College ‡ of Cardinals alone, and so it has continued to the present time.

mony he became unable to articulate the offended name of the Holy Ghost, though he could pronounce those of the Father and the Son without any difficulty. Petrus Damiani, Epist. ad Nicolaum Papam. Desiderius Abbas Cassinensis., &c. &c.

* 'Pope Stephen, by consent of the Bishops, Clergy, and Roman people, had ordained that at his death no successor should be chosen, except by the counsel of Hildebrand, then Subdeacon of Rome. Hildebrand chose Gerand, Bishop of Florence, who took the name of Nicholas II.' Hist. Litt. de la France, Vie Nich. II. See also Leo Ostiensis, lib. ii., cap. 101. Pagi, Breviar. Vit. Steph. IX.

† Mosh. Cent. xi., p. ii., c. ii. The Cardinals were to be unanimous in their choice. Hist. Litt. Franc., Vie Nich. II.

‡ The College received, on that occasion, some additions for the purpose of conciliating the aristocracy and the civil authorities; but the people gained little or nothing by them.

No one acquainted with the frightful * disorders which were the scandal of the Roman Church during the two preceding centuries, and which were occasionally felt even at much earlier periods, will affect to censure a measure which removed the principal cause of them by subverting the system of popular election. In defence of a custom, which in principle was not calculated for a numerous society, and which had been condemned by the experience of at least five centuries, it was in vain to plead the venerable institution of antiquity. Universal in its origin, it had for some time been adopted in Episcopal elections throughout the whole of Christendom; but as its inconveniences were multiplied by the increase of proselytes, it fell into gradual disuse, first in the East, and afterwards in the Western Church; and at the period which we are now describing, it was perhaps no where in full operation except at Rome. The evils, which at Rome it had so pre-eminently produced, abundantly justify the wisdom of the Reformer†.

We have also mentioned another important clause contained in the Edict of Nicholas; that which reduced the imperial confirmation to a mere personal privilege, conferred indeed on Henry III., but liable to be withheld from his successors‡. The *Imperial Confirmation*. long minority of that Prince, and the weakness of his government, favoured this usurpation, and accelerated the result which Hildebrand foresaw from it, namely, total emancipation from imperial interference. In fact, the very following Pontiff, Alexander II., maintained himself without the sanction, and even against the will, of the Emperor; and though Gregory himself vouchsafed to defer his own consecration till Henry had ratified his election, succeeding Popes did not on any occasion acknowledge such right as any longer vested in the Throne, but proceeded to the exercise of their office, without awaiting even the form of confirmation from Germany. Thus we perceive that the celebrated Council of 1059 was the instrument of finally accomplishing (and that at no very distant period) both the objects at which it aimed, without the power of immediately effecting either—the entire independence of papal election from the opposite restraints of popular suffrage and imperial confirmation. It is true that Hildebrand lived not to behold with his own eyes the completion of the work which he had projected; but such is commonly the fate of those who engage in comprehensive schemes of

* Giannoni (Hist. Nap., l. v., c. vi.) details them with great force.

† Gibbon seems to have considered the Popes as *endeared* to the people by the practice of popular election. The affection of the Romans for their Popes (we speak not now of those earlier ages when all episcopal elections were popular) was probably confined to that period which intervened between their neglect by the Eastern Emperor and the accession of Charlemagne; and during that interval, while endangered by the constant invasions of the Lombards, they were certainly and strongly attached to their leader by the sense of common peril. There are also other and more respectable reasons for that attachment. The Popes of that time were generally Romans by birth, and known to their subjects, as they are known to posterity, by their piety and their virtues. The ecclesiastical revenues were employed to protect the Churches and convents against a barbarous and Arian foe; and the affection awakened by the merits of the Popes was multiplied by their services. See Sismondi, *Republ. Ital.*, c. iii.

‡ It is important to cite the words of this Edict. ‘*Cardinales Episcopi diligentissima simul consideratione tractantes mox sibi Clericos Cardinales adhibeant, sicque reliquos Clerus et populus ad consensum novæ electionis accedant. . . . Eligant autem de ipsius Ecclesiæ gremio, si repertus fuerit idoneus; et si de ipsa non invenitur ex alia assumatur; salvo debito honore et reverentia dilecti Filii nostri Henrici, qui impræsentiarum Rex habetur, et futurus Imperator Deo concedente speratur, sicut jam ipsi concessimus, et successorum illius qui ab Apostolica Sede personaliter hoc jus impetraverint.*’ *Pagi, Brev. Vit. Nicolai II.*, s. 7.

reformation, and whose measures are accommodated to their permanent fulfilment. The work which they build is not for the gratification of their own vanity, or the profit of their own days—it is enough for them that the structure proceeds with some immediate advantage and great promise of future excellence—the use and enjoyment of its perfection is destined to other generations.

Another important event distinguished the pontificate of Nicholas. The Norman conquerors of the South of Italy being harassed on the one hand by the hostility of the Greek Emperor, and by the violent incursions of the Saracens on the other, imagined that they should improve their title to their conquests, and increase their security, if they held them as a fief from the See of Rome. The Pontiff readily availed himself of a concession, which implied the acknowledgment of one of the broadest principles of papal ambition. And thus he consented to receive the homage of the Normans, and solemnly to create Robert Guiscard Duke of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily, on condition that he should observe, as a faithful vassal, inviolable allegiance, and pay an annual * tribute, in proof of his subjection to the Apostolic See. The permanence of this feudal grant increases its claims on our attention; and the kingdom of the two Sicilies, even as it now subsists, stands on that foundation. The nature of this transaction is so closely allied to that of others which we are now approaching, that there is no difficulty in tracing it to the hand of Hildebrand.

On the death of Nicholas in 1061, the dissensions which had disturbed his election were to some extent renewed. The more powerful party, under the guidance of Hildebrand, placed *Alexander II.* Alexander II. in the chair; the Nobles resisted, and their opposition was encouraged by the direct support of the Emperor; whose confirmation had not been required by the new Pope, and who was justly exasperated at the neglect. Nevertheless, the genius of Hildebrand triumphed over all difficulties; and after a contest of three years Alexander was firmly established in the chair, though it was still feebly disputed with him. He occupied it for twelve years, and passed the greater portion of that time in the retirement of Lucca or Monte Cassino—but the See lost nothing by his secession, since he intrusted its various interests and the entire direction of public affairs to the diligent zeal of Hildebrand, who had been raised by Nicholas to the dignity of Archdeacon of Rome, and who exerted there an unbounded and undisguised authority †.

Accordingly we find, during this pontificate, (1) that various attempts were made to reform the morals of the Clergy and the abuses of the Church—(2) that the famous question concerning Investitures was first moved—(3) that, by a constitution of Alexander, no Bishop in the Catholic Church was permitted to exercise his functions, until he had received the

* ‘Accepta prius ab iis, cum sacramento, Romanæ ecclesiæ fidelitate; censuque’ quot-
‘annis per juga boum singula denariis duodecim.’—Leo Ostiensis, lib. iii. cap. 15. The
words of the oath are cited by Baronius.

† The following contemporary verses perhaps do not much exaggerate the actual su-
premacý of Hildebrand.

‘Papam rite colo, sed te prostratus adoro :
Tu facis hunc dominum—te facit ille Deum.
Vivere vis Romæ? clarâ depromito voce,
Plus Domino Papæ, quam Domno pareo Papæ.’

Petr. Damiani.

confirmation of the Holy See*—(4) that the Emperor himself was summoned to Rome, to answer to the charge of simony, and other complaints which had reached the See respecting him†. Under these various heads we perceive the operation of the same master-spirit aiming steadily at the reform of the Church, at its independence, at the extension of papal authority over the episcopal order, and over the conduct and sceptre of Princes.

Alexander II. died in 1073; and thus for four-and-twenty years Hildebrand had exercised in the Vatican an unremitting influence which had latterly grown into despotic authority—and thus far contented with the reality of pontifical power, he had not cared to invest himself with the name and rank. Perhaps he had thought the moment not yet arrived in which he could occupy the office with dignity, or fill it with great advantage; probably he was desirous to complete, under other names, the train which he had been long preparing, and to which he designed to apply the torch in his own person; it is even possible, that his severe and imperious character, by alienating popular‡ favour, rendered his election uncertain. It was not, assuredly, that he valued the security of a humbler post; for, among the numerous vices with which he has been charged, the baseness of selfish timidity has never been accounted as one. At length, on the very day of Alexander's death, Hildebrand was elected his successor by the unanimous suffrage of the Cardinals, and the universal acclamation of the Clergy and people; and that he might mark, at least, the beginning of his pontificate by an act of moderation, he waited for the Emperor's consent before his consecration. But it is true that he rather claimed than requested that consent, and that it was granted with the graceless reluctance of impotent jealousy. He assumed the title of Gregory VII.; and, after twelve years of restless exertion, he left that name invested with a portentous celebrity which attaches to no other in the annals of the Church.

SECTION II.—*The Pontificate of Gregory.*

Gregory's First Council—its two objects—to prevent (1.) Marriage or Concubinage of the Clergy—(2.) Simoniack Sale of Benefices—On the Celibacy of the Clergy—why encouraged by Popes—Leo IX.—Severity and Consequence of Gregory's Edict—Original Method of appointment to Benefices—Usurpations of Princes—how abused—the Question of Investiture—Explained—Pretext for Royal Encroachments—Original form of Consecration by the King and Crown—Right usurped by Otho—State of the Question at the Accession of Gregory—Conduct of Henry—further measures of the Pope—Indifference of Henry—Summoned before a Council at Rome—Council of Worms—Excommunication of the Emperor and Absolution of his Subjects from their Allegiance—Consequence of this Edict—Dissensions in Germany—how suspended—Henry does Penance at Canossa—restored to the Communion of the Church—again takes the field—Rodolphus declared Emperor—Gregory's Neutrality—Remarks on the course of Gregory's Measures—Universality of his temporal Claims—his probable project—Considerations in excuse of his Schemes—partial admission of his Claims—Ground on which he founded them—power to bind and to loose—Means by which he supported them—Excommunication—Interdict—Legates

* St. Marc, p. 460. Hallam (Midd. Ages, c. vii.) considers this provision to have contributed more than any other papal privilege, to the maintenance of the temporal influence, as well as the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome.

† See Semler, cent. xi. c. 1, and Pagi, Vit. Alexand. II. sect. 48. This part of Mosheim's history is exceedingly hurried and imperfect.

‡ This is Sismondi's opinion, chap. iii.; and we can readily believe, that the stern virtues of Gregory were not likely to recommend him to a venal populace. Yet, when at length he did propose himself, we hear nothing of any opposition from that quarter, while the acclamations which attended his election are universally recorded. But, after all, that severity of manner, which is known to be connected with an austere sanctity of life, is not an unpopular feature in the sacerdotal character.

à Latere—Alliance with Matilda—his Norman allies—German Rebels—Internal Administration—Effect of his rigorous Measures of Reform—his grand scheme of Supremacy within the Church.—False Decretals—Power conferred by them on the Pope—brought into action by Gregory—Appeals to Pope—Generally encouraged and practised—their pernicious Effects—Gregory's double Scheme of Universal Dominion—Return to Narrative—Clement III. anti-Pope—Death of Rodolphus—Henry twice repulsed from before Rome—finally succeeds—his Coronation by Clement—the Normans restore Gregory—he follows them to Salerno and there dies—his historical importance—his Character—Public—his grand principle in the Administration of the Church—Private—as to Morality—as to Religion.

IN the year following his advancement, Gregory assembled a numerous Council at Rome, chiefly for the purpose of correcting two abuses in Church discipline and government, which appeared most to require reform. These were (1) the marriage or concubinage of the Clergy; (2) the simoniacal sale of benefices.

1. Most of the early Fathers were diligent in their endeavours to establish the connexion between celibacy and sanctity, and to persuade men that those who were wedded to the Church were contaminated by an earthly union. This *Marriage of the Clergy.* notion was readily embraced by the Laity; and many of the Clergy acted upon it without reluctance, owing to the greater commendation of austerity which the practice was found to confer upon them: still, in the Eastern Church, where it originated, it was never very rigidly enforced; and a Council of Constantinople, held in 691, permitted, with certain limitations, the ordination of married men. These Canons were never formally received in the West, where celibacy and strict continence were unrelentingly enjoined on all orders of the priesthood. With whatsoever laxity the latter injunction may have been observed, there are not many complaints of the open violation of the former, at least from the end of the sixth, until the conclusion of the ninth, and the progress of the tenth century: but during this period the irregularity spread widely, and even displayed itself with undisguised confidence throughout every branch of the Roman Hierarchy. The Popes were naturally averse to this relaxation of discipline—partly from the continued prevalence of the original notion, that those were better qualified for spiritual meditations and offices who were severed from secular interests and affections; partly from the scandal thus occasioned to the prejudices of the laity; partly from respect to established ordinances and usages; partly from attachment to a principle, which, by withdrawing the Clergy from worldly connexions, bound them more closely to each other and to their Head. At any rate the evil had now grown to so great a height, that it was become quite necessary either to repeal the laws so openly violated, or to enforce them. They chose the latter office, and the first who distinguished himself in the difficult enterprise was Leo IX. His immediate successors trod in his steps; but as sufficient measures were not taken (perhaps could not have been taken) to carry these edicts into effect, they seem generally to have fallen to the ground without advantage, except in so far as they prepared the way for the more vigorous exertions of Gregory.

In the abovementioned Council it was ordained—‘that the sacerdotal orders should abstain from marriage; and that such members of them as had already wives or concubines should immediately dismiss them or quit the priestly office.’ The more difficult part remained to enforce this decree; and herein Gregory did not confine himself to the legitimate weapon of spiritual censure, but also exerted his powerful influence to arm the temporal authorities in his service. Numerous disorders were

the consequence of this measure ; at Milan * and in Germany the Edict was openly resisted, and many ecclesiastics were found in every country, who preferred the sacrifice of their dignities and interests to the abandonment of those connexions which they held dearer than either †. The confusion thus created was indeed gradually tranquillized by the progress of time, by the perseverance of the Pontiff, by the aid, perhaps, of the laity, by the indifference of the Sovereigns—but the practice itself was not so easily removed ; and though, through severe restraint, it proceeded constantly to abate, it continued in some degree to disturb the Church during the following century, and to call down the denunciations of her Popes and her Councils.

2. Another Edict of the same Council forbade in the severest terms the sale of ecclesiastical benefices ; and the following circumstance made that Edict necessary. The Bishop was originally elected by the Clergy and people of the diocese ; but in process of time, the people, as we have already seen, were in most places excluded, and the election rested with the Clergy alone. Presently, in the anarchy which prevailed after the dissolution of the Western Empire, the wealth which flowed into the coffers of the Church, as it brought with it no proportionate security, not only tempted the rapacity of the Nobles, but invited the usurpation of the Sovereigns. Thus, at an early period, long antecedent to the reign of Charlemagne, the Western Princes commenced their interference in Episcopal elections—first, as it would seem, by simple recommendation ; then by the interposition of threats and show of authority ; lastly, by positive appointment. The partial restoration of the right which took place in the ninth century, under Lewis the Meek and his successor, was probably confined to the Church of France and to the life of Hincmar.

Their next step was to abuse the privilege which they had usurped, and the manner of abuse was alike indecent and scandalous : the spoils of their injustice were retailed to their avarice ; and the most important charges and offices of the ministry were commonly and publicly sold to the highest bidder, without regard to literary qualification or sanctity of character, or the most obvious interests of religion. This was, in fact, the avowed corruption which Gregory sought to remedy ; and the specious object to which his exertions and those of his successors, through so many conflicts, tended, was to deprive the Prince of his usurped authority in Episcopal election. A secondary view was closely attached to

* At Milan a violent dispute on this subject had arisen between the Clergy and the Laity, under Stephen IX., in the year 1057. (Pagi, Vit. Steph. IX.) The schism continued under Nicholas II., who sent legates to compose it ; but it still continued during the pontificate of Alexander. The Popes took part with the Laity against the married Clergy, who were named Nicolaites.

† 'Malle se sacerdotium quam conjugium deserere.' Lambert, Schaffn. in Chronico. Gregory is much censured by Mosheim and others for not having distinguished, in his sweeping decree, between the wives and the concubines of the Clergy ; and with justice, since he visited the violation of canonical law with the same severity with which he protected the eternal precepts of Christian morality. It must be admitted, however, that as his object was the entire and immediate extirpation of what he considered a scandalous abuse, he took the only means at all likely to accomplish it. It was in vain that the Milanese Clergy pleaded the authority of St. Ambrose and the example of the Greeks—it was well known that the former protected not those who admitted papal supremacy ; and that the Council, which permitted the latter, was never acknowledged by the Roman Church. It seems indeed probable that St. Gregory was the first Pope who rigidly enforced the practice of celibacy ; but for two centuries after his time it was both the law and practice of the Church, and in the two ages which succeeded, though it had ceased to be the practice, it still continued the law.—See Bayle, Vie Greg. I. Fleury, Discours sur l'H. E. depuis 600 jusqu'à 1100.

this, but not yet so boldly professed—to transfer that authority, if not in form, in * substance, to the Pope.

Thus much appears exceedingly simple; but the point on which the dispute did in reality turn, and which has given the name to the contest, was one, as it might seem, of mere formality—the *Investiture* of the Bishop or Abbot. We must now shortly explain *Investiture*. this part of the question; and we shall thus become acquainted with the circumstances which are urged in justification of the royal claims. When the early conquerors of the West conferred territorial grants upon the Church, the individuals who came to the enjoyment of them were obliged to present themselves at Court, to swear allegiance to the King, and to receive from his hands some symbol, in proof that the temporalities were placed in their possession. The same ceremony, in fact, was imposed on the ecclesiastical as on the lay proprietor of royal fiefs; and it was called *Investiture*. Afterwards, when the Princes had usurped the presentation to all valuable benefices, even to those which had not been derived from royal bounty, they introduced no distinction founded on the different sources of the revenue, but continued to subject those whom they nominated, to the same oath of allegiance, and the same ceremony of investiture, with the laity.

In the mean time it had been an early custom, on the consecration of a Bishop, that the Metropolitan, who by right performed the ceremony, should place in the hands of the Prelate elect a *ring* and a *crossier*—symbols of his spiritual connexion with the Church, and of his pastoral duties. This was a form of investiture purely ecclesiastical, and the Princes, even after they had usurped the presentation to benefices, did not at first venture to make use of it; and, it is said, that they were finally led to do so by some artful attempts on the part of the Clergy to recover their original right of election. Mosheim (in opposition to many less celebrated writers) is of opinion that Otho the Great was the first Prince who ventured to present with profane hand the emblems of spiritual authority; at least it is quite certain that this custom had been in very general use for some time before the accession of Gregory. And thus the temporal power had gradually succeeded in a double usurpation on ecclesiastical privileges—first, in despoiling the lower Clergy of their right of election—next, in encroaching upon the province of the Metropolitans, and presuming to dispense in their place the symbols of a spiritual office.

As a partial palliation of the conduct of the throne it is maintained, that the homage required from the Bishop or Abbot at investiture was for his temporalities only; and in so far as these were the feudal grants of former princes, the claim was manifestly just, but no farther than this. The crown could not fairly assert any suzerainty over the vast domains and enormous extent of property which had accrued to the Church from other quarters, before the establishment of the feudal system, and which, therefore, were not held on any feudal tenure; nor can any sufficient plea be found for its general assumption of the disposal of benefices (to say nothing of the flagitious manner in which they were retained), and its adoption of a form of investiture which was purely ecclesiastical.

Such, as nearly as we can collect, was the state of this question, when Gregory published his edict against Simony in the year 1074. The results of the Council were communicated to the Emperor † Henry IV.,

* By conceding to him the right of confirmation.

† According to the church writers, *King* only. He had not yet gone through the ceremony of coronation at Rome.

who received the Legates courteously, and bestowed some unmeaning praise on the zeal of the Pope for the reform of his Church. But Gregory was not to be satisfied with expressions; and, as he intended to give general effect to his decrees, he desired permission to summon councils in Germany, by which those accused of simony might be convicted and deposed. Henry refused that permission, partly from the consciousness of his own criminality, partly because he was not really anxious for any reform which would curtail his own patronage. This opposition obliged the Pope to proceed one step farther. After pressing the execution of his former ordinances in a variety of letters, addressed, with various effect or inefficacy, to different princes and bishops, he convoked, early in the year following, a second council at Rome; and, with its assistance, he proceeded to those measures which he had proposed to accomplish by synods in Germany, and, probably, somewhat beyond them. On this occasion he not only deposed the Archbishop of Bremen and the Bishops of Strasbourg, Spire, and Bamberg, besides some Lombard Bishops, but also excommunicated five of the Imperial Court, whose ministry the prince had used in simoniacal transactions. At the same time he pronounced his formal anathema against any one who should receive the investiture of a Bishopric or Abbey from the hands of a layman, and also against all by whom such investiture should be performed*. Henry paid no other attention to this edict, than to repeat his former general acknowledgment of the existence of simony, and his intention, in future, to discourage it.

Some particular differences, respecting the appointment to the See of Milan and other matters, tended at this moment to exasperate the growing hostility of Gregory and Henry; it happened, too, that the latter was disturbed and weakened by civil dissensions, occasioned, in some degree, by his own dissolute and profligate rule, which, by distracting his forces, invited the aggression of his foreign enemies. It is even asserted (by Dupin) that the malcontents sent deputies to Rome to solicit the interference of the Pope. Such an application is rendered probable by the fact which we now proceed to mention, and which is a certain and a memorable monument of papal extravagance. Gregory sent Legates into Germany, bearing positive orders to the Emperor to present himself forthwith at Rome, since it became him to clear himself, before the Pope and his Council, from various charges which his subjects had alleged against him. These charges might possibly be confined to ecclesiastical offences, of which the Emperor had notoriously been guilty; but never, before the days of Hildebrand, had it been expressly asserted that he was amenable for such offences to any ecclesiastical tribunal.

He treated the summons as a wanton insult, and wantonly retorted it. He collected at Worms† a council of about twenty German Bishops

* The words of the edict are: 'Si quis deinceps Episcopatum vel Abbatiam de manu alicujus laicæ personæ susceperit, nullatenus inter Episcopos vel Abbates habeatur, nec ulla ei ut Episcopo vel Abbati audientia concedatur. Insuper etiam gratiam B. Petri et introitum Ecclesiæ interdicimus, quoad usque locum, quem sub crimine tam ambitionis quam inobedientiæ, quod est scelus idololatriæ, cepit, deseruerit. Similiter etiam de inferioribus Ecclesiasticis dignitatibus constituimus. Item si quis Imperatorum, Ducum, Marchionum, Comitum, vel quilibet secularium potestatum aut personarum investituram Episcopatus, vel alicujus Ecclesiasticæ dignitatis dare præsumperit, ejusdem sententiæ vinculo se adstrictum sciat.' Hugo Flaviniacensis, ap. Pag. Vit. Greg. VII., s. 26.

† 'Quæ legatio Regem vehementer permovit; statimque abjectis cum gravi contumelia Legatis, omnes qui in regno suo essent Episcopos et Abbates Wormetiæ Dominica

(some of whom were already personally embroiled with Gregory); and these prelates, after passing many censures on the conduct, election, and constitutions of Hildebrand, pronounced him unworthy of his dignity, and accordingly deposed him. Gregory was not further disturbed by such empty denunciations, than to take measures to return them much more effectually. In a full assembly of one hundred and ten Bishops, he suspended from their offices the ecclesiastics who had declared against him; he then pronounced the excommunication of the Emperor; and accompanied his anathema by the unqualified sentence, 'that he had forfeited the kingdoms of Germany and Italy, and that his subjects were absolved from their oath of fealty *.'

*Excommunicated
and deposed.*

This assertion of control over the allegiance of subjects was hitherto without precedent in the history of the Papal Church; and it was now, for the first time, advanced to the prejudice of a monarch, whose character, though stained both by vices and weaknesses, was not wholly depraved nor universally odious. Nevertheless, the edict of Gregory was diligently promulgated throughout Germany; nor was it idly cast into a kingdom already divided, and among a people already discontented and accustomed to rebellion. The Dukes of Swabia, headed by Rodolphus, presently rose in arms; they were supported by a fresh revolt of the Saxons; and there were those even among Henry's best friends, whose fidelity was somewhat paralyzed by the anathema under which he had fallen. After a short but angry struggle, an arrangement was made greatly to his disadvantage—that the claims and wrongs of both parties should be subjected to the decision of the Pope, who was invited to preside at a council at Augsburg for that purpose; and that, in the mean time, Henry should be suspended from the royal dignity. It is not easy to decide how much of this success should be attributed to the previous animosity of the parties opposed to Henry, how much to a blind respect for the edict and authority of the Pope; but the treaty to which all consented certainly implied an acknowledgment of the power which Gregory had assumed, and gave a sort of foundation and countenance to his future measures.

Henry, who had little to hope from a public sentence, to be delivered in the midst of his rebellious subjects by his professed enemy, determined to anticipate, or, if possible, to prevent his disgrace by an act of private submission to Pontifical authority. For that pur-

*Henry does penance
at Canossa.*

* Septuagesimæ convenire præcepit, tractare cum eis volens ad deponendum Romanum

Pontificem, si qua sibi via, si qua ratio pateret: *in hoc cardine totam verti ratus salutem*

suam et regni stabilitatem, si is non esset Episcopus. Lambert Schaffin. ad ann. 1076.

* The words in which this celebrated sentence was conveyed should be recorded: 'Petre

Apostolorum Princeps, etc. etc. Hac fiducia fretus pro Ecclesiæ tuæ honore et defen-

sione, ex parte Omnipotentis Dei, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, per tuam potestatem et

auctoritatem Henrico Regi, filio Henrici Imperatoris, qui contra Ecclesiam tam inaudita

superbia insurrexit, totius regni Teutonicorum et Italiæ gubernacula contradico, et

omnes Christianos a vinculo juramenti quod sibi fecere vel facient, absolvo; et ut nullus

ei sicut Regi serviat, interdico. Dignum est enim, ut, qui studet honorem Ecclesiæ tuæ

imminuere, ipse honorem amittat quem videtur habere. Et quia Christianus contempsit

obedire nec ad Dominum rediit, quem dimisit participando excommunicatis et multas

iniquitates faciendo, *meaque monita, quæ pro salute sua sibi misi, te teste spernendo, sequi*

ab Ecclesia sua, tentans eam scindere separando, vinculo eum anathematis *vice tua* alligo,

ut sciant Gentes et comprobent quia Tu es Petrus, et super tuam Petram Filius Dei vivi

ædificavit Ecclesiam suam, et portæ Inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam.' Paul. Bern-

ried., cap. 75; Pagi, Vit., Greg. VII., s. 42.

pose he crossed the Alps with few attendants during the severity of an inclement winter, and proceeded to Canossa, a fortress in the neighbourhood of Parma, in which Gregory was then residing. In penitential garments, with his feet and head bare and unsheltered from the season, the Emperor presented himself at the gate of the fortress, as a sinner and a suppliant. His humble request was to be admitted to the presence of the Pontiff and to receive his absolution. For three dreary days, from dawn till sunset, the proudest sovereign in Europe was condemned to continue his fast and his penance before the walls, and probably under the eyes of Gregory, in solitary* and helpless humiliation. At length, on the fourth day, he was permitted to approach the person of the Pontiff, and was absolved from the sentence of excommunication. Yet even this favour was not vouchsafed him unconditionally†: he was still suspended from the title and offices of royalty, and enjoined to appear at the Congress of Augsburg and abide by the decision which should then be passed upon him.

Henry soon discovered that he had gained nothing by this degradation, except contempt; and after descending to the lowest humiliation which ever Prince had voluntarily undergone, he found himself precisely in his former situation, with the Council of Augsburg still hanging over his head. Of an useless submission he repented vehemently; he abandoned himself to his feelings of shame and indignation, resumed his title and his functions and prepared once more to confront his adversaries. The Saxons and Swabians immediately declared Rodolphus Emperor of Germany (in 1077); Henry was supported by the Lombards in Italy; and a sanguinary war was carried on in both countries with various success and general devastation. For three years Gregory preserved the show, perhaps the substance, of neutrality; he received the deputies of both parties with equal courtesy, and seemed to wish to profit so far only by their dissensions, as to engage them to aid him in the execution of his original edicts. But in the year 1080, decided, as some say, by the misfortunes, as others assert, by the crimes‡ of Henry, he pronounced a second

* Henry is represented to have traversed the Alps at extreme risk by unfrequented roads, as the ordinary passes were guarded by his enemies; and Lambertus of Aschaffenburg, a contemporary historian, describes the castle of Canossa as surrounded by a triple wall, within the second of which the Emperor was admitted to his penance, while the whole of his suite remained without the exterior. See Sismondi, *Hist. Rep. Ital.* c. iii. Paul. Bernried speaks of the *insolita papæ duritia* shown on this occasion.

† The oath which he took is given at length by Paulus Bernriedensis, *Vit. Greg. VII.* Sismondi designates the conduct of Gregory as ‘une trahison insigne,’ but not justly so; since it cannot be shown that the Pope had bound himself by any engagement to the Emperor which he did not strictly fulfil; the latter did penance for his contumacy towards the Church, and the Pope, in consequence, restored him to the Communion of the Church. The Council or Diet to be held at Augsburg was a measure previously arranged, to which many other eminent persons were parties; and it was intended for the settlement of political, at least as much as of ecclesiastical differences;—whereas the penance at Canossa was merely a particular atonement to the See of Rome, not at all connected with the general maladministration of Henry. In fact, Gregory’s own words are conclusive on the question. ‘Henricus, confusus et humiliatus ad me veniens absolutionem ab excommunicatione quæsit. Quem ego videns humiliatum, multis ab eo promissionibus acceptis de vitæ suæ emendatione, *solum ei communionem reddidi; non tamen in regno instauravi, nec fidelitatem hominum qui sibi juraverant vel erant juraturi ut sibi serventur præcepi, &c.*’ See Mabill., *Vit. Greg. VII.*, c. 107. Pagi, *Vit. Greg. VII.*, s. xliii. Denina, *Delle Rivol. d’Italia*, lib. x., c. vi.

‡ Sismondi, whose partialities are against Gregory and the Church, says respecting Henry, that ‘his character was generous and noble; but he abandoned himself with too little restraint to the passions of his age;’ and those passions undoubtedly led him to the commission of great political offences. Private excesses may sometimes find their excuse in youth; but the vices of Kings deserve less indulgence, since they usually

sentence of deposition, and conferred upon Rodolphus the crown of Germany*.

Thus far we have traced, without much comment, the rapid but regular progress of Gregory. The first measure, as we have seen, in his temporal usurpation (for in his earliest decrees against Church abuses he did not exceed the just limits of his authority), was to declare the Emperor amenable to a Papal court of judicature, and to summon him before it; the next was to deprive him of his throne and to absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance; the last was to dispose of the empire, with absolute authority, as a fief of St. Peter. Without further examination we might at once have concluded, that claims so extravagant and irrational were merely the passionate ebullitions of a feeble spirit, irritated by personal pique or effeminate vanity. But this was not so; the claims in question were advanced by the most vigorous and consistent character of his age, and they were pressed with a deliberate and earnest zeal which evinced a conviction of their justice. They were not confined to the dominions of Henry; they displayed themselves in every state and province of Europe. The kingdom of *France* was declared tributary to the See of Rome, and Papal legates were commissioned to demand the annual payment of the tribute †, by virtue of the true obedience due to that See by every Frenchman. And the King himself (Philip I.) was reminded 'that both his kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. Peter, who had the power to *bind* and to *loose* both in Heaven and on earth.' *Saxony* was pronounced to be held on feudal tenure from the Apostolic chair and in subjection to it. It was pretended that the kingdom of *Spain* had been the property of the Holy See from the earliest ages of Christianity. William the Norman, after the conquest of *England*, was astonished to learn that he held that country as a fief of Rome and tributary to it. The entire feudal submission of the kingdom of *Naples* has been already mentioned. Nothing was so lofty as to daunt the ambition of Gregory, or so low as to escape it. The numerous Dukes or Princes of Germany, those of Hungary, of Denmark, of Russia, of Poland, of Croatia and Dalmatia, were either solicited to subject their states to the suzerainty of St. Peter, or reminded of their actual subjection. And the grand object of Gregory is probably not exaggerated by those who believe that he designed to re-establish the Western ‡ empire on the basis of opinion, and to bind by one spiritual chain to the chair of St. Peter the political governments and ever-conflicting interests of the universal kingdom of Christ §.

influence the morals and happiness of their subjects. A less favourable, but probably a more correct view of the character of Henry is taken by Denina. *Delle Rivoluz. d'Italia*, lib. x., c. v.

* The act and the authority for it were expressed in a hexameter verse, inscribed on the crown which Gregory sent to Rodolph—

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho.

† Per veram obedientiam.

‡ Thus, in effect, the Western empire of which the foundations were really laid at the coronation of Charlemagne, was not the temporal dominion at which the *Prince* aspired, and which so soon passed away from his sceptre, but that spiritual despotism, affected by the *Priest*, and which was much more extensive, as it was much more durable.

§ Amid this multiplicity of objects, which divided without distracting the mind of Gregory, he did not allow himself to forget either the schism or calamities of the East; he even projected to remedy both by personally conducting an army against the Mahometans. This is mentioned in a letter to Henry, written in 1074, in which, after some mention of his project, he adds—*Illud enim me ad hoc opus permaximè instigat, quod Constantinopolitana ecclesia de Spiritu Sancto à nobis dissidens concordiam Apostolicæ Sedis expetat,*

Are we astonished at the magnificence, or do we laugh at the wildness of this project? Let us first inquire by what means the mighty architect proposed to combine and consolidate his structure. Gregory seriously designed to regulate his truly Catholic empire by a council of bishops, who were to be assembled at Rome annually, with full power to decide the differences of princes both with each other and with their subjects; to examine the rights and pretensions of all parties, and to arbitrate in all the perplexed concerns of international policy. If we can, indeed, imagine that Gregory was animated by that general spirit of philanthropy which is ever found to burn most brightly in the noblest minds; if he really dared to hope that his project would reconcile the quarrels of the licentious princes of his day, or remedy the vices of their governments, or alleviate the misery of the people who were suffering equally from both those causes—we may smile at the vanity of the vision, but we are bound to respect the motive which created it. Nor is it only the political degradation of Europe which we are called upon to consider, before we may pronounce sentence upon that Pontiff; we must also make great allowance for the principles of ecclesiastical supremacy which had already taken root before his time, which had been partially acted upon, and which, to a certain extent, were acknowledged—for the necessary confusion of temporal with spiritual authority, which the feudal system had still worse confounded, so that their limits were indiscernible, inviting both parties to mutual aggression—and for the usurpations which the crown had already made on the privileges of the Church, and the evil purposes to which it had turned them. These circumstances, when duly and impartially weighed by us, will mitigate the astonishment which the bare recital of Gregory's proceedings is calculated to awaken, and moderate the indignant censure with which the example of other writers might dispose us to visit them.

We are not, however, to imagine, that the Pope's extraordinary claims were universally admitted. The King of France refused the tribute demanded of him; the conqueror of England consented to the tribute (called Peter's pence), but disclaimed allegiance. Various success attended his attempts on the other states, according to the variety of their strength or weakness, or the circumstances of their actual politics. But at the same time, the mere fact that such claims were confidently asserted and repeated obstinately, that in many instances they were practically assented to, and very rarely repelled with vigour and intrepidity, persuaded ignorant people (and almost all were ignorant) that there was indeed some real foundation for them, and that the Holy See was, in truth, invested with some vague prescriptive right of universal control, and surrounded by mysterious, but inviolable sanctity.

We must add a few words, both respecting the grounds on which Gregory founded those claims, and the means which he employed to enforce them. As to the former, it does not appear that he openly availed himself of the grand forgery of his predecessors, or at least that he justified any of his pretensions by direct appeal to the 'donation of Constantine;' unless, indeed, it were assumed that the universal rights of St. Peter over the Western Empire originated in that donation. Respecting Spain, for

'&c.' Pagi, Vit. Greg. VII., s. xx. We may observe that, among the numerous points of difference which had in latter times grown up between the two Churches, and had been exaggerated with such intemperate zeal by both, the eye of Gregory notices one only.

instance, he particularly admitted that, though that country was among the earliest of the pontifical possessions, the grant which made it so had perished among other ancient records*. In treating with those provinces which had formed no part of the Western Empire, he seems to have assailed them severally as the circumstances of their history happened to favour his demands. Saxony, for example, he asserts to have been bestowed on the Roman See by the piety of Charlemagne. Some among the smaller states were merely exhorted to make a cession of their territories to St. Peter; by which it was admitted that the apostle had yet obtained no rights over them. Some of them made such cession, and thus encouraged the arrogance of Gregory and the aggressions of future pontiffs.

The power possessed by the successors of St. Peter 'to bind and to loose' was not confined by them to spiritual affairs, however wide the extremities to which they pushed it in these matters. It was extended also to temporal transactions, and so far extended as to be made the plea of justification with a Pope, whenever he presumed to loose the sacred bonds of allegiance which connect the subject with the sovereign. It would be difficult, perhaps, to produce a more certain index of the character of religious knowledge, and the degradation of the reasoning faculty, which prevailed in those days, than by exhibiting that much-perverted text as the single basis on which so monstrous a pretension rested and was upheld.

Secondly—The appalling influence of anathema and excommunication † over a blind and superstitious people had long been known and frequently put to trial by preceding Popes; *Power of Gregory.* and the still more formidable weapon of Interdict began to be valued and adopted about the time of Gregory. Extraordinary legates ‡, whose office suspended the resident vicars of the pontiff, had been sparingly commissioned before the end of the tenth century; they now became much more common, and fearlessly exercised their unbounded authority in holding councils, in promulgating canons, in deposing bishops, and issuing at discretion the severest censures of the Church. But it was not concealed from the wisdom of Gregory that temporal authority could not surely be advanced or permanently supported without temporal power. Accordingly he cemented his previous alliance with the Normans of Naples; and also (which was still more important, and proved, perhaps, the most substantial) among his temporal conquests) he prevailed upon Matilda, the daughter and heiress of Boniface, Duke of Tuscany, to make over her extensive territories to the apostle, and hold it on feudal tenure from his successors. By these means the ecclesiastical states were fortified, both on the north and south, by powerful and obedient allies, while the disaffection of Henry's subjects created a great military diversion in the Pope's favour in Saxony and Swabia.

* Lib. x., epist. 28.

† The frequent use and abuse of excommunication by all orders of the priesthood had greatly diminished the terror and efficacy of the sentence even in much earlier ages. We find the councils of the ninth century continually legislating for the purpose of restoring their weight to both ecclesiastical weapons. By the Council of Meaux (held in 845) it was especially enacted, that the *anathema* could not be pronounced even by a bishop, unless by the consent of the archbishop and the other bishops of the province.

‡ Called Legates *à latere*—sent from the side of the Pope.

Let us return for a moment to the internal administration of the Church. We are disposed to think that the very vigorous measures which Gregory employed for what he considered its reform were favourable, upon the whole, to the success of his other projects.

Objects of Gregory in the internal administration of the Church. We may observe that these were of two descriptions, one of which tended to restore the discipline of the clergy; the other to reduce the ecclesiastical orders into more direct subjection to the Papal See. It is true that, by the former of these, great disaffection was excited among such as suffered by them; that is, among those who had been already living in open disobedience to the canons of the Church; but such, it is probable, were not the most numerous, as certainly they were the least respectable portion of the body. The same severity which offended them would naturally gratify and attach all those, whose religious zeal and austere morality secured them greater influence in the Church and deeper veneration from the people. So that, notwithstanding the clamours of the moment, we doubt not that the Pope was substantially a gainer by his exertions; and that (like every judicious reformer) he extended his actual power and credit with only the partial loss of a worthless popularity.

The second object of Gregory in his ecclesiastical government has not yet been mentioned by us. It seems to have been no less than to destroy the independence of national Churches; and to merge all such local distinctions in the body and substance of the Church universal, whose head was at Rome. For the effecting of this mighty scheme he used every exertion to loosen the connexion of bishops and abbots with their several sovereigns, and to persuade them that their allegiance was due to one master only, the successor of St. Peter. And to that end he very readily availed himself of the materials which he found prepared for his purpose, and which had been transmitted to him undisputed by so many predecessors, that it probably never occurred to him to doubt their legitimacy. The false decretals contained the canons which he sought; and Gregory had the boldness at length to bring them forth from the comparative obscurity in which they had reposed for above two hundred and fifty years, and openly to force them into action. We have mentioned the nature of those decretals—they were a series of epistles professing to be written by the oldest bishops of Rome, the Anacletes, Sixtus the First and Second, Fabian, Victor, Zephyrinus, Marcellus, and others*. They recorded the primitive practice in the nomination to the highest ecclesiastical offices, and in that and many other matters ascribed authority almost unlimited to the Holy See. It is worth while here to particularize, even at the risk of repetition, some of the points on which they most insisted. (1.) That it was not permitted to hold any council, without the command or consent of the pope; a regulation which destroyed the independence of those local synods, by which the Church was for many centuries governed. (2.) That bishops could not be definitively judged, except by the Pope. (3.) That

* The first collection of canons made in the west was the work of a Roman monk named Dionysius, who lived in the sixth century. This was followed by many others; but that which gained the greatest celebrity was the one ascribed to St. Isidore, Bishop of Seville; and it had great prevalence in Gaul as well as in Spain. Guizot remarks that it was in the North and East of France that the 'false decretals' first made their appearance, in the beginning of the ninth century. (Hist. de la Civ. en France, Leçon, 27.) The collection of decrees, known by the name of Dictatus Hildebrandini, and falsely ascribed to Gregory VII., is generally held to be the next forgery which disgraced the principles and swelled the authority of the Roman Church.

the right of episcopal translation rested with the Pope alone. (4.) That not only every bishop, but every priest, and not the clergy only, but every individual *, had the right of direct appeal from all other judgments to that of the Pope.—These rights, and such as these, had been neglected or vainly asserted by the Roman See during the long period of imbecility † which followed their forgery; but the spuriousness of their origin had never been exposed or suspected; and the simplicity of every succeeding generation added to their security, their antiquity, and their respectability. Gregory at length undertook to give them full efficacy; and though none were ceded or overlooked by him, that which he appears most earnestly to have pressed was the Pope's exclusive jurisdiction over the whole episcopal order: to this end he enforced universal appeal to Rome. Orders to attend before the pontifical court were issued to every quarter of Europe; and they generally met with obedient attention, not only from those whose principles sincerely acknowledged such spiritual supremacy, or who expected from their submission a more favourable sentence, but also from the great mass of offenders, who naturally preferred a distant and ecclesiastical tribunal to the close judicial inspection of a temporal magistrate. The good which Gregory proposed from this system could be one only, and that a very ambiguous advantage—to secure the *independence* of the Church, or, in fact, to withdraw it from the control of all secular power, and subject it to one single spiritual despot. The evils which he occasioned were numerous and of most serious magnitude—to create and nourish inextinguishable dissensions between princes and their clergy, to retard and perplex the operations of justice, and to multiply the chances of a partial or erroneous decision ‡.

In the prosecution of this history we have frequently lamented the necessity of dismissing some important event or useful speculation with a few hasty and unsatisfactory sentences, and especially do we lament it at this moment.

*His double scheme
of universal do-
minion.*

But enough may possibly have been said to give the reader some insight into the DOUBLE scheme of universal dominion to which the vast ambition of Gregory was directed—enough to make it evident how he projected, in the first place, to unite under the suzerain authority of St. Peter and his successors the entire *territory* of Christian Europe, so as to exert a sort of feudal jurisdiction over its princes, and nobles, and civil governors; and, in the next place, to establish throughout the same wide extent of various and diversely constituted states one

* Fleury, 4^{me} Disc. sur H. E. sect. v.

† Pope Nicholas I., who ruled from 858 to 867, is the principal exception to this remark: he is described by contemporary chronicles as the greatest pontiff since the days of St. Gregory—kind and lenient in his treatment of the clergy, but bold and imperious in his intercourse with kings. His conduct to Hincmar in the affair of Rothadus is at *seeming* variance with part of this eulogy; but though Nicholas was triumphant both in that dispute and in the more important difference with Lothaire, neither he nor any other Pope under the Carolingian dynasty could establish, in France at least, the claim *first* mentioned in the text. The emperors continued to convoke all councils and to confirm their canons.

‡ Gregory also obliged the Metropolitans to attend at Rome from all countries, in order to receive the pallium at his hands. This, together with the appeal system, kept that capital continually crowded with foreign prelates, with great vexation to themselves, with great detriment to their dioceses, and with no real profit to the Catholic Church. In the mean time, it is certain that mere *papal* influence gained by this system; for all authority, to be always respected, must sometimes be felt; but unfounded and irrational authority most chiefly so.

single *spiritual* monarchy, of which Rome should be the centre and sole metropolis; a monarchy so pure and undivided, that every individual minister of that church should look up to no other earthly sovereign than the Pope. Such does indeed appear to have been the stupendous scheme of Gregory VII. We have already seen by what measures he proceeded to its execution, and we shall now trace his extraordinary career to its conclusion.

The election of a new Emperor by the Pope was very reasonably retorted by the election of a new Pope by the Emperor; *Henry advances* and Clement III. was exalted to the honour of being *to Rome.* the rival of Gregory. But a much more sensible injury was inflicted on the fortunes of that pontiff immediately afterwards by the defeat and death of Rodolphus. That prince received a mortal wound in battle in the year 1080; and with him was extinguished the spirit of rebellion, or at least the hope of its success. Henry immediately turned his victorious arms against Italy; the opposition presented to him by Matilda and the Tuscans he overcame or evaded, and advanced with speed and indignation to the gates of Rome. From his dreams of universal empire—from the lofty anticipations of princes suppliant and nations prostrate in allegiance before the apostolic throne, Gregory was rudely awakened by the shouts of a hostile army, pressing round the Imperial City. But he woke to the tasks of constancy and courage; and so formidable a show of resistance was presented, that Henry, after desolating the neighbouring country, withdrew, without honour or advantage, to the cities of his Lombard allies.

Not deterred by this repulse, he renewed his attempt early in the spring following, and encountered the same opposition with the same result. The soldiers of Germany retired for the second time before the arms of the unwarlike Romans and the name of Gregory. But in the succeeding year (1084), the efforts of the Emperor were followed by greater success. The citizens, wearied by repeated invasions, and suffering from the ravages attending them, abandoned that which now appeared the weaker cause—on this third occasion they threw open their gates to Henry, and to Clement, the Antipope, who followed in his train. Henry placed his creature on the throne of Gregory, and the exultation of that moment may have rewarded him for the bitterness of many reverses. The measure which he next adopted should be carefully noticed, since it proves the veneration which was exacted even from him by the See itself, without consideration of its occupant. By an immediate act of submission to the chair which his own power had so recently bestowed, he solicited the Imperial Crown from the hand of Clement, and he received it amid the faithless salutations of the Roman people. In the mean time, his victory was neither complete nor secure: from the Castle of St. Angelo, Gregory surveyed in safety the partial overthrow of his fortunes, and awaited the succours from the south with which he purposed to repair them. Robert Guiscard—whether mindful of his feudal allegiance, or jealous of the Emperor's progress—was already approaching at the head of his Norman warriors; Henry and his Pope retired with precipitate haste, and Gregory was tumultuously restored to his rightful dignity.

The success of the Normans was disgraced by the pillage of a large portion of the city: this circumstance depressed still further the declining popularity of the Pope, and he had learnt by his late experience how little

he could confide in the capricious allegiance of the Romans*. Accordingly, on the return of Robert to his own dominions, Gregory followed him, and retired, first to the monastery of Monte Cassino, afterwards to Salerno. It is recorded that, on this occasion, Robert would have profited by the weakness or the gratitude of Gregory, to obtain from him the concession, on the part of the Church, of some disputed feudal right of no great importance, but that the Pope resisted the solicitations of his protector in the very centre of his camp. And, no doubt, his persevering and fearless spirit was still meditating the reoccupation of his chair, and the prosecution of his mighty projects. But such anticipations were speedily cut short, and in the year 1085, very soon after his arrival at Salerno, he died†. He concluded a turbulent pontificate of twelve years in misfortune, in exile, with little honour, with few lamentations‡; without having witnessed the perfect accomplishment of any portion of the project which had animated his existence, and even at the very moment when it appeared most hopeless. He died—but he left behind him a name, which has arrested with singular force the attention of history, which has been strangely disfigured indeed by her capricious partiality, but which has never been overlooked, and will never be forgotten. He did more than that;—he left behind him his spirit, his example, and his principles; and they continued, through many successive generations, to agitate the policy and influence the destinies of the whole Christian world.

The latest words of Gregory are recorded § to have been these:—‘I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile;’ words which seem to indicate a discontented spirit, reluctantly bending before the decrees of Providence. But the same complaint may also have proceeded from a sense of pious intention, and the recollection of duties conscientiously performed. It becomes us then to inquire, in what really consisted that justice which he loved, and that iniquity which he hated? what were the principles which guided his public life? what were the habits which regulated his private conversation? The leading, perhaps the only, principle of his public life was to reform, unite, and aggrandize the Church over which he presided, and especially to exalt the office which he filled. He may have been very serious and sincere in that principle—he may even have considered, that the whole of his duties were

*Death of
Gregory.*

His Character.

* ‘Gli umori sempre diversi del popolo Romano.’—*Denina, Riv. d’Ital.*, lib. x., c. 8.

† These are Semler’s words:—Gregorius. . . tantis ausibus ipse immortuus est; nulli jam parti carus aut amatus; diu omnibus, execrationibus, scommatibus, satiris, mendaciisque post mortem oneratus—Sec. xi. c. 1.

‡ Guilielmus Apuliensis, a poetical eulogist of Gregory, sings, that Robert Guiscard, who would have beheld with tearless eyes the death of his father, his son, and his wife, was moved to weakness by that of Gregory:—

Dux non se lacrymis audita forte coerces
Morte viri tanti: non mors patris amplius illum
Cogeret ad lacrymas, non filius ipse nec uxor,
Extremos etsi casus utriusque videret.

Pagi, *Vit. Greg. VII.* sect. cxv.

§ Millot, *Hist. de la France*. They are given somewhat differently by Paulus Bernriedensis:—‘Ego, fratres mei dilectissimi, nullos labores meos alicujus momenti facio, in hoc solummodo confidens, quod semper dilexi justitiam et odio habui iniquitatem.’ And when his friends who were present expressed some anxiety respecting his future condition, he stretched forth his hands to Heaven, and said, ‘Illuc ascendam; et obnixis precibus Deo propitio vos committam.’

contained in it, and that he was bound to pursue it through every danger and difficulty, as a churchman and a pope. This was his grand and original delusion, and here alone can we discover any trace of narrowness and littleness. And yet there have existed so many good men in all ages, even in the most enlightened, who have mistaken their own form of faith for the only true faith, and held their own particular church to be synonymous with the Church of Christ, that the error of Gregory will meet with much sympathy, though it can deserve no pardon. But when we observe the measures into which it betrayed him, and through which he followed it with deliberate hardihood; when we recollect the profusion of blood which flowed through his encouragement or instigation, for the support of an ambitious and visionary project; and, more than that, when we compare the nature of that project with the humble, and holy, and peaceful system of Christ, whose gospel was in the pontiff's hands, and whose blessed name was incessantly profaned for the support of his purposes—it is then that we are obliged to regard him with unmitigated disgust. His endeavours to reform the morals of his clergy and the system of his church* will only be censured by those who prefer diseases to their remedies, or who think it dangerous to apply any remedy to ecclesiastical corruption—and over such persons the sceptre of reason has no control. But his claims of temporal sovereignty, his usurpation of spiritual supremacy, his lofty bearing, and pontifical arrogance, were so widely at variance with the spirit of that book† on which his church was originally founded, that we must either suppose him wholly to have disdained its precepts, or to have strangely‡ misinterpreted them.

* Some writers have represented Gregory as an enemy to innovation, as one of those characters who have placed their pride in keeping the age stationary, and perpetuating all that was transmitted to them. Had Gregory been such a man, he had been long ago forgotten. Far otherwise: he was the greatest of all innovators; but, like Charlemagne and Peter of Russia, he marched to his object by the road of despotism. The reforms which he projected, in affairs civil, political, and ecclesiastical, embraced every interest and reached every department of society; but it was by the establishment of a spiritual monarchy—a sort of papal theocracy—that he proposed to compass them. Guizot has somewhere made this observation: he has further attributed to Gregory two errors in the conduct of his plan, but not (as it seems to us) with equal justice. He blames that pope for having proclaimed his plan too pompously, menacing when he had not the means of conquering; and also for not having confined his attempts to what might fairly seem practicable. Guizot appears for the moment to have forgotten on what uncertain ground the papal power really rested; how much of it was built on mere claims, disputed perhaps at first, but finally established and enforced by mere impudent importunity—the very advance of such claims by one pope was always a stepping-stone for his successors. Again, in treating of what was practicable by Gregory, if we well consider the peculiar nature of his weapons, hitherto untried in any great contest, and the character of the age to be moved by them, it will seem quite impossible that he could exactly have calculated what he could, or what he could not, accomplish. Under all circumstances it was probable, that the bolder his claims, and the more loudly he asserted them, the greater was his chance of some immediate success, and the broader the path that was opened for future pontiffs. And Gregory had too extensive a genius not to think and act also for posterity.

† The first evil consequence of associating tradition with the gospel as the foundation of the Church was, that the former was soon considered as substantial a part of the building as the latter. United in words, they were presently confounded in idea, and that not by the very ignorant only, but even by men, especially churchmen, who had deeply studied the subject, and most so by monks. Gregory had received a monastic education; and though his mind was naturally vast and penetrating, it is not absurd to suppose that he might sincerely consider the false decretals (believing them to be genuine) as possessing authority almost equivalent to the Bible; at least, he might think it a fair compromise to govern his church by the former, and his private conduct by the latter rule.

‡ In his epistles he frequently repeats the prophet's words: 'Cursed is he that doeth the

In descending to the personal character of Gregory, we may first observe, that he was superior to the spirit of intolerance, which was then becoming manifest in his church. The only doctrinal controversy in which he was engaged was that with Berenger, on transubstantiation. The pope maintained the doctrine, which appears then to have been generally received in Italy and France, and he may have menaced the contumacy of the heretic. But no impartial reader can rise from the perusal of that controversy with the impression that Gregory was personally the advocate of persecution. On the contrary, his moderation has been noticed by writers * little favourable to his character, and has even led some to the very unnecessary inference that he was friendly to the opinion, because he spared and endured its author †.

Among the calumniators of Gregory, none are found so unjust as to deny his extraordinary talents and address, his intrepid constancy, his inflexible perseverance. And there are none among his blindest admirers who would excuse the unchristian arrogance of his ambition. His other qualities are for the most part disputed :—his moral excellence ‡, and the depth of his private piety, have been strongly asserted by some, and contested by others : for our own part, after carefully comparing the conclusions of his more moderate historians with the particular acts and general spirit of his life, we are disposed to assent to the more favourable judgment—to this extent at least, that we believe him to have possessed those austere monastic virtues, common, perhaps, in the cloister, but rare in

work of the Lord deceitfully,'—'that keepeth back his sword from blood;' that is, who does not execute God's commands in punishing God's enemies: hence his severity with simoniacal bishops, and other ecclesiastical offenders.

* Jortin (among others) thinks that the pope was much inclined to defend Berenger—a merit which might have led that candid writer to pause before he entered into the absurd and fanatical notion that Gregory was Antichrist. Milner also holds this last opinion more confidently—a very remote point of contact between two men of very different and even opposite views, but of equal sincerity and excellence! But (to speak without reference to either of those authors) it has been the misfortune of Gregory to excite the spleen of two descriptions of writers who agree in very few of their principles—those who abhor the Roman Catholic Church and all its supporters with vehement and unqualified hatred, and those who dislike every church and every assessor of ecclesiastical rights. The former are our religious, the latter our philosophical, historians—both are equally unjust.

† After all, it is a question whether Gregory's moderation on questions purely theological does not furnish a fair argument against his general conduct. It proves, at least, that his violence and arrogance were not merely faults of temper, showing themselves whenever there was a dispute; but feelings which, to excite them, required the stimulus of temporal ambition. Again, in an age when reason and philosophy had little influence, moderation on theological questions naturally excites the suspicion of indifference. But if Gregory was indifferent on theological questions, and violent on matters touching the temporal aggrandizement of himself and his Church, his character had even less merit than we have assigned to it.

‡ His intrigue with Matilda, which is insinuated in a very childish manner by Mosheim, is expressly denied by Lambertus, a contemporary historian of good repute. Ambition was motive quite sufficient for his intimacy with that princess, and his advanced age (seventy-two) might reasonably have saved him from the imputation of any other. Besides which, there is no single fact or circumstance to authorize the suspicion; and his deep enthusiasm and intrepid zeal, and the very austerity which made him dangerous, are qualities wholly inconsistent with vulgar hypocritical profligacy. 'That a widow of thirty (says Denina), also motherless, should be the declared protectress and body-guard of an old and austere pontiff, furnished a famous pretext for calumny to the concubinary clergy who were persecuted by the Pope,' (Rivoluz. d'Ital. l. x. c. 6.) and to them we may probably ascribe this charge.

those days either among princes* or popes. And if, indeed, in addition to those merits, he was compassionate to the poor, the defender of the oppressed, the protector of the innocent (as a very impartial, as well as accurate, writer † affirms) we shall find the greater reason to lament that his private sanctity was overshadowed and darkened by his public administration.

Respecting his religious disposition, though passages may be found in his Epistles not uninspired with Christian piety, it is more probable that he sought his motives of godliness ‡ and the aliment of his fervour in the interests of his church, than in the lessons of his Bible. A profound canonist, a skilful theologian, a zealous churchman, he may still have been unacquainted with the feelings of a Christian, and uninformed by the spirit of the faith. And it is not impossible that even his reforms in discipline and morals, which were the best among his acts, proceeded from a narrow ecclesiastical zeal, not from the purer and holier influence of evangelical devotion.

SECTION III.

(I.) Controversy respecting Transubstantiation—suspended in the Ninth, renewed in the Eleventh Century—Character of Berenger—Council of Leo IX.—of Victor II. at Tours in 1054—Condemnation and conduct of Berenger—Council of Nicholas II.—repeated Retraction and Relapse of Berenger—Alexander II.—Council at Rome under Gregory VII.—Extent of the Concession then required from Berenger—further Requisition of the Bishops—a Second Council assembled—Conduct of Gregory—Berenger again solemnly assents to the Catholic Doctrine, and again returns to his own—his old Age, Remorse, and Death—Remarks on his Conduct—on the Moderation of Gregory. (II.) Latin Liturgy—Gradual Disuse of the Latin Language throughout Europe—Adoption of the Gothic Missal in Spain—Alfonso proposes to substitute the Roman—Declension by the Judgment of God—by Combat—by Fire—doubtful Result—final Adoption of the Latin Liturgy—Its introduction among the Bohemians by Gregory—Motives of the Popes—other instances of services not performed in the Vulgar Tongue—Usage of the early Christian Church.

THE age of Gregory was distinguished by a very important doctrinal controversy: but though that pontiff was abundantly pugnacious in asserting the most inadmissible rights of the church, he showed no disposition to encourage the dispute in question, nor any furious zeal to extirpate the supposed error; and yet the error was no less than a disbelief in the mystery afterwards called Transubstantiation. We have already mentioned the promulgation of that dogma by Paschasius Radbertus: we have observed with what ardour and liberty it was both supported and

* Gregory reproved the abbot, who admitted Hugo, Duke of Burgundy, into his monastery, on this ground—'We have abundance of good monks, but there is a great scarcity of good princes.' Those are the virtues which Gibbon calls *dangerous*; and it is in speaking of Gregory that he advances that remarkable assertion—that the vices of the clergy are less dangerous than their virtues,—a position which is seldom understood with the qualification which the author obviously intended to attach to it. The passage is illustrated by another in the sixty-ninth chapter—'The scandals of the tenth century were obliterated by the austere and more dangerous virtues of Gregory VII.'

† Giannone, *Storia di Napoli*, lib. x. c. 6. Gregory has been reproached with placing faith in the predictions of astrologers; with dealing in divinations, interpreting dreams, and exercising the magical art. Few of those who have shone with great splendour in an ignorant age have escaped the same suspicion.

‡ When Muratori (*Vit. Rom. Pontif. in Leo IX.*) speaks of him as '*Adolescens . . . clari ingenii, sanctæque Religionis*,' and when Giannone calls him '*uomo pieno di Religione*,' nothing more is at all necessarily implied than Gregory's monastic sanctity would justify.

combated during the ninth century, until the flames of the controversy, unsustained by any public edicts, gradually and innocently expired. The arguments which had been urged on both sides were thus left to produce their respective fruits of good or evil, according to the soil on which they fell, and the season in which they were sown. Both these circumstances were fearfully unfavourable to the growth of any wholesome knowledge: for in those days reason was less persuasive than its abuse, and truth was less attractive than specious show; so that religion was buried in superstitious observances. Thus it happened that, during the tenth century, the opinion in question made a general, though silent progress; and, in the beginning of the eleventh, it was tacitly understood to be the doctrine of the Roman church. In the year 1045, Berenger, principal of the public school (scholastic) at Tours, and afterwards Archdeacon* of Angers, publicly professed his opposition to it.

Roman Catholic writers do not dispute the brilliancy of his talents, the power of his eloquence, his skill in dialectics, and his general erudition; they admit, too, that habits of exemplary virtue and piety gave life and efficacy to his genius and his learning †. By these merits he acquired the veneration of the people, and the friendship of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of his day. But when some of his historians assert that his virtues suddenly deserted him, and were even changed into their opposite vices, at the moment when he propounded his opinion, we can only consider them as illustrating their own definition of 'heresy.' It is also said, that Berenger was stimulated to publish, even to invent, his doctrine by private jealousy of the learned Lanfranc; and in truth the most splendid actions do so commonly originate in sordid motives, that this charge may possibly be true: but it is not probable, because it is at variance with the tenour of his character; nor is it at all important, since it affects neither the truth nor the prevalence of his doctrine.

Berenger's opposition to transubstantiation became known to Leo IX., who condemned it at a council held at Rome in 1050; and in the same year two other councils were summoned in France, at Verceil and Paris, both of which strongly anathematized the heresy; and, in consequence of the decree of the latter, Henry I. deprived the offender of the temporalities proceeding from his benefice. He did not attend these councils, but continued to profess and promulgate his doctrine. During the pontificate of Victor II. a council was assembled at Tours in 1055 ‡, at which Hildebrand presided as legate of the pope. Berenger was summoned before it, and on this occasion he obeyed the summons—with the less apprehension, because he possessed the personal regard of Hildebrand.

* Mosheim is guilty of a strange blunder in making him Archbishop of Angers, and of designating him throughout as a *prelate*. In fact, Angers is only an episcopal see, and Eusebius Bruno, one of Berenger's own pupils, was raised to it in 1047. *Hist. Litt. de la France, Vie de Bérenger*.

† His learning is perhaps sufficiently proved, by the fact, that he too attained the honourable reputation (common to him with so many learned persons) of being a magician.

‡ See Pagi, *Vit. Victor II.*, sect. v., where various authorities are collected, and among them the following expressions from Lanfranc addressed to Berenger: 'Denique in Concilio Turonensi, cui ipsius Victoris interfuerunt legati, data est tibi optio defendendi partem tuam. Quam cum defendendam suscipere non auderet, confessus coram omnibus communem ecclesie fidem, jurasti te ab illa hora ita crediturum, sicut in Romano Concilio te jurasse est superius comprehensum.' From this it would appear that Berenger had been present at the council of Leo, though he disregarded those assembled in France; unless indeed the Roman Council mentioned by Lanfranc be that afterwards held by Nicholas, which is more probable.

He appears to have urged little in defence of his opinion, and to have made no difficulty in subscribing on oath to the received faith of the Church concerning the real presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. And having subscribed to this faith, he immediately returned to the propagation of his actual opinions.

He then remained undisturbed for four or five years, until Nicholas II. called upon him to justify himself before a Roman Council. He appeared there, and professed his readiness to follow the doctrine which should seem good to that assembly. Accordingly, a profession of faith was drawn up, which went to the furthest extent to which the dogma has ever been carried*, and with the same hand which signed it Berenger committed to the flames the books containing his opposition to it. He then returned to France, resumed his sincere profession, and abjured his abjuration.

Alexander II. (acting probably under his archdeacon's counsels) contented himself with addressing to the heretic a letter of peaceful and friendly exhortation; but as his opinion and his contumacy now created some confusion in the Church, Hildebrand, not long after his elevation to the chair, summoned Berenger to Rome a second time. For the space of nearly a year Gregory retained him near his person, and honoured him with his familiarity; and then, in a council in 1078, he was contented to require his subscription to a profession which admitted the real presence without any change of substance; and Berenger did not hesitate to sign it.

But this moderation did not satisfy the zeal of certain ardent prelates, who required not only a more specific declaration of orthodoxy, but also that the sincerity of the retractation should be approved by the fiery trial. Berenger is stated to have prepared himself by prayer and fasting for submission to that ceremony; but Gregory, though he accorded the first of their requisitions, refused to countenance the senseless mockery of the second. The year following, another council assembled, and once more Berenger in their presence solemnly renounced his opinions, and confirmed by oath his adherence to the broadest interpretation of the Catholic faith. He was then dismissed by the pontiff, with new proofs of his satisfaction; and no sooner was he restored to the security of his native country, than he renewed the profession of the doctrine which he had never in truth abandoned. But he received little further molestation † from the ecclesiastical powers, and died in 1088, at a very advanced age, with no other disquietude than those severe internal sufferings which were the consequence of his repeated and deliberate perjuries ‡.

* In the presence of the pope, and one hundred and thirteen bishops, Berenger subscribed the following profession: 'Ego Berengarius, indignus diaconus, &c. . . consentio S. R. Ecclesiæ et Ap. Sedi, et ore et corde profiteor de sacramento Dominicæ mensæ eam fidem me tenere quam dominus et venerabilis Papa Nicolaus et hæc sancta synodus tenendam tradidit. . . scilicet panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse; et sensualiter, non solum sacramento sed in veritate, manibus sacerdotum tractari et frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri; jurans per sanctam et homoousiam Trinitatem. Eos vero qui contra hanc fidem venerint æterno anathemate dignos esse pronuntio. Quod si ego aliquando aliquid contra hæc sentire et prædicare præsumpsero subjaceam canonum severitati. Lecto et perlecto *sponte* subscripsi.' It is cited by Pagi in the Life of Nicholas II., as are the second and third professions of Berenger (in 1078 and 1079) in the Life of Gregory, sect. lxx. lxxii.

† Dupin mentions that he was summoned before a council at Bourdeaux, in 1080, where he gave an account of his faith.

‡ A loud and very unimportant dispute has been raised between Papists and Profes-

Berenger was anxious for the reputation of a great Reformer, and perhaps sincerely zealous for the extirpation of what he considered a revolting corruption—but he did not aspire to the glory of martyrdom. And when he presented himself at four successive councils, under the obligation either to defend or retract his opinions, we cannot doubt that, as he saw the former course to be useless as well as dangerous, he went there calmly prepared to debase himself by an insincere and perjured humiliation. Perhaps he preserved his property, or prolonged his life for a few years, by such reiterated sin and degradation; but if his latest days were passed in remorse and bitter penitence, his gain was not great, and the moments which he added to his existence were taken away from his happiness. His followers were not, probably, very numerous*; and they were chilled by his weakness and confounded by his frequent recantations. His fortitude and constancy would have confirmed and multiplied and perpetuated them. We admire his talents, we respect his virtues, and venerate the cause in which he displayed them; but in that age the defence of that cause demanded (as it deserved) a character of sterner materials and more rigid consistency than was that of Berenger.

From the moderation which Gregory used towards the person of that Reformer, it has been inferred that he secretly favoured his opinions; and this may be so far true, that he generally inculcated an adherence to the words of scripture †; and discouraged any curious researches and positive decisions respecting the *manner* of Christ's presence at the Eucharist. And as a real spiritual (or intellectual ‡) presence was probably admitted by Berenger himself, who professed only to follow the opinions of John Scotus §, there could remain no ground for any violent difference between the pope and the heretic.

II. But if we are to consider the doctrine of transubstantiation to have been effectually established, rather through the obstinate zeal of his ecclesiastics, than by the favour of Gregory, we shall have no hesitation in attributing to his personal exertions a contemporary corruption in the ceremonies of the church. It was the will of Hildebrand that the liturgy of the Universal Church should be delivered in Latin only; and having once adopted that scheme, as in every other object which he thought proper to pursue, he neglected no imaginable means to carry it into effect. The use of Latin as the vulgar tongue, which had prevailed throughout the southern provinces of Europe, gradually ceased during the course of the ninth century; and the language of the first conquerors insensibly gave place to the barbarous jargon of the second. Latin thus became a subject of study, and all knowledge of it was presently confined to the priesthood. Still it seems clear that, in France as well as in Italy, the services of the church con-

*Establishment
of the Latin
Liturgy.*

tants as to the opinions in which Berenger actually *died*. The truth appears to be that he died a penitent,—and the former attribute to the consciousness of his heresy that remorse which the latter much more probably ascribe to his perjury.

* We mean that they formed a very trifling proportion to the whole body of the church. They contained no individual of any great eminence, nor do they appear to have existed *as a sect* after the death of Berenger.

† Mosheim, cent. xi.

‡ Hist. Litt. de la France, Vie de Berenger.

§ Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine are the Fathers on whose authority Berenger chiefly rests his defence. Lanfranc, before he became Archbishop of Canterbury, was his most distinguished opponent.

tinued to be performed entirely in Latin, and even that sermons were for some time delivered in that tongue to an audience most imperfectly acquainted with it. But in Spain, the Gothic missal had gradually supplanted the Roman, and at the middle of the eleventh century was universally prevalent in that church. Soon after that time, by the united influence (as is said) of Richard, the papal legate, and Constance, Queen of Leon (who had brought with her from France an attachment to the forms of her native church), Alfonso, the sixth of Leon and first of Castile, was persuaded to propose the introduction of the Roman liturgy. The nobility and the people, and even the majority of the clergy, warmly supported the established form, and after some heats had been excited on both sides, a day was finally appointed to decide on the perfections of the rival missals. To this effect, recourse was had, according to the customs of those days, to the 'judgments of God,' and the trial to which they were first submitted was that by combat. Two knights contended in the presence of a vast assembly, and the Gothic champion prevailed. The king, dissatisfied with this result, subjected the missals to a second proof, which they were qualified to sustain in their own persons—the trial by fire. The Gothic liturgy resisted the flames, and was taken out unhurt, while the Roman yielded, and was consumed. The triumph of the former appeared now to be complete, when it was discovered that the ashes of the latter had curled to the top of the flames, and leaped out of them. By this strange phenomenon the scales were again turned, or at least the victory was held to be so doubtful, that the king, to preserve a show of impartiality, established the use of both liturgies. It then became very easy, by an exclusive encouragement of the Roman, effectually, though gradually, to banish its competitor*.

It was one of the latest acts of Alexander II. especially to prohibit the Bohemians from performing service in their native Slavonian, and to impose on them the Roman missal; and about seven years afterwards Gregory prosecuted, as pope, the enterprise which, as archdeacon, he had doubtless originated. Little serious resistance appears to have been opposed to this and similar attempts; and it may be asserted without dispute, that before the conclusion of the eleventh century, the Latin liturgy was very generally received in the western churches.

The motive † of the popes for this vexatious exertion of ecclesiastical tyranny

* See Dr. Macrie's History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Spain. The contest between the liturgies began during the pontificate of Alexander II., between the years 1060 and 1068; but one of the first acts of Gregory was to give his strenuous and effectual support to the Roman. See Pagi, Vit. Alex. II. et Greg. VII.

† The reason, which Gregory fairly avowed in his answer to Vratislaus, Duke of Bohemia, was the impolicy of making the scriptures too public; and, in this document, it is curious to observe with what ease, when it suited his purpose, he could dispense (like Gregory the Great) with the authority of the primitive church, so conclusive and venerable when it was expedient to follow it. The expressions of so great a pontiff deserve to be recorded:—'Quia Nobilitas tua postulavit, quod secundum Slavonicam linguam apud vos divinum celebrari annueremus officium, scias nos huic petitioni tuæ nequaquam posse favere. Ex hoc nempe sæpe volentibus liquet non immerito *Sacram Scripturam omnipotenti Deo placuisse quibusdam locis esse occultam*, ne, si ad liquidum cunctis pateret, forte vilisceret et subjaceret despectui, aut pravè intellecta a mediocribus in errorem induceret. Neque enim ad excusationem juvet, quod quidam religiosi viri hoc quod simpliciter populus quæsit, patienter tulerunt, seu incorrectum dimiserunt; cum *Primitiva Ecclesia multa dissimulaverit*, quæ a sanctis Patribus, postmodum firmata Christianitate et religione crescente, *subtili examinatione correctæ sunt*. Unde ne id fiat, quod a vestris imprudenter exposcitur, auctoritate B. Petri inhibemus, atque ad honorem omnipotentis Dei huic vanæ temeritati viribus totis resistere præcipimus.'

was undoubtedly their ardour for the Unity of the church, as one body under one head; and to this end it certainly conduced, that she should speak to all her children, of all nations and races, in one language only. It was also necessary that that language should be Latin, because it thus became a chain which not only united to each other the extremities of the North and the West, but also bound them in universal allegiance to a common Sovereign. But this policy, like some other of the profoundest schemes of the Vatican, was calculated on the continuation of general ignorance, and the stability of principles which the slightest efforts of reason were sufficient to overturn.

We should add, however, that a similar custom prevails among certain other nations and creeds, which cannot have originated in similar motives, but is rather to be attributed to the superstitious veneration for antiquity, so common where the understanding has been little cultivated. The Ægyptians or Jacobites performed their service in Coptic; the Nestorians in Syriac; the Abyssinians in the old Æthiopic; and the prayers which are offered to the god of the Mahometans are universally addressed in Arabic. But the usage was entirely contrary to the practice* of the early Christian church, which permitted every variety of language in its ceremonies; a practice which received the positive confirmation of the Council of Francfort at the end of the eighth century, and which was not entirely subverted till the pontificate of Gregory and of his immediate successors.

NOTE AT THE END OF PART III.

(1.) In an early part of this work (Chap. V. p. 63), Justin Martyr is accused of error in having given to Simon Magus a statue which, in fact, was dedicated to Semo Sangus, a Sabine deity. The question, however, is involved in some uncertainty; for it appears that the inscription found in 1574 was not engraved on a *statue* (as above asserted), but on a stone, bearing resemblance, indeed, to the basis of a statue, yet so small, that it could scarcely have supported any representation of the human body. Such is the account of Baronius, (Ann. 44.) which at the time had escaped the author. Under these circumstances, whatever may be the leaning of our own private judgment, we are historically bound to admit the direct affirmation of Justin, who expressly asserts that the *statue* existed in his time. If we believe Baronius, that this stone cannot reasonably be considered as a pedestal, we must also believe Justin; otherwise we are compelled to suppose that the Father deliberately called that a statue which has no part, or even support, of a statue, but a mere stone consecrated to rude Pagan divinity. At any rate, the direct evidence is all on one side, with only a bare, and as many will think, unreasonable supposition on the other.

* 'You may have observed (says Fleury) that the offices of the church were *then* in the language most used in each country, that is to say, in Latin through all the West, and in Greek through all the East, except in the remoter provinces, as in Thebais where the Ægyptian was spoken, and in Upper Syria where Syriac was used. . . . The Armenians have, from the very beginning, performed divine service in their own tongue. If the nations were of a mixed kind, there were in the church interpreters to explain what was read. . . . In Palestine, St. Sabas and St. Theodosius had in their monasteries many churches, wherein the monks of different nations had their liturgy, each in his own language.'

(2.) In Chapter X, p. 153, a passage is cited from St. Eligius, a bishop of Noyon, contemporary of Gregory the Great. The sense, and even the words in question, had been previously retailed both by Robertson and Jortin; and the original Latin is quoted by Mosheim, whom the latter of those writers has followed. The author of this work, who had also confided in the same guide, has been lately led to look more particularly into the 'Life of Eligius,' as it is published in the *Spicilegium Dacherii* (vol. v., p. 147—304); and he was pleased to discover many excellent precepts and pious exhortations scattered among the strange matter with which it abounds. But at the same time, it was with great sorrow and some shame, that he ascertained the treachery of his historical conductor. The expressions cited by Mosheim, and cited too with a direct reference to the *Spicilegium*, are forcibly brought together by a very unpardonable mutilation of his authority. They are to be found, indeed, in a sermon preached by the bishop; but found in the society of so many good and Christian maxims, that it had been charitable entirely to overlook them, as it was certainly unfair to weed them out and heap them together, without notice of the rich harvest that surrounds them. In justice, then, to the character both of St. Eligius and his church, and that the exact extent of the historian's delinquency may be known, we shall here subjoin the entire passage which Mosheim has disfigured; and we are glad of the occasion to present even this short specimen of the discourses, which were delivered to a Christian people in the age of its darkest ignorance.

'Wherefore, my brethren, love your friends in God, and love your enemies on account of God, for he who loveth his neighbour (saith the apostle) hath fulfilled the law; for the man who would be a true Christian must observe the precepts, since he who observes not circumvents himself. He, then, is a good Christian, who believes not in charms or inventions of the devil, but places the whole of his hope in Christ alone; who receives the stranger with joy, as though he were receiving Christ himself; since it was He who said, "I was a stranger, and ye took me in," and "inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." *He, I say, is a good Christian, who washes the feet of the strangers, and cherishes them as his beloved parents; who gives alms to the poor in proportion to his possessions; who goes frequently to church and makes his oblations at God's altar; who never tastes of his own fruit until he hath presented some to God; who has no deceitful balances, nor deceitful measures; who has never lent his money on usury; who both lives chastely himself, and teaches his children and his neighbours to live chastely and in the fear of God; and who for many days before the festivals observes strict chastity, though he be married, that he may approach the altar with a safe conscience; lastly, who can repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and teaches the same to his children and his family. He who is such as this, without any doubt is a true Christian, and Christ dwells in him.*

'Behold! ye have heard, my brethren, what sort of people good Christians are; wherefore strive as much as you are able, with the help of God, that the name of Christ may not be false in you; but to the end that ye be true Christians, always ponder the precepts of Christ in your mind, and also fulfil them in your practice. *Redeem your souls from punishment whilst you have it in your power; give alms according to your means; keep peace and charity; recall the contentious to concord;*

avoid lies; tremble at perjury; bear not false witness; commit no theft; *offer your free gifts and tithes to the churches; contribute towards the luminaries in the holy places*; repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and teach it to your children; instruct and correct even your god-children, and recollect that you are their sponsors with God. *Repair frequently to church, and humbly implore the protection of the saints*; observe the Lord's day, through reverence for Christ's resurrection, without any bodily work; piously celebrate the solemnities of the saints; love your neighbours as yourselves, and do as you would be done by; and what you wish not to be done to yourselves, that do to no man. Observe charity before all things, because charity covers a multitude of sins; be hospitable, humble, placing all your solicitude in God, since he hath care of you. Visit the infirm, seek out those who are in prison, take charge of strangers, feed the hungry, clothe the naked. Despise jugglers and magicians; be just in your measures; require of no man more than your due; and on no account exact usury. *If you observe these things, you may appear boldly at God's tribunal in the day of judgment, and say, Give, Lord, as we have given*; show compassion even as we have shown it; we have fulfilled what thou hast commanded, do thou now reward us as thou hast promised.'

The sentences printed in italics are those which Mosheim has selected and strung together, without any notice of the context. The impression which, by this method, he conveys to his readers, is wholly false; and the calumny thus indirectly cast upon his author is not the less reprehensible, because it falls on one of the obscurest saints in the Roman calendar. If the very essence of history be truth, and if any deliberate violation of that be sinful in the profane annalist, still less can it deserve pardon or mercy in the historian of the Church of Christ.

CONTENTS OF PART IV.

From the Death of Gregory VII. to that of Boniface VIII.

CHAPTER XVII.

(I.) Papal history—Urban II.—Council of Placentia—that of Clermont—their principal acts—The Crusades—their origin and possible advantage—Pascal II.—Renewed disputes with Henry—his misfortunes, private and public—his death and exhumation—Henry, his son, marches to Rome—Convention with Pascal respecting the regalia—its violation—Imprisonment of the Pope—his concessions—annulled by subsequent Council—Henry again at Rome—Death and character of Pascal—Final arrangement of the investiture question by Calixtus II.—Observations—The first Lateran (ninth general) Council—Death of Calixtus—Subsequent confusion and its causes—Arnold of Brescia—his opinions, fate, and character—Adrian IV.—Frederic Barbarossa—Disputes between them, and final success of the Pope—Alexander III.—his quarrel with Frederic, and advantages—his talents and merits—Celestine III.—The differences between Rome and the Empire—The internal dissensions at Rome on papal election—National contentions between Church and State. (II.) Education and theological learning—Review of preceding ages—in Italy and France—Parochial schools—Deficiency in the material—Papyrus—Parchment—Consequent scarcity of MSS.—Invention of paper—Three periods of theological literature—the characteristics of each—Gradual improvement in the eleventh century.

CHAPTER XVIII.—*Pontificate of Innocent III.*

Prefatory facts and observations—Circumstances under which Innocent ascended the chair—Collection of Canons—Condition of the clergy—Ecclesiastical jurisdiction—by what means extended—Innocent's four leading objects—(1.) to establish and enlarge his temporal power in the city and ecclesiastical states—Office of the Prefect—Favourable circumstance, of which Innocent avails himself—his work completed by Nicholas IV.—(2.) to establish the universal pre-eminence of papal over royal authority—His claims to the Empire—His dispute with Philippe Auguste of France—he places the kingdom under interdict—submission of Philippe—His general assertions of supremacy—particular applications of them—to England and France, Navarre, Wallachia and Bulgaria, Arragon and Armenia—His contest with John of England—Interdict—the Legate Pandulph—Humiliation of the King—(3.) to extend his authority within the church—Italian clergy in England—his general success in influencing the priesthood—Power of the Episcopal Order—The fourth Lateran Council. Canons on transubstantiation—on private confession—against all heretics—(4.) to extinguish heresy. The Petrobrussians—their author and tenets. Various other sects, how resisted. The Cathari—supposition of Mosheim and Gibbon the more probable opinion—The Waldenses—their history and character—error of Mosheim—Peter Waldus—his persecution. The Albigois or Albigeois—their residence and opinions—attacked by Innocent—St. Dominic—title of Inquisitor—Raymond of Toulouse—holy war preached against them—Simon de Montfort—resistance and massacre of the heretics. The crusade of children—Continued persecution of the Albigeois—Death of Innocent.

CHAPTER XIX.—*On the Monastic System.*

(I.) Early instance of the monastic spirit in the east—Pliny the philosopher—The Therapeutæ or Essenes—The Ascetics—their real character and origin—The earliest Christian hermits—dated from the Decian or Diocletian persecutions—Cænobites. Pachomius and St. Anthony—originated in Ægypt—Basilius of Cæsarea—his order and rule—his institution of a vow questionable—Monasteries encouraged by the fathers of the fourth and fifteenth ages—from what motives—Vow of celibacy—Restrictions of admission into monastic order—Original monks were laymen—Comparative fanaticism of the east and west—Severity and discipline in the west—motives and inducements to it—contrasted with the Oriental practice—Establishment of nunneries in the east. (II.) Introduction of monachism into the west—St. Athanasius—Martin of Tours—Most ancient rule of the western monasteries—their probable paucity and poverty—Benedict of Nursia—his order, and reasonable rule, and object—Foundation of Monte Cassino—France—St. Columban—Ravages of the Lombards and Danes—Reform by Benedict of Aniane—The order of Cluni—its origin, rise, and reputation—its attachment to papacy and its prosperity—The order of Cîteaux—date of its foundation—Dependent Abbey of Clairvaux—St. Bernard—its progress and

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

decline—Order of the Chartreux. (III.) Order of St. Augustin—Rule of Chrodegangus—Rule of Aix-la-Chapelle—subsequent reforms. (IV.) Connexion between the monasteries and the Pope—mutual services—The military orders—(1.) The Knights of the Hospital—origin of their institution—their discipline and character—(2.) Knights Templar—their origin and object—(3.) The Teutonic order—its establishment and prosperity. (V.) The mendicant orders—causes of their rise and great progress—(1.) St. Dominic—his exertions and designs—(2.) St. Francis and his followers—compared with the Dominicans—apparent assimilation—essential differences—disputes of the Franciscans with the Popes, and among themselves—Inquisitorial office of the Dominicans, their learning and influence—quarrels with the Doctors of Paris—Austerity of the Franciscans—the Fratricelli—(3.) The Carmelites—their professed origin—(4.) Hermits of St. Augustin—Privileges of these four orders. (VI.) Various establishments of Nuns—their usual offices and character—General remarks—The three grand orders of the Western Church (suited to the ages in which they severally appeared and flourished)—The Jesuits—The Monastic system one of perpetual reformation—thus alone it survived so long—its merits and advantages—The bodily labour of the Monks—their charitable and hospitable offices—real piety to be found among them—superintendence of education, and means of learning preserved by them—limits to their utility—their frequent alliance with superstition—their early dependence on the Bishops—gradual exemption, and final subjection to the Pope—Their profits and opulence, and means of amassing it—Luther a mendicant.

CHAPTER XX.—*From the Death of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII.*

The ardour of the Popes for Crusades—its motives and policy—Honorius III.—Frederic's vow to take the cross, and procrastination—Gregory IX.—his Coronation—he excommunicates the Emperor—who thus departs for Palestine—Gregory impedes his success, and invades his dominions—their subsequent disputes—Innocent IV.—his previous friendship with Frederic—Council of Lyons—various charges urged against Frederic—Innocent deposes Frederic and appoints his successor—on his own papal authority—Civil war in Germany—in Italy—death of Frederic—his character and conduct—his rigorous Decree against Heretics—Observations—Other reasons alleged to justify his deposition—this dispute compared with that between Gregory VII. and Henry—Taxes levied by the Pope on the Clergy—Crusade against the Emperor—Exaltation of Innocent—his visit to Italy and intrigues—his death—his qualities as a statesman—as a churchman—expression of the Sultan of Egypt—Alexander IV.—Urban IV.—Clement IV.—Introduction of Charles d'Anjou to the throne of Naples—Gregory X.—his piety, and other merits—Second Council of Lyons—Vain preparations for another Crusade—Death of Gregory—Objects of Nicholas II.—Martin IV.—Senator of Rome—Nicholas IV. diligent against Heresy—Pietro di Morone or Celestine V.—circumstances of his elevation—his previous life and habits—his singular incapacity—disaffection among the higher Clergy—his discontent and meditations—his resignation—Boniface VIII.—his excessive ambition and insolence—on the decline of the papal power—his temporal pretensions—Sardinia, Corsica, Scotland, Hungary—Recognition of Albert King of the Romans—and act of his submission—Phillip the Fair—The Gallican Church—origin of its liberties—St. Louis and the Pragmatic Sanction—Differences between Boniface and Phillip—Bull Clericis Laicos—its substance and subsequent interpretation—Affairs of the Bishop of Parmiers—Bull Auscultat Fili—burnt by Phillip—Conduct of the French Nobles—of the Clergy—of Boniface. Bull Unam Sanctam—other violent proceedings—Moderation of Phillip—further insolence of the Pope—Phillip's appeal to a General Council—William of Nogaret—Personal assault on Boniface—his behaviour and the circumstances of his death.

CHAPTER XXI.

On Louis IX. of France—his religious and ecclesiastical acts and projects—On the origin and establishment of the Inquisition—On some of the principal effects of the Crusades—The Pragmatic Sanction, and the Liberties of the Gallican Church.

CHAPTER XVII.

From Gregory VII. to Innocent III.

THE death of Gregory did not restore either concord to the Church or repose to the Empire. The successor, whom at the solicitation of his cardinals, he nominated on his death-bed, testified a singular, but sincere, repugnance for a dignity, which being probably too feeble to sustain, he was too wise to desire. Desiderius*, Abbot of Mount Cassino, held for a short period, under the name of Victor III., a disputed rule; and on his early death in the year 1087, Urban II., a native of France, was proclaimed in his place. But Clement the Antipope was still in possession of the capital, where the imperial party was triumphant, and five years of dissension† intervened before the authority of Urban was generally acknowledged. That Pope had been a monk of Clugni, and owed his preferment to the See of Ostia to the favour of Gregory; and he continued to the end of his life to exhibit his fidelity by following, as far as his talents permitted him, the schemes which had been traced by his patron.

Of the numerous councils held during his pontificate two are entitled to particular attention—those of Placentia and Clermont‡: in both of these he confirmed the laws and asserted the principles of Gregory, and carried his favourite claims to their full extent; for by the fifteenth canon of the latter he enacted, ‘that no ecclesiastic shall receive any church dignity from the hand of a layman, or pay him liege homage for it; and that no prince shall give the investiture §.’ But that council is recommended to general history by other and more important recollections. And while at Placentia the final sanction was given to the two strongest characteristics in the doctrine and in the discipline of the Roman Church—namely ||, tran-

Urban II.

* His disinclination for the dangerous honour is said to have been so great, that he was actually dragged to the Church, and forcibly invested with the pontifical garments. Fleury, H. E., liv. lxiii., sect. 25 and 27. But this circumstance is not mentioned by Pagi; though, on the authority of Leo Ostiensis, he bears ample testimony to Victor's reluctance.

† The only remarkable acts of personal hostility which these two rivals appear to have exchanged, was a satiric taunt couched on either side in a pair of very innocent hexameters. Clement, insolent in the possession of the city, wrote to his rustivating adversary as follows:—

Diceris Urbanus, cum sis projectus ab Urbe;
Vel muta nomen, vel regrediaris ad Urbem.

To this Urban replied,

Clemens nomen habes, sed Clemens non potes esse,
Tradita solvendi cum sit tibi nulla potestas.

Hist. Litt. de la France.

‡ Both were held in 1095—the former on March 1, the latter on November 18. At the former were present two hundred bishops, nearly four thousand of the inferior clergy, and more than thirty thousand of the laity; so that the assemblies were held in the open air. The latter appears to have been still more numerously attended. See Fleury, H. E., liv. lxiv., sect. 22. Hist. Litt. de la France.

§ ‘Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciat.’ See Mosheim, Cent. xi. p. ii. c. ii. Fleury, liv. lxiv., sect. 29.

|| Hist. Litt. de la France. Vie de Berenger. Fleury, loc. cit. The question regarding the ordination of the sons of presbyters, which was warmly debated about this

substantiation and the celibacy of the clergy, it was the Council of Clermont which first sounded that blast of fanaticism which shook the whole fabric of society, from the extremities of the west even to the heart of Asia, for above two centuries.

It may seem strange that the sanguinary project of launching the power of Christendom in one vast armament against the Mahometan conquerors of the Holy Land should first have been proposed by a Pope, who was celebrated for his studious cultivation of the noblest arts of peace. It was Sylvester II.* with whom the scheme of a general crusade originated; but to him it may have been suggested by personal observation of the sufferings of Spain and the humiliation of the Christian name. And to any one beholding and deploring the various disorders of Europe—the fierce contentions of kings with each other, their more fatal dissensions with their subjects, the military license which everywhere prevailed and forbade all security of person or property—it might have seemed an act of comparative mercy to unite those discordant spirits even by the rudest tie, and to divert against a common foe the turbulence which engaged them in mutual destruction. The same measure was not without some justification in prudence; since the slightest caprice of a Saracen conqueror might have directed his rage against Christendom, and especially against Italy, the most attractive, the most exposed, the least defensible province—the centre of the Christian Church, and, as it were, the Palestine of the West. These and similar considerations may have recommended the same project to a much greater mind than that of Sylvester; for it was also (as has been mentioned) a favourite design of Gregory VII., who proposed personally to conduct against the infidel the universal army of Christ. It was realized by Urban II.; and his exhortations † to

time, was set at rest by the Council of Clermont. It was conceded, that with dispensation from the Pope they might be admitted to Holy Orders. Pagi (Vit. Urban. II., sect. 43.) ascribes to this period the practice of administering the Eucharist to the laity under one species only, which, he adds, became more confirmed, after the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem by the crusaders; for in that Church (he maintains) it has existed from primitive times. We may also mention in this place, that the ‘Office of the Holy Virgin,’ though perhaps not composed by Urban, was brought into more general use during his pontificate.

* It will be recollected that Sylvester, as well as Urban and his agent Peter the Hermit, was a Frenchman. So that the entire credit of the scheme, both of its invention and the bringing it into practice, belongs, such as it is, to that enthusiastic and inconsiderate people. It is a remark of Gibbon, that at the council of Placentia, in Italy, the people wept over the calamities of the Christians of the East—while at Clermont, in France, they took up arms to avenge them.

† The Pope closed the session of the council by a sermon, which has been variously reported by different writers. Fleury gives the following sentences as a part of it, on the authority of William of Tyre, ‘a grave and judicious author:’—‘Do you then, my dear children, arm yourselves with the zeal of God; march to the succour of our brethren, and the Lord be with you. Turn against the enemy of the Christian name the arms which you employ in injuring each other. Redeem, by a service so agreeable to God your pillages, conflagrations, homicides, and other mortal crimes, so as to obtain his ready pardon. We exhort you and enjoin you, for the remission of your sins, to have pity on the affliction of our brethren in Jerusalem, and to repress the insolence of the infidels, who propose to subjugate kingdoms and empires, and to extinguish the name of Christ.’ Hist. Eccl., Liv. lxiv., sect. 32. As the populace devoutly believed the Pope’s assurance, that the pilgrimage would atone for the most abominable crimes, the immediate effect of the crusade might be to rid Europe of the refuse of its population; just as the certain consequence would be the encouragement of crime, when the method of atonement was always at hand.

the Council of Clermont, being at the same time addressed to the superstitious and the military spirit, the two predominant motives of action in that age, were received with an enthusiastic acclamation of frenzy, which was mistaken for the approbation of God.

We do not propose to enter into any description of the military adventures of the crusaders, which have employed the eloquence of so many writers; but shall confine ourselves to the less attractive, but perhaps more useful, task of occasionally recurring to the domestic changes connected with them, and investigating the traces which they have left in the History of the Church.

Urban died in 1099, and was succeeded by Pascal II. Nearly contemporaneous with the decease of Urban was that of Clement III., the Antipope, who had maintained with some interruptions the possession of the capital, though unacknowledged by the great body of the Church. The imperial party was at that moment too weak to appoint a successor, and therefore Pascal entered into undisputed occupation of the chair. Pascal, as well as Gregory and Urban, had been educated in the monastery of Clugni; like the former, he was a Tuscan; like the latter, he was indebted for his early advancement to Gregory; and thus the spirit of that extraordinary man, by animating the congenial bosoms of his two disciples, continued to haunt the pontifical chair, and to regulate the councils of the Vatican, for above thirty years after his departure*. And if Urban prosecuted the reforms undertaken by his master, and realized one of his fondest speculations, to Pascal remained the more difficult and odious office of resuming with fresh violence the interrupted contest with the empire. He engaged in it earnestly, if not eagerly; and as the emperor was still unprepared for submission, he prevented an attempt (perhaps an insidious attempt) at compromise, by renewing (in 1102) all former decrees against investitures, and then commenced the conflict by the usual sentence of excommunication.

Henry IV., after surviving so many Popes, was still in possession of the throne; but his latter years had been afflicted by the rebellion, and, what might be less bitter to him, by the death of his eldest son. The affections of his subjects he never possessed nor deserved; but we do not learn that by any domestic delinquency he had forfeited the less dissoluble allegiance of his children. And yet, scarcely had Conrad terminated his unnatural impiety by death, when—as if the anathemas of Gregory were still suspended over him—as if to accomplish the *temporal* retribution which that pontiff had denounced against the foes of St. Peter†—Henry, his other son, on learning the excommunication of his father, rose in arms against him. A scene revolting to nature and humanity was the consequence; and even the death of the Emperor, which speedily followed, does not close the story of his persecutions. His body, which was still lying under the anathema, having been inconsiderately consigned to consecrated ground, was imme-

Pascal II.

*Misfortunes and
Death of Henry IV.*

* Pascal died on January 18th, 1118, after an unusually long pontificate of eighteen years, five months, and five days.

† It will be recollected that, in his second excommunication of Henry, Gregory supplicated St. Peter to take away from that prince prosperity in war and victory over his enemies, 'that all the world may know' (says he) 'that thou hast power both in heaven and on earth.'

diately dug up, ejected from the holy precincts, and condemned to an unhallowed sepulchre*; and there it rested for the space of five years, a revolting monument of papal power and papal malignity: at length the sentence was withdrawn †, and Henry V. was permitted to make a tardy atonement to offended nature and piety.

There is no proof that Pascal positively excited this monstrous rebellion, but it is well known that he countenanced and promoted it, and that too, not as a reluctant concession of virtue to interest, but with ardent and uncompromising zeal. Indeed, his interest was not engaged in this matter, but his passions merely, and the vindictive hatred for Henry IV. which he had contracted in the school of Gregory. The Holy See had nothing to gain by the death or deposition of an unpopular monarch, but everything to fear from the union which would probably ensue among his subjects. For, as to any prospect of gratitude from his successor—any hope that the Emperor would be mindful of services conferred upon the rebel,—a Tuscan and a Pope could scarcely indulge so simple an expectation. If Pascal did so, he very speedily discovered his error; for scarcely was Henry IV. dead, when his son asserted with equal vehemence the disputed rights. The Pope resisted, and both parties prepared for a second struggle.

Henry V. nothing deterred by the portentous appearance of a comet, which inspired general dismay, descended into Italy during the summer of 1110, carefully prepared for a twofold contest with the Holy See; for he was not only attended by a powerful army, but also by a suite of *literary* protectors ‡, so that the pen might be at hand to justify the deeds of the sword. His advance was preceded by a declaration of his intention, which was 'to maintain a right acquired by privilege and the custom of his predecessors from the time of Charlemagne, and preserved during three hundred years under sixty-three popes—that of presenting to bishoprics and abbeys by the ring and crosier.' In reality, his object, when more fully explained, was to prevent the election of bishops without his consent, to invest the bishop-elect with the regalia, to receive from him homage and the oath of allegiance. At the same time, he proposed to undergo the solemn ceremony of coronation at the hands of the Pope.

By the regalia above mentioned were understood various grants conferred on the bishops by Charlemagne, which partook of the privileges of royalty, such as the power of raising tribute, coining money, and also the possession of certain independent lands, directly derived from the crown, with some other immunities. And it seemed natural that the successors of Charlemagne should retain the right of confirming

* 'Comprobantibus his qui aderant Archiepiscopis et Episcopis; quia quibus vivis ecclesia non communicat, illis etiam nec mortuis communicare possit.'—Urspergensis Abbas, ap. Pagi, Vit. Pascalii II. Some ascribe this act of barbarity to the German Bishops, and exculpate the Pope, except in as far as he had set them the example, by exhumating the bones of Guibert the Antipope, who had been buried at Ravenna, and casting them into the neighbouring river.

† Fleury, H. E., lib. lxxv. s. 44, and lib. lxxvi. s. 5.

‡ 'One of them was a Scotsman named David, who had presided over the schools at Wurtemberg, and whom the King had appointed his chaplain, à cause de sa vertu. He wrote a relation of this expedition, but rather as a panegyrist than a historian.'—Fleury, lib. lxxvi. s. 1, on authority of Will. Malmes., lib. v. p. 166.

the privileges which he had bestowed. This circumstance involved the Pope in great perplexity; and though it was easy to publish edicts, and advance vague and exorbitant pretensions, when the Emperor was distant or embarrassed, he could scarcely hope by such expedients to withstand his near and armed approach. In this difficulty, Pascal proved at least the sincerity of his professions, and his attachment to the best and purest interests of the Church. He had the virtue to prefer its spiritual independence to its worldly splendour, and the courage to proclaim his preference. This better part being chosen, he concluded a treaty with Henry, by which it was agreed that the bishops, on the one hand, should make to Henry a positive cession of all that belonged to the crown in the time of Louis, Henry, and his other predecessors, on pain of excommunication if they attempted to usurp such regalia; and that the Emperor, on the other, should resign the right of investiture. On this arrangement, the Pope consented to perform the ceremony of coronation*, and Henry proceeded to Rome for that purpose.

The circumstances which followed are told with some trifling variations, but were probably thus. The bishops interested in the treaty, and especially those of Germany, who would have been the greatest sufferers, felt the deepest repugnance to resign so large a portion of their splendid temporalities for a remote and invisible object, which, however it might be accessory to the honour of the Church, did not benefit their own immediate interests. Consequently they protested with so much violence against the compromise, which seemed to them to exchange a substance for a shadow, that the Pope despaired of his power to execute that condition of the treaty. In the mean time, Henry arrived at Rome: he was conducted with acclamations to the Basilica of St. Peter, where the Pope, with his Bishops and Cardinals, was waiting to receive him. The King, according to the accustomed ceremony, prostrated himself before the Pope, and kissed his feet; he then read the usual oath, and they advanced together into the church†. But here, before they proceeded to the office of consecration, a dispute broke out respecting the fulfilment of the treaty, and it was presently inflamed into an angry quarrel. Henry availed himself of the presence of his soldiers to arrest the Pope and several Cardinals; the Roman populace took arms and endeavoured to rescue him; a fierce and tumultuous conflict ensued, and the courts of the Vatican, and even the hallowed pavement of St. Peter, were polluted with blood; but the Germans succeeded in preserving their prisoners, and carried them away to their neighbouring encampment at Viterbo. After a rigorous confinement of two months, Pascal yielded to such persuasion as a king may exercise over his captive; and then he not only performed the required ceremony, but, by a new convention, ceded unconditionally the right of investiture.

* For this compact we have the authority of Petrus Diaconus (who cites a contemporary account of the transaction) confirmed by that of Urspergens. Abbas, as follows. 'Ibi Legati Apostolici cum missis Regis advenientes, promptum esse Papam ad consecrationem . . . si tamen ipse sibimet annueret libertatem Ecclesiarum, laicam ab illis prohibens investituram—recipiendo nihilominus ab Ecclesiis Ducatus, Marchias, Comitatus, Advocatias, Moneta, Telonia, cæterorumque Regalium quæ possident summam.'—See Pagi, Vit. Pasch. II.—Fleury, lib. lxvi. s. ii.

† This took place on Feb. 11, 1111. 'Ter se invicem complexi, ter se invicem osculati sunt; et, sicut mos, Rex dexteram Pontificis tenens cum magno populi gaudio et clamore ad Portam venit Argenteam. Ibi ex libro professionem imperatoriam faciens a Pontifice designatus est Imperator, &c.'—Acta Vaticana ap. Baronium.

The presence of the Emperor was demanded in Germany; Pascal returned to Rome; but he was saluted there by such a tempest of indignation, as to find it necessary, in the year following, to submit the whole affair, even as it involved his own personal conduct, to a very numerous Council at the Lateran. Here the Pope confessed the error into which his weakness had betrayed him; and the Council, with his consent, solemnly revoked and cancelled the treaty, and justified their perfidy by pleading the violence which had extorted it. The immediate resentment of Henry was diverted by civil disorders; but in 1117, he marched to Rome as an avowed enemy; Pascal retired to Benevento, and sought the protection of his Norman vassals, still faithful to the chair of Gregory. The Emperor presently withdrew, and Pascal returned to his see, and died; and his fortunes, in many respects similar to those of his patron, were blessed with a happier termination, since he was permitted to close his eyes at Rome. His fortunes were, in some respects, similar to those of Gregory, and similar was the audacity of his pretensions; but he wanted the firmness necessary to dignify the former, and to give weight and stability to the latter; his adversity was inglorious, and his arrogance feeble and without consequence. The levity of his character disqualified him for the task he had undertaken, and its pliancy did not compensate for its want of coherence and consistency.

The question respecting investitures, after having variously agitated the kingdoms of the west for half a century, was now drawing near to its final decision. After a short interval of disputed succession*, then usual on the death of every Pope, Calixtus II., Archbishop of Vienna, a Count of Burgundy, and a near relative of the Emperor, was raised to the pontifical chair. It does not appear, however, that he sacrificed to the claims of consanguinity any portion of the rights or pretensions of his see; but he consented that the differences should be submitted for their final arrangement to a Council, or Diet, to be assembled at Worms for that purpose. A Convention was there concluded, which was reasonable and permanent; its substance was this †:—(1.) That the election of bishops and abbots, in his Teutonic kingdom, take place in its rightful form, without violence or simony, in the presence of the Emperor or his legate, so that in case of a difference, his protection be given with the advice of the metropolitan to the juster claim ‡. (2.) That the ecclesiastic elected receive his regalia at the hand of the Emperor, and do homage for them. But (3.) that in the ceremony of investiture the Emperor no longer use the insignia of spiritual authority, but the *sceptre* only. A similar arrangement had previously § taken place in England between Henry I. and Pascal II.; and in France||, if the custom of investiture by the ring and crosier ever

* Gelasius II. stands in the list of Popes as having filled that interval.

† See Fleury, liv. lxxvii. sect. 30. Pagi, Vit. Callisti II. sect. xxiv. xxv. This convention took place in September, 1122.

‡ ‘Si qua inter partes discordia emerit, metropolitani provincialium consilio vel judicio, saniori parti assensum et auxilium præbeas.’ So this clause is expressed in the acts of the Lateran Council held in the following year.

§ Probably in 1106, after a severe dispute between the Pope and King during the primacy of Anselm. Hist. Litt. France, Vie Pascal. Pagi, Vit. Pascal. II.

|| Guillaume de Champeau, Bishop of Chalons, is related to have addressed (in 1119) the following discourse to the Emperor:—‘Sire, if you desire a substantial peace you must absolutely renounce the investiture to bishoprics and abbeys. And to assure you that you will thus suffer no diminution of your royal authority, let me inform you, that when I was

prevailed, which seems uncertain, it had been abolished about the same time.

The terms of this treaty, in which each party yielded what was extravagant in his claims*, were undoubtedly favourable to the Church. Her restitution of the 'rightful form' of election deprived the Emperor of an usurped privilege which had been extremely valuable and profitable to him, both in its use and its abuse. And since the Popes, ever after the edict of Alexander II., had claimed as indisputable the right of *confirmation* in episcopal election—a claim which, as it was purely ecclesiastical, the Emperor had not greatly cared to contest—a large portion of the influence which was ceded by the crown did in fact *devolve* on the holy see. Again, the *original* form of election was in no case positively restored, since the advantage of excluding the people, and even the body of the diocesan clergy, had been long and generally acknowledged; so that the right seems to have been invested almost immediately in the chapters of the cathedral Churches; at least it was confirmed to them about the end of the twelfth century.

The second condition of the Convention secured to the sovereign the civil allegiance of his ecclesiastical subjects, and repressed their dangerous struggles for entire immunity from feudal obligations. At the same time it restored to them the integrity of their ghostly independence, and cut off the last pretence for secular interference in matters strictly spiritual.

So easy and reasonable was the conclusion of that debate, which, in addition to the usual calamities of international warfare, had excited subjects against their sovereign, and children against their fathers, which had convulsed the holy Church, and overthrown its sanctuaries, and stained its altars with blood. However, on a calm historical survey of the circumstances of the conflict, and of the crimes and errors which led to them, we are little disposed to load with unmixed reprehension any individual of either party. The *crimes*, indeed, and the passions which produced them, were equally numerous and flagrant on either side; on the one, were tyranny and profligacy and brutal violence: arrogance and obstinacy and imposture, on the other; pride and ambition and injustice, on both. Yet our prejudices naturally incline to the imperial party; because the same or equal vices become infinitely more detestable when they are found under the banners of religion†. But the *errors* were those of the

*elected in the kingdom of France, *I received nothing from the hand of the king*, neither before nor after consecration. Nevertheless I serve him as faithfully in virtue of the tributes and various other rights of the state which Christian kings have in ancient days given to the Church, as faithfully, I say, as your bishops in your kingdom serve you, in virtue of that investiture which has drawn such discords and anathemas on you.' Fleury, II. E. liv. lxvii. sec. 3. The Emperor yielded to that argument.

* The peace of the Church is thus celebrated by Gotfridus of Viterbo, in his Chronicle:
 Reddit Apostolico Cæsar quæcunque rogavit;
 Pax bona conficitur; sublata Deo reparavit;
 Jura suæ partis lætus uterque trahit.

† Mosheim is disposed to throw all the reproach of this dispute on the *monastic* education and character of Gregory and his two disciples; and these he contrasts with the more secular virtues which high birth and society had nourished in Calixtus. But in the first place, the whole blame is not by any means on that side, but is very equally divided with the empire; and in the next, Pascal at least did actually prove, by his arrangement with the English king, his disposition to end the controversy, on the very terms finally accepted by Calixtus. Mosheim moderates with great impartiality between contending sects, and a very great merit that is; but when the contest is between a Pope and a German sovereign, his feelings sometimes overpower his perfect judgment.

times rather than of the men, and even served, in some degree, to palliate the crimes. The barbarism of preceding ages and the ignorance actually existing, had engendered and nourished a swarm of obscure notions and active prejudices, which infatuated the vulgar, and partially blinded even the best and the wisest. The records of past events were little studied; indeed they were seen only by those discontinuous glimpses, which perplex and deceive far more than they enlighten; and reason had lost her native force, and health, and penetration, through neglect and abuse—so that claims the most absurd were established by arguments the most senseless; and men could not rightly discern the real nature of their adversaries' pretensions, nor even the strength of their own, so as effectually to controvert the one, or rationally to maintain the other. Thus were their contests carried on in a sort of moral obscurity, which took off nothing from their positiveness and obstinacy, and permitted even additional licence to their malignity.

In the following year a very numerous* assembly was held at Rome, which is commonly acknowledged in that Church as the *The First Lateran Council*. ninth General, and the First Lateran council. Of the two-and-twenty canons which resulted from its labours, the greater part were in confirmation of the acts of preceding Popes; and we observe that the object of several of the original enactments was to protect the property of the Church from alienation, and lay usurpations. There was one which promoted the Crusading zeal, both by spiritual promises and menaces. And among the most important we may consider that (the 17th) which prohibited abbots and monks from the performance of public masses, the administration of the holy chrism, and other religious services, and confided those solemn offices entirely to the secular clergy. This was an early and very public manifestation of that jealousy between the two orders of the Romish hierarchy, which in a later age displayed itself so generally as to become an efficient instrument in working its overthrow.

Calixtus died in 1124, and during the thirty years which followed, the pontifical city enjoyed scarcely any intermission from *Popular tumults at Rome*. discord and convulsion. The names of Honorius and Innocent †, and Anaclete and Eugenius, with some others, pass by in rapid and tumultuous procession.

The chair, which was generally contested, was never maintained to any good purpose; and one of its possessors, Lucius II., was actually murdered by the populace in an attempt to restore tranquillity.

But we must here observe, that the popular commotions of this period were not of the same description with those which we have already found occasion to notice; the question of papal election had ceased to be their sole, or even their principal, cause; the turbulence which had been occasioned by the abuse of that right, and prolonged by the endeavour to reclaim it, was now founded in a deeper and much more powerful motive. A party had lately grown up in the Roman city of patriots ambitious to restore the name, and, as some might fondly deem, the glory of the ancient republic.

* About a thousand prelates were present, of whom above three hundred were bishops, and above six hundred abbots. Many pontifical Councils had been previously held at the Lateran, but this was the first which obtained a place among the General Councils.

† The Pontificate of Innocent II., though interrupted by frequent dissension, was the longest and the most important; and during it, in the year 1139, the tenth General Council, or second Lateran, was assembled.

And the first and necessary step towards the accomplishment of this scheme was the subversion, or, at least, the entire reconstruction of the ecclesiastical system. To diminish the privileges, to reduce the revenues of the church, to deprive the Pontiff of temporal power and all civil jurisdiction, and to degrade (should we not rather say, to exalt?) his stately splendour to the homeliness of his primitive predecessors—these were the projects preparatory to the political regeneration of Rome. About the year 1135, Arnold, a native of *Arnold of Brescia*. Brescia, a disciple of the celebrated Abelard, returned to Italy from the schools of Paris, and having assumed the monastic habit, began publicly to preach and declaim against the vices of the clergy. It is admitted by a Catholic writer*, that the pomp of the prelates, and the soft licentious life both of clerks and monks, furnished abundant materials for his denunciations; but it is complained that he exceeded the limits of truth and moderation; and it is besides asserted, that his orthodoxy was liable to suspicion, and that he held some unsound opinions respecting the Eucharist and infant baptism. In consequence of these various charges, he was condemned by a Lateran Council, in 1139: he immediately retired from Italy, and transferred his popular declamation to Zurich, in Switzerland.

Not many years afterwards, encouraged by the independent spirit which was rising at Rome, he boldly selected that metropolis for the scene of his two-fold exertions against papacy and despotism. In the mean time (in the year 1154) a man of decided firmness and energy had obtained possession of the Chair. *Adrian IV.* Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever attained that dignity, had raised himself from the very lowest office in society † to the throne of St. Peter; and though the arrogance which he then exhibited might entirely belong to his latest fortunes, an intrepid resolution, tempered by the most refined address, must have characterised every stage of his progress; since these are qualities which offices and dignities may exercise, but can never bestow. In the year following his elevation, one of his cardinals was dangerously wounded in some tumult excited by the associates of Arnold. Adrian instantly placed the city of Rome under an interdict; the churches were closed, and the divine offices for some time suspended, in the very heart of the Catholic church. The priests and the people wearied the pontifical chair with supplications for a recall of the edict, but Adrian did not relent until Arnold and his associates were expelled from the city. ‘All the people (says Fleury) blessed God for this mercy: on the following day (Holy Thursday), they rushed from every quarter to receive the customary absolution, and a vast multitude of pilgrims was also present. Then the Pope, attended by bishops and car-

* Fleury, H. E., lib. lxxviii., sect. 55. Arnold maintained that there was no hope of salvation for prelates who held baronies, or for any clerks or monks who possessed any fixed property; that those possessions belonged to the prince, and that he alone could bestow them, and on laymen only; that the clergy ought to live on the tithes and the voluntary oblations of the people, content with a moderate and frugal sufficiency. Pagi, Vit. Innocent II., sect. lxxix., refers to Otho Frisingensis. The ravings (deliramenta) of Peter de Bruis were condemned on the same occasion. That Heresiarch objected to the reverence paid to the cross, denied the daily sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and the efficacy of prayers or alms for the dead, besides other unpardonable errors.

† His name was Nicholas Breakspere: going to Arles, in Provence, he was admitted in the quality of servant to the Canons of St. Rufus, where he became monk, and in the sequel Abbot and General of the Order.

dinals, and a numerous troop of nobles, came forth from his residence, and crossing the extent of Rome, amidst the acclamations of the people, arrived at the Lateran Palace, where he celebrated the festival of Easter.'

Soon afterwards, Arnold unhappily fell into the power of Frederic Barbarossa, who was then in Italy on his advance to Rome; and the Emperor, probably actuated by a common dislike to independence and innovation under every form, yielded up his prisoner to the solicitations of the Pope. He was conducted to Rome, and subjected to the partial judgment of an ecclesiastical tribunal. His guilt was eagerly pronounced, the prefect of the city delivered his sentence, and he was burnt alive, 'in the presence of a careless and ungrateful people.' But lest this same multitude, with the same capriciousness, should presently turn to adore *the martyr* and offer worship at his tomb, his ashes were contemptuously scattered over the bosom of the Tiber. His name has been the subject of splendid panegyric and scandalous calumny: with its claims to political celebrity, we have no concern in this history; but in respect to his disputes with the church, we may venture to rank Arnold of Brescia among those earnest but inconsiderate reformers, whose premature opposition to established abuses produced little immediate result except their own discomfiture and destruction; but whose memory has become dear, as their example has been useful, to a happier and a wiser posterity; whom we celebrate as martyrs to the best of human principles, and whose very indiscretions we account to them for zeal and virtue.

Frederic Barbarossa, whose elevation was nearly contemporaneous with that of Adrian, had also announced his intention to restrain the increasing wealth and moderate the insolence of the Pope and his clergy; and in 1155, he proceeded to Rome for the purposes of celebrating his coronation, and commencing his reform: but he found the Pontiff as firm and as powerful to resist imperial interference as to quell domestic disorder. And so far was Adrian, on this occasion, from betraying the interests of his order, or the prerogatives of his office, that he even asserted a recent and ambiguous and singularly offensive claim—he demanded the personal service of the Emperor to hold his stirrup when he mounted his horse*. A precedent for this indignity having been pointed out to him, Barbarossa, the haughtiest prince in Europe, at the head of a powerful and obedient army, submitted to an office of servitude, which he may possibly have mistaken for Christian humiliation. But, however that may be, the triumph of the See over so great a monarch proved the substantial reality of its power, and the awe which it deeply inspired into the most intrepid minds.

Some vexatious pretensions of Adrian respecting the regalia, and a gratuitous insinuation that Frederic held the empire as a fief (*beneficium*) from Rome, served to keep alive a jealous irritation between the Church and the empire, though peace was not actually interrupted. Frederic, on the other hand, published, in 1158, an edict, of which the object was to prevent the transfer of fiefs without the knowledge and consent of the superior or lord in whose name they were held. It was by such unauthorized transfers of feudal property that the territories of the Church had

* 'This homage' (says Gibbon) 'was paid by kings to archbishops, and by vassals to their lords; and it was the nicest policy of Rome to confound the marks of filial and feudal subjection.' Chap. 69.

for a long period been gradually swollen, so as to spread themselves in every direction over the surface of Europe. The law in question was well calculated to check their further increase, and it seems to have been the first that was enacted for that purpose. Its obvious tendency did not escape the directors of the Church; but the opposition which it had peculiarly to expect from the Holy See was suspended by the death of Adrian and the confusion which followed it.

Alexander III. was immediately elected by a very large majority of the cardinals; but as some of the other party still persisted in supporting a rival named Octavian*, Frederic, on his own authority, summoned a General Council at Pavia to decide on their claims. Alexander disputed the Emperor's right to arbitrate or at all to interfere in the schisms of the Church†; and, as he refused to present himself at the Council, his rival was declared to be duly elected, and the decision received the approbation of the Emperor. But Alexander was still sustained by the more faithful and powerful party within the Church, and acknowledged by most of the sovereigns of Europe; and from these supports he derived confidence sufficient to excommunicate his adversary, and to absolve his subjects from their oath of fidelity. But Frederic did not feel the blow; he proceeded to place his creature in possession of the pontifical city, while Alexander adopted the resolution, so commonly followed by his successors in after ages, to seek security in the territories of France. He withdrew to Montpellier with his whole court, and resided in that neighbourhood for the space of three years, till circumstances enabled him to return to Rome in 1165. Here he was soon afterwards assailed by Frederic in person, and though defended for some little time by the ambiguous and venal fidelity‡ of the Romans, he was finally obliged to escape in the disguise of a pilgrim. He retired to Benevento, but not till he had thundered another anathema against Frederic; and on this occasion he not only deprived him of the throne, but also forbade, 'by the authority of God, that he should thereafter have any force in battle, or triumph over any Christian; or that he should enjoy anywhere peace or repose, until he had given sufficient proofs of his penitence.§' The denunciations contained in this frightful sentence were not, indeed, wholly accomplished; yet did it so come to pass, that Frederic was obliged to retire almost immediately from Rome by the sickness of his army; and that, in the long and destructive war which followed, he suffered such reverses as to find it expedient (in the year 1177) to sign a disadvantageous treaty with the Pope||. The war

* After the death of Octavian, Alexander had still to struggle successively with three other Antipopes. The second, called by his adherents Calixtus III., was appointed in 1168, and abdicated in about ten years; but his party replaced him by another puppet, whom they called Innocent III.

† Frederic had two precedents for his claim, though he might not perhaps much regard, or even know, that circumstance. In 408 Honorius held a Council at Ravenna to decide the disputed election between Boniface and Eulalius, and his decision was followed by the Church. Afterwards the schism between Symmachus and Laurentius was terminated by Theodoric, though an Arian. The imperial power does not appear to have been disputed in either instance.

‡ It appears that he could secure little influence over the Roman people, 'who, pretending to wish well to both parties, were faithful to neither,' until he received a large sum of money from William, his Sicilian vassal. Fleury, H. E., liv. lxxi., sec. 34, &c. &c.

§ See Pagi, Vit. Alexandri III., sect. 66, who reasonably assigns this event to the year 1167.

|| Alexander is accused, and with some justice, of having too exclusively consulted his own interests in this affair, and of having negotiated a truce only for his faithful allies,

was for the most part carried on in the North of Italy; and as it was fomented by the address and policy, rather than by the sword, of Alexander, the calm expression of his exultation was in some manner justified—‘it hath pleased God (he said) to permit an old man and a priest to triumph without the use of arms over a powerful and formidable emperor*.’

From that time Alexander possessed in security the chair which he had merited by his persevering exertions, as well as by his various virtues. He immediately turned his attention to the internal condition of the Church, and his first object was to remove from his successors an evil which had so long and so dangerously afflicted himself. Accordingly he summoned (in 1179) a Council, commonly called the third of Lateran, and there enacted those final regulations † respecting papal election which have already been mentioned.

Among the very few characters which throw an honourable lustre upon the dark procession of pontifical names, we may confidently record that of Alexander III., not only from the splendour of his talents, his constancy, and his success, but from a still nobler claim which he possesses on our admiration. He was the zealous champion of intellectual advancement, and the determined foe of ignorance. The system of his internal administration was regulated by this principle, and he carried it to the most generous extent. He made inquiries in foreign countries, and especially in France, for persons eminent for learning, that he might promote them, without regard to birth or influence, to the highest ecclesiastical dignities. He caused large numbers of the Italian Clergy, to whom their own country did not supply sufficient means of instruction, to proceed to Paris for their more liberal education; and having learnt that in some places the chapters of cathedrals exacted fees from young proficients before they licensed them to lecture publicly, Alexander removed the abuse, and abolished every restriction which had been arbitrarily imposed on the free advance of learning. At the same time he was not so blinded by this zeal as to consider the mere exercise of the understanding as a sufficient guarantee for moral improvement. But observing, on the contrary, with great apprehension the progress of the scholastic system of theology, and the numberless vain disputations to which it gave rise, he assembled a very large Council of Men of Letters ‡ for the purpose of condemning that system, and discouraging its prevalence at Paris.

He died in 1181: in the course of the ten following years four pontiffs ruled and passed away, and in 1191 the chair was occupied by Celestine III., the fifth from Alexander. This prelate has deserved a place in the history of mankind by the protection which he afforded to Richard I. of England, when imprisoned on his return from the Holy Land. He died in 1198, and was succeeded by Lotharius, Count of Segni, a Cardinal Deacon, who assumed the name of Innocent III.

while he secured an honourable and profitable peace for himself. Denina (Rivol. d' Ital. L. xi. C. iv.) calls it a ‘*Pace particolare fra Alessandro III. e Federico.*’

* Muratori, in his forty-eighth dissertation, describes Frederic as ‘*Vir alti animi, acris ingenii, multarumque virtutum consensu ornatus.*’

† These regulations were so effectual, that during the 600 following years, a double choice (as Gibbon observes) only once disturbed the unity of the College. Chap. 69.

‡ Three thousand gens de lettres are said to have been assembled on that occasion. Hist. Litt. de la France, xii. siècle.

We shall conclude this account with a few of the observations which most naturally offer themselves. From the moment that the Roman See put forward its claims to temporal authority, its history presents a spectacle of contentions, varying indeed in character and in bitterness, but in their succession almost uninterrupted. The retrospect of the period of one hundred and fifteen years, of which the most memorable circumstances have now been related, presents to us a mass of angry dissensions, which may generally be distinguished into three classes: (1.) The first and most prominent of these contains such quarrels as arose in continuation of the grand debate between the popedom and the empire. It was not sufficient that the original matter of dispute was removed by the concordat of Calixtus; the roots of animosity lay deeper than the form of an investiture, and they had branched out more widely and more vigorously during the contest which succeeded that concordat. The coronation of every new emperor was now attended by a new dispute, which usually caused immediate bloodshed, and was sometimes prolonged into obstinate warfare. Rome had never a more formidable German adversary than Frederic Barbarossa; yet so far was he from obtaining any lasting advantage over her, that the papal pretensions appear to have gained considerably both in consistency and general credit during his reign, or, to speak more properly, during the pontificate of Alexander III. Frederic was not justified in contesting the legitimacy of that pontiff. Whatsoever general rights he might possess over the Roman church (and they were very vague and could only be temporal); whatsoever precedents he might plead for interference (and those were very remote, and not wholly applicable to the present case); the election of Alexander was unquestionably valid, according to the canons which had been enacted a century before and never repealed or contested, and according to the practice of the See since the days of Gregory VII. Assuredly, the desire to recover an obsolete privilege, virtually ceded by the silence of intervening treaties, was excuse insufficient for that violent opposition, which did properly terminate in defeat and humiliation, as it was commenced and continued in injustice. (2.) The contentions among the rival candidates for the pontifical chair, so scandalous and so usual in former periods, had abated nothing of their rage in the present; for though they changed their character, they lost not any part of their virulence, from the intermixture of political animosity. The short reigns of the greater number of the pontiffs, and the most trifling divisions in the college, gave frequent occasion, and some pretext, for popular interference; and this could never be exercised without excess. The regulation of Nicholas II. was not in fact of much real advantage, except as a preparatory measure to that of Alexander III.,—for it was vain to exclude from positive election an unprincipled and venal mob, as long as they retained a negative influence,—it was of no avail, as a final arrangement, to forbid their suffrage, and to require their consent,—for the turbulent expression of their disapprobation was instantly seized by the defeated candidate, as furnishing some hope for success, or, at least, some plea for perseverance. And perhaps it was not the least evil of those tumults, that they encouraged and almost invited the interference of the emperor, so seldom offered with any friendly intention. There was no other possible method of securing at once the justice and decency of papal election, than by the entire exclusion of the people—this measure was at length effected by Alexander. (3.) Of another description again were those dissensions which distracted the several kingdoms of Europe

by the internal division of the church and the state,—that is, by the opposition of the ecclesiastical to the civil authorities. But since in these matters the affairs of every nation constitute histories essentially distinct from each other, and mainly influenced, in every instance, by civil concerns; and since the detached incidents which we might produce would form independent narratives, standing for the most part on separate foundations, it would be difficult, in these limited pages, to give them consistency, or even coherence. We must, therefore, content ourselves with referring to the annals of the different nations for the details of such disputes; to those of France, for instance, for the quarrel between Louis le Gros and the Bishop of Paris, who had the boldness to excommunicate his sovereign; and to those of our own country for the particulars of the aggression of William Rufus on the property of the church, made during the pontificate of Urban II., and of the protection perseveringly vouchsafed to Thomas à Becket by the piety or policy of Alexander III.

To those abovementioned we might reasonably add another form of discord which was beginning obscurely to present itself, with omens and menaces of tribulation. The voice of heresy had been already raised in the valleys of France, and the ministers of spiritual despotism had already bestirred themselves for its suppression. But this subject is so peculiarly connected with the celebrity of Innocent III., that we shall not disconnect it from his name.

II. The gradual establishment of the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, though occasionally influenced by the vicissitudes of literature, is not inseparably connected with its history, but was promoted in different ages by very different causes. It is indeed remarked, that in the tenth century the disputes respecting predestination and other subtle questions became less common, and gave place to the final establishment of the doctrine of Purgatory,—a change well suited to the transition from an age (the ninth), distinguished by some efforts of intellectual inquisitiveness, into one remarkable for the general prostration of the human understanding. But, on the other hand, we find that, in the eleventh and twelfth ages, the necessity of *secret* confession was more strictly and assiduously inculcated; yet the firmer rivetting of that spiritual chain cannot certainly be attributed to any further access of darkness. In fact, the contrary was the case, since the partial revival of letters is very justly ascribed to that period. But the innovation which we have last mentioned, and to which others might be added, was probably occasioned by the disputes then prevailing between the church and the empire, which made it necessary to extend by every exertion the influence of the clergy over their lay fellow-subjects. Again, the use of indulgences in the place of canonical penance, which grew up in the twelfth age, was one of the earliest and most pernicious creations of the crusades, and wholly independent of the growth and movements of literature. But notwithstanding these and many other points of disconnection, there has ever existed a sort of general correspondence between religion and learning, most especially remarkable in those ages when the ministers of the one could alone give access to the mysteries of the other, and when the only incentive to studious application was religious zeal or ecclesiastical ambition; so that it would be as improper entirely to separate those subjects as it would be impossible, in these pages, to enter very deeply into discussion concerning the ecclesiastical literature of so many ages. We shall

therefore content ourselves by striving from time to time to illustrate this work by such subsidiary lights as shall most obviously present themselves, so far at least as regards the different forms of theological learning, and the methods of theological education. At present, after a very brief review of earlier times, we shall conclude our imperfect inquiries at the end of the eleventh century.

The earliest schools established in the provinces of the Western Empire were of civil foundation, and intended entirely for the purposes of civil education; and so they continued *Early Schools.* until the social system was subverted by the barbarian conquest. This revolution affected the literary in common with all other institutions: in the course of the sixth century profane learning entirely disappeared, together with the means of acquiring it; and before its conclusion, the office of instruction had passed entirely into the hands of the clergy. The municipal schools of the empire gave place to cathedral or episcopal establishments, which were attached, in every diocese, to the residence of the bishop; and throughout the country elementary schools were formed in many of the monasteries, and even in the manses of the parochial priesthood.

The system of education which prevailed in those of Italy, and which was probably very general, is described by the canon* which enjoins it:— ‘Let all presbyters who are appointed to parishes, according to the custom so wholesomely established throughout all Italy, receive the younger readers into their houses with them, and feeding them, like good fathers, with spiritual nourishment, labour to instruct them in preparing the Psalms, in industry of holy reading, and in the law of the Lord.’ Such regulations prove, no doubt (if they were really enforced), that the education of the clergy was not entirely neglected: but they prove also, that such education, even in that early age, was confined to the clergy, and that it embraced no subjects of secular erudition. It is true, indeed, that the *names* of rhetoric, dialectics, and the former subjects of civil instruction, were perpetuated in the ecclesiastical seminaries; but those sciences were only taught, as they were connected, or might be brought into connexion, with theology, and made instrumental in the service of the church †.

But even this partial glimmering of knowledge was extinguished by the invasion of the Lombards, and the very genius of Italy seems to have been chilled and contracted by the iron grasp of the seventh century. Rome alone retained any warmth or pulsation of learning; if learning that can be called, which scarcely extended beyond a superficial acquaintance with the canons of the church. And though there exist some monuments, which appear to prove the existence of presbyteral or archipresbyteral schools in the eighth century, we need scarcely hesitate to prolong to the middle of that age the stupefaction of the preceding, and to attribute the first movement of reanimation to the touch of Charlemagne, or his immediate predecessor.

* Concilium Vasense Secundum (529 A.D.) The materials for the following pages are principally taken from the Dissertations (43 and 44) of Muratori, the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, two Discourses of Fleury, and the 16th *Leçon* of Guizot.

† The reproach addressed by Gregory the Great to St. Dizier, Bishop of Vienne, is commonly known. That prelate had ventured to deliver lessons on ‘Grammar’ in his cathedral schools: ‘It is not meet (said the pope) that lips consecrated to the praises of God should open to those of Jupiter.’ The extensive meaning then attached to the word *grammar* will be mentioned presently.

While Italy was thus lifeless, some seeds from the plant of knowledge, which had been blown to the western extremity of Europe, took root there, and reached a certain maturity. Accordingly, we find it recorded, that 'two Irishmen, persons incomparably skilled in secular and sacred learning,' had reached the shores of France, and were giving public lectures to the people*. Their fame reached the ears of Charlemagne, who immediately employed them in the education of the youth of Gaul and Italy.

Alcuin, as we have mentioned, enjoyed the honour of affording personal instruction to the emperor and presiding over his Palatine school; and Dungal, another native of Ireland †, has acquired some importance in the history of Italy by the lessons which he delivered in her schools. This eagerness of Charlemagne to avail himself of foreign talent and acquirements evinces his earnestness in the prosecution of his great project, to civilize by the path of knowledge—a project which failed indeed through the perversity of political circumstances and the incapacity of most of his successors; but which, if perseveringly pursued, must generally be successful, because it is in unison with the natural inclinations, and energies, and prospects of the mind of man.

France profited by this conjuncture more rapidly than Italy, as she had not previously fallen quite so low in ignorance: and it would even seem that the schools, which were now instituted in that country, were open to the laity as well as to those intended for the sacred profession, though the office of instruction remained entirely in the hands of the clergy. But it is certain, that very few were found to avail themselves of a privilege of which they knew not the value. Among the numerous names, which adorn the literary annals of France during the ninth century, there are scarcely one or two which are not ecclesiastical. Even Germany outstripped in the race of improvement the languid progress of Italy; and under a sky so splendidly prolific of taste and genius there arose not any one character conspicuous, even in his own day, for intellectual advancement, through a space of more than four centuries ‡. And this extraordinary dearth of merit is not entirely to be charged on the neglect of rulers, whether temporal or spiritual. Italy shared with his other provinces the admirable institutions of Charlemagne and of some of his successors; and there are canons of Roman councils still extant, published in the ninth century §, which directed the suspension of any among the priesthood who should be convicted of ignorance, and provided means for the instruction of the rural clergy ¶. But these measures, though they might possibly secure a mediocrity of theological acquirement, were insufficient to call forth any commanding spirit into the field of literature.

The tenth century did not increase the store of knowledge, nor multiply the candidates for fame either in Italy or France. ¶¶ In France, the

* Not gratuitously, it would seem, as literary missionaries, but for money contributed by their hearers.

† *Scotus*: a term which was long confined to the sister island. Muratori condescends to employ some pains to ascertain whether or not Dungal was a monk, as were his two compatriots mentioned in the text—a question deemed of some importance to the honour of the monastic order.

‡ Some may consider Pope Nicholas as an exception; and he certainly possessed great talents, and was not devoid of canonical learning, though in both respects probably much inferior to Hincmar. But his character was essentially ecclesiastical; it was not adorned by any recollection purely literary.

§ In the years 826 and 853.

¶ The decree of Pope Leo IV. is cited by Muratori.

¶¶ The two leading literary heroes of France during this age were (1.) St. Odo, Abbot

depredations of the Normans during the conclusion of the preceding age, destroyed not only the leisure and security, but even the means and food of study. For in their savage incursions, those unlettered pagans directed their rage against the monasteries, as being the principal seats of letters and religion; the buildings were reparable, but the manuscripts which they contained perished irretrievably. Nor was this the only calamity, nor even the most fatal of the injuries, which obstructed the progress of learning: for it was during the same period that the kingdom of France was broken up into small principalities under independent hereditary vassals, who despoiled the people of the few rights and blessings which they had possessed under a single sceptre, and whose rule permitted the license which their example encouraged. In the prostration of human laws the law divine was easily forgotten, and the hand which was accustomed to robbery did not long refrain from sacrilege. In such wild periods the wealth and the weakness of the Clergy have always pointed them out as the earliest victims*; and this domestic anarchy was probably more effectual in arresting the steps of learning and civilization than the more transient tempests of foreign invasion. We shall here only pause to remark, that during the struggles of this frightful period, the defence of the tower of knowledge, as heretofore its construction, was entrusted by Providence to ecclesiastical hands; while its walls were incessantly menaced or violated by a lawless military aristocracy, which had closely wrapped itself in ignorance, and was partly jealous and partly contemptuous of every exertion to improve and enlighten mankind.

We are not surprised to observe that a condition of civil demoralization, such as then existed, should have been attended by corruption in every rank of the clergy. The Bishops were negligent and immoral, and the inferior orders indulged in still grosser vices and more offensive indecencies†; and we may be well assured that the laity were still further debased by the example of deformities, which their own turbulence had so greatly tended to create.

Comets, and eclipses, and earthquakes were fearful prodigies and sure prognostics of disaster, and the most penetrating astronomers‡ of the day shared (or pretended to share) the common solicitude. Enchantments, auguries, and divinations were ardently sought after, and commanded implicit belief. The forms of trial called 'the Judgments of God,' were of the same description, and scarcely less remote from the precincts of reason; and yet these degrading superstitious, though never canonically received as a part of Church discipline, and even continually combated by the more enlightened ecclesiastics, were both respected and practised among the lower Clergy during this and the three following ages.

of Cluni, who wrote some theological works and a Life of St. Gregory of Tours—he died in 942—and (2.) Frodoard, Canon of Rheims, who composed the History of the Church of Rheims, and a Chronicle, extending from 919 to 966, the year of his death.

* Most of the monasteries which escaped destruction fell into the hands of *lay* Abbots, who used them as residences or castles, or usually as hunting-seats. On the other hand, the foundation of Cluni, in the same age, compensated the loss of many old, and probably corrupt, establishments.

† In the enumeration of these by the truly Catholic compilers of the Hist. Litt. de la France, it is mentioned, as not the lightest scandal, that 'there were priests who dared to marry publicly.'

‡ Astrologers, we should rather say. Muratori (Dissert. 44) attributes the introduction of these vanities to the study of Arabic literature. But was that study generally in fashion before the time of Pope Sylvester?

Howbeit, even in the dreary records of this century we find traces of parochial schools for the instruction of children of both sexes*; and we read a long list of literary worthies whose names have in many cases survived their works, and whose works were chiefly remarkable for the meanness of their subjects, and the perplexed or puerile manner in which they are treated. And yet even these are sufficient to exhibit to us the spirit of improvement striving against the casual torrents which threatened to wash it away; and though it unquestionably receded during the calamitous interval between the death of Hincmar and the end of the tenth century †, still, if we look somewhat farther back, and confine our attention to the country about which we are best informed, we need not hesitate to pronounce that the literary condition of France was, upon the whole, more prosperous when Sylvester II. ascended the chair, than when Charlemagne mounted the throne of Rome.

As to Italy, the spell which had bound her genius during the preceding centuries seemed to be confirmed and riveted in the tenth. It is true, that some schools were yet found scattered through the towns and villages, which may have raised the character of the clergy somewhat above the degradation of the seventh and eighth centuries, to which the Lombard conquest had reduced it; but the industry of those schools appears still to have been confined to the study of grammar and some necessary knowledge of canonical law; and it is complained that the nobles, who sent their sons to them, had rather in view the episcopal dignities for which they thus became qualified, than the spiritual fruits of religious education. It is very probable that they were attended by none of any class excepting those intended for some branch of the ministry.

These remarks sufficiently explain, to what extremely narrow limits was confined, both in respect to its character and diffusion, the learning of those ages which immediately followed the subversion of the Western Empire. From civil, it had passed under ecclesiastical superintendence; but the Church which undertook the charge was itself corrupted and barbarized by contact with the profound ignorance and rude character and institutions of the conquerors: so that the immortal models were neglected, the precepts of the ancient masters forgotten, and the whole light of literature, properly so called, extinguished. Nevertheless, we are not to suppose that the ecclesiastics of those days offered to their contemporaries no substitute for those treasures which they had not the means or the inclination to dispense. On the contrary, their productions were at some periods extremely abundant in number, and in character far from unprofitable: and on this last point there is one important observation, which it is here proper to make, and which we press the more seriously, because it is not very commonly urged. These writings were almost wholly confined to theological matters, and their object (however faultily it may sometimes have been pursued) was *practical*. Instructions, sermons,

* According to the regulations of that at Toul the children were admissible at seven years of age, and received their first lessons in the Psalms; and it was provided that the boys and girls should be taught separately. The parochial curés appear (as in Italy) to have had the charge of such establishments.

† About this time the establishment of some Greek commonalties took place in Lorraine, introducing a partial knowledge of that language. And these Orientals were there encountered by certain emigrants from Ireland, a country which appears never to have forfeited the affections, nor to have secured the residence, of its sons. 'Nationem Scotorum quibus consuetudo peregrinandi jam pæne in naturam conversa est.' Walafrius Strabus (liv. ii., c. 27, de vita Sancti Galli), apud Murat. Diss. 37.

homilies, interpretations and illustrations of scripture, were published in great profusion, and furnished to the people the only means of intellectual instruction. It is true that they were rude and unskilfully composed; but they were addressed to rude assemblies, and were for the most * part directed to the moral improvement of those who read and heard them; and moreover, their effect to that end, whatsoever it may have been, was at least not counteracted by any other description of literature: the whole mass had one object only, and that, upon the whole, beneficial. Even the 'Lives of the Saints,' and other legends of those days, may have conduced, though by a different and more doubtful path, to the same purpose; for among the swarms of those compositions which were then produced, and of which so many had a tendency to mere superstition, some may be found unquestionably calculated to move the real devotion and amend the moral principles of a barbarous people. Thus was there much even in the effusions of the most illiterate times which must have persuaded, influenced, and profited the generation to which they were addressed; but their action was confined to their own day, to the moment of their delivery; they were not associated with any of the stable wisdom of former ages; nor were they qualified, nor were they indeed intended, to fix the attention of posterity.

Italy had suffered to a certain extent from calamities similar to those which suspended the progress of France, and which were there followed by the same moral degeneracy; but these causes would scarcely have been adequate to

Scarcity of Manuscripts.

so general an extinction, not of learning only, but almost of the curiosity and wish to learn, had they not been powerfully aided by another circumstance, which is less regarded by historians: this was no other than the extreme scarcity and dearness of manuscripts. This misfortune was not entirely, nor even mainly, attributable either to the destruction of monasteries or the indolence of monks: a more general and substantial cause existed in the absolute deficiency of the *material*. The ancients had obtained from the shores of the Nile, through easy and continual intercourse with Alexandria, sufficient supplies of papyrus to satisfy at a slight expense their literary wants; but after the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens, the communication became less frequent and secure, and the fabric of an implement of peace was probably discouraged by the warlike habits of the conquerors. At least it is certain, that about that period the papyrus began to be disused throughout Europe, and that the monuments which remain of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, are invariably composed of parchment. It was not possible, when the material was so expensive, that manuscripts could multiply very rapidly, or even that the losses occasioned by decay or devastation could be repaired with any facility; and thus the libraries of the cathedrals and monasteries, to which all the treasures of former ages were at this period confided, were gradually impoverished or destroyed. The records of the time abound with complaints of this general penury of books, as well as with facts in proof of it, one of which is the following:—In the year 855, Lupus, of Ferrara, wrote from his abbey, in France, to Pope Bene-

* It is unquestionable that these writings contained a vast deal calculated to mislead, many errors of an absurd and superstitious tendency; but these evils were probably more than counterbalanced, in their immediate effect upon the people, by the expositions of sound doctrine and lessons of practical piety, which are even more abundant. We refer as a fair example, to the passage of St. Eligius, cited at the conclusion of the last chapter.

dict III., praying for the loan of the concluding part of St. Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah, with the promise that it should be rapidly copied and returned—'for in our regions nothing is to be found later than the Sixth Book, and we pray to recover through you, that which is wanting to our own insignificance.' In addition to this, he ventured to solicit the use of three books of profane writers—the Treatise of Cicero de Oratore, the Institutions of Quintilian, and Donatus's Commentary on Terence.

Muratori considers the zealous Abbot's request as unreasonable and immoderate, and we do not learn whether the Pope consented to grant it; but if the resources of France were really unable to supply him with the books in question, we need not distrust him when he laments the general scarcity of ancient and valuable compositions. This consideration will prevent the disdainful feeling which is almost necessarily roused, when we observe a succession of generations plunged in torpid ignorance, without an effort to extricate themselves from shame, or to let loose the human mind on its natural career of advancement: it disposes us much more nearly to compassion—especially if we reflect how frequently the energy of a vigorous and enterprising soul, secluded in the hermitage or the cloister, must have exhausted itself on the most contemptible subjects, or pined away from the mere dearth of literary sustenance. We shall find little reason to be astonished that genius itself was so seldom able to emerge out of the noisome mist and rise into light and vigour, since its infancy was chilled by prejudices, unexcited by any wholesome exercise, and famished by the positive destitution of intellectual nourishment.

The cause of literary stagnation which we have last mentioned was removed in the eleventh century by the invention of paper,* and accordingly we find that the number of MSS. was greatly multiplied after that time.† But the fury of civil dissension was not mitigated; and under governments at the same time feeble and arbitrary, there was little encouragement for studious application, as indeed there was little honour, or even security, except in the profession of arms. And in sad truth, during the earlier years of this age, the wildest disorders were of such ordinary perpetration, misery had such universal prevalence, and injustice walked abroad so boldly and triumphantly, that there were those who held the persuasion that the millenarian prophecy *had been* already accomplished; that Satan had shaken off his fetters at the one thousandth year, and was actually directing the evil destinies of the human race.

At the same time, let us recollect that great exertions were made by the higher ecclesiastical orders to apply an indirect but very powerful remedy to these excesses, by re-establishing the discipline of the Church. For this purpose, about eighty councils were held in France alone during the eleventh century.‡ We have already related how zealously the authority of

* A very interesting account of the progress of paper-making, writing, printing, &c. may be found in the Life of Caxton published by this Society.

† Still it was in the eleventh age that a Countess of Anjou is recorded to have purchased the Homilies of Haimon, at the price of 200 sheep, besides a very large payment in wheat, barley, skins, and other valuable articles. Hist. Litt. de la France, xi. siècle.

‡ The zeal which was applied in the beginning of this age to the building and restoration of churches, basilicæ, monasteries, and other holy edifices, is warmly praised by ecclesiastical writers. 'Erat enim instar ac si mundus ipse excutiendo semet, rejecta vetustate, passim candidarum ecclesiarum vestem indueret—Glabrus Rodolph. apud Du Chesne, Script. Franc., lib. xiv., cap. 4, cited by Muratori.

Rome had engaged itself in the same cause; and by a necessary reaction, the success of every effort for the improvement of morality was favourable to the advancement of literature. The example of Sylvester II. might be sufficient to rouse the jealous emulation of Italy; and Sylvester left to that country not his example only, but the fruits of his active zeal in encouraging the learned of his own time, and in establishing schools and collecting libraries for the use of other generations. Some of the Popes, his successors, followed his traces with more or less earnestness; and among the rest, Gregory VII. added to his extraordinary qualities the undisputed merit of promoting the progress of education*.

The voice of controversy, which was once more heard in this century, not only created another motive for literary activity, but proved the revival of a spirit of inquiry, inconsistent at least with universal ignorance. The talents of Lanfranc†, the earliest boast of reviving Italy, were animated by the 'Heresy' of Berenger; and to the ingenious disputations thus occasioned it is usual to attribute the growth of the new system of theological science, afterwards called Scholastic.

That is a very broad, but in many respects a correct view of early theological literature, which distributes it into three æras. The *first* of these comprehends the whole list of the ecclesiastical fathers—men who, though they varied exceedingly in character, style, and even opinion, were nevertheless united by one great principle; for they acknowledged no other sources of faith, and revered no other authority, than Scripture and apostolical tradition. On this foundation, they boldly applied to the elucidation of religious subjects such reasoning and eloquence as Nature had bestowed on them: perverted, it might be, by the peculiar prejudices of the times and countries wherein they lived, but little restrained either by the use or abuse of educational discipline, and wholly exempt from servile subjection to the opinions of any predecessor. The characteristics of this age are such as we should expect from such principles—an overflow of piety stained by superstition, exuberance of learning without a proportionate fruit of knowledge, and sallies of oratory, which sometimes ascended into eloquence, and sometimes dwindled away into puerile declamation, or cold and empty allegory. This æra is by many extended down to the eighth century, and considered as properly terminating with John Damascenus; but the concluding half of the fourth age and the beginning of the fifth was the true period of its glory; and thence we may trace the gradual dissolution of its distinguishing qualities into that system which was afterwards established in its place and on its ruins.

The *second* was the æra of intellectual blindness and dependence; its most laborious works were mere collections, quotations, and compilations; as if the minds of that generation were stupified by gazing on

*Three Characters
of theological
Literature.*

* In a council held in 1078, he strongly pressed on all bishops the necessity of superintending education in their respective dioceses.

† 'Lanfrancus teneriorem ætatem in sæcularibus detritiv, sed in Scripturis divinis animo et ævo maturavit.' France was for some time the principal field of his exertions, and Muratori supposes that Hildebrand, attracted by his celebrity, may have visited that country for the purpose of hearing him. The name of Anselm succeeds to that of Lanfranc: that learned prelate was born at Aosta, which then belonged to the Duke of Burgundy—so that France disputes with Italy the honour of having produced him. He too is considered by Muratori as having prepared the way for the scholastic system of theology.

the brilliant creations of their predecessors, till they mistook them for pure and inimitable perfection. St. Augustin and St. Gregory were the idols of those abject worshippers; and if their piety was sometimes kindled by the enthusiasm of the former, their Catholic zeal and Papal prejudices were more commonly (or at least more manifestly) nourished by the principles of Gregory. The termination of this period is fixed at the middle of the eleventh century; but its character had been partially interrupted by the writers of the ninth, and most especially by John Scotus; and his style and manner, as well as his opinions, were followed and revived by Berenger.

The grand principle of the *third* æra was the exaltation of reason to its proper pre-eminence over the influence of human authority; a true and noble principle as long as reason itself can be restrained to its just province, so as neither to deviate into minute and barren sophistry, nor to break loose into those dark and interminable inquiries which God has closed against it. Unhappily it was not long before it fell into both these errors, which are, indeed, very closely connected. In the establishment and support of the Scholastic theology, it so frequently descended to degrading artifice, and perplexed itself so blindly in the mazes of chicanery, as to make it doubtful whether religious truth was not more disfigured by the minute disceptations which thenceforward prevailed, than by the superstitious extravagance of the first period, or the obsequious ignorance of the second.

We shall possibly recur to this subject hereafter. At present we need only remark, that during the latter half of the eleventh century considerable addition was made both to the copiousness of libraries and the number of schools and of students, as well in Italy as in France*; but the course of study was still generally confined to the two paths denominated the Trivium and Quadrivium. The first of these embraced grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics; and grammar was defined to be 'the art of writing and speaking well †,' and professed to comprehend the study of several classical as well as sacred writers. The knowledge of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy swelled the pretensions of the Quadrivium.

But, in real truth, the productions and language of the Greeks were wholly neglected and unknown. The science of criticism—the art of distinguishing what is graceful in style, and what is *true* in fact—was not cultivated; and both the study and composition of history were still confined to legendary chronicles‡, or to the ill-digested details of contempo-

* Schools of civil law were founded in both those countries in the eleventh century, and acquired some eminence before its conclusion. Physic, of course, had never been entirely neglected; and as we find that by a council held at Rheims, in 1131, monks were forbidden the practice either of law or medicine, we would willingly have hoped that some attention now began to be paid to the education of the laity. But the prohibition only extended to the walls of the monasteries; the practice of those professions is described to have been very lucrative, and for that reason, and through the continued ignorance of the laity, even in the century following (if we are to believe the compilers of the *Hist. Littéraire*), there were scarcely any who professed medicine except clerks and monks; with the addition indeed of certain Jews, who were held the most skilful practitioners.

† *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii. siècle.

‡ The first Christian chronicler was Gregory of Tours. He was born at Auvergne in 539, and besides many copious narratives of martyrdoms and miracles, he produced an 'Ecclesiastical History of the Franks.' This work, which contains some faint indications of an educated mind, was not surpassed during that century, or the two which followed. The history begins at the death of St. Martin, in 377, and ends at the year 591. It was

rary narrative. Besides which, the sciences professed were for the most part imperfectly understood even by those who pretended to them; and it is moreover admitted that, as the students of those days usually affected to become acquainted with all the subjects placed before them, they generally departed without any profitable knowledge of any of them. The great mass of the people had no education whatsoever. The result was such as must necessarily follow, whenever the possession of any valuable portion of literary acquirement is confined to very few individuals: the possessors employed it to delude as well as to enlighten the people. So that those ages, deeply as they suffered from the scanty provision of useful and liberal knowledge, were scarcely less vitiated through the inequality with which that little was distributed. The small number who had penetrated the mysteries felt too strongly the advantage and the power conferred by exclusive initiation, to desire their more general promulgation. The more numerous class, who from a distant and hasty glimpse had caught some imperfect insight, by communicating their own obscure views and misconceptions, disseminated many fanciful, if not pernicious, errors and absurd notions. So it proved that the lights which were thus faintly transmitted to the body of the people, were not faint only, but sometimes false and deceitful also. And it is a question for the decision of Philosophy, whether plain and downright ignorance, with all its demoralizing consequences, be not a condition of less danger and better hope than one of mistake and delusion.

NOTE ON ST. BERNARD.

The life of St. Bernard connected, within a few years, the pontificate of Gregory VII. with that of Alexander III. Born in 1091, he flourished during one of the rudest periods of papal history; and he died (in 1153,) just before the era commenced of its proudest triumphs, and, perhaps, of its deepest crimes. His actions and his writings throw the best light which now remains upon that period, and even the following short account of them will not be without its use. St. Bernard was a native of Fontaines, in Burgundy, and descended from a noble family. He entered, at the age of twenty-two, into the monastery of Citeaux, near Dijon; and so early was the display of his zeal and his talents, that only two years afterwards he was appointed to establish a religious colony at Clairvaux*, in the diocese of Langres. It grew with rapidity, and spread its scions with great luxuriance under his superintendence—so that at his decease, at no very advanced age, he was enabled to bequeath to the Church the inestimable treasure of about one hundred and sixty monasteries, founded by his own exertions. As for himself, though it seems clear that the highest ecclesiastical dignities were open, and even offered to him, his humbler ambition was contented to preside over the society which he had first created, and to influence the character of those which had proceeded from it, by counsel, example, and authority.

But the influence of St. Bernard was not confined to his monastic progeny—it displayed itself in all grand ecclesiastical transactions, in France, in Germany, in Italy; from the altars of the church it spread to courts

continued for the fifty following years, in a much inferior style, by one Fredegarius, a Burgundian, and probably a monk.

* Or Clairval—Clara Vallis.

and parliaments. And, as it was founded on reputation, not on dignity ; as it stood on no other ground than his wisdom and sanctity ; so was it generally exerted for good purposes ; and always for purposes which, according to the principles of that age, were accounted good.

On the schism which took place after the death of Honorius II.*, St. Bernard advocated the cause of the legitimate claimant, Innocent II., with great zeal and effect. During eight years of contestation and turbulence he persevered in the struggle. His authority † unquestionably decided the King and the Clergy of France. The King of England ‡ at Chartres, the Emperor at Liege, are stated to have listened and yielded to his persuasions. He reconciled Genoa and Pisa to the cause of Innocent. In the latter city a council was held in 1134, in which St. Bernard was the moving and animating spirit. Nevertheless it is obvious, from the genuine piety which pervades so many of his works, that his mind was then most at home when engaged in holy offices and pious meditation. How well soever he might be qualified to preside in the assemblies, and rule the passions, and reconcile the interests of men, it was in the peaceful solitude of Clairvaux that his earthly affections were placed, and it was to the mercy-seat of heaven that his warmest vows and aspirations were addressed. Through these various qualities—through his charitable devotion to the poor ; through that earnest piety which tintured his writings with a character sometimes approaching to mysticism ; through his imitation of the ancient writers, Augustin and Ambrose ; through his zeal for the unity and doctrinal purity of the Church, St. Bernard has acquired and deserved the respectable appellation of the *Last of the Fathers*.

The remaining works of St. Bernard consist of about four hundred and fifty Letters, a great number of Sermons, and some very important Tracts and Treatises. It would not here be possible, nor any where very profitable, to present a mere analysis of so many and so various compositions. A great proportion of the matter is devoted to the ends of piety and charity,—to the exaltation of the soul of man,—and the inculcation of his highest duties. On points of doctrine, the Abbot of Clairvaux was too ardently attached to his Church to venture upon any deviation from the

* In 1130. Innocent II. succeeded, and ruled thirteen years and a half. Eugenius III. was elected 1145, and reigned for eight years.

† The means by which ecclesiastical authority sometimes (and not, perhaps, very uncommonly) attained its ends in those days, are well displayed in the following anecdote of St. Bernard. The Duke of Guienne had expelled the Bishops of Poitiers and Limoges, and refused to restore them, even on the solemn and repeated injunctions of the Pope and his Legate. St. Bernard had exerted his influence for the same purpose, equally in vain. At length, when celebrating, on some particular occasion, the holy sacrifice, after the consecration was finished and the blessing of peace bestowed upon the people, St. Bernard placed the body of the Lord on the plate, and carrying it in his hand, with an inflamed countenance, and eyes sparkling fire, advanced towards the Duke, and uttered these thrilling words:—‘ Thus far we have used supplication only, and you have despised us ; many servants of God, who were present in this assembly, joined their prayers with ours, and you have disregarded them : behold, this is the Son of God, who is the King and Lord of the Church which you persecute, who now advances towards you ;—behold your Judge !—at whose name every knee bends in heaven, in earth, and beneath the earth. Behold the just avenger of crimes, into whose hands that very soul which animates you will some day fall. Will you disdain him also ? Will you dare to scorn the Master, as you have scorned his servants ?’ This tremendous appeal was successful. The Duke is related to have fallen with his face to the earth when he heard it ; the prelates were restored to their sees, and the schism extinguished. See Dupin, *Nouvelle Biblioth.* tom. ix. ch. iv.

‡ Ernardus, *Vita Sancti Bernardi*. Pagi, *Gest. Pontif. Roman. Vit. Innocent II.*

established, or, at least, the tolerated faith. On the important subject of grace, he appears to have followed the opinion of St. Augustin. He considered the freedom of will to be preserved by the voluntary consent which it gives to the operations of grace;—that that consent is indeed brought about by grace, but that being voluntary, and without constraint, it is still free. The necessity of this freedom he argues at great length, as indispensable to any system of retribution*. ‘Where there is necessity there is not liberty; where there is not liberty, neither is there merit, nor, consequently, judgment.’ (Ubi necessitas, ibi libertas non est; ubi libertas non est, nec meritum, nec per hoc iudicium.) On the other hand, he maintained the indisputable efficacy of grace; and in defining the limits of its operation, and reconciling its overruling influence with the necessary liberty of a responsible agent, he fathomed the depths, and, perhaps, exhausted the resources of human reason.

As Lanfranc had been the champion of the Church against the heresy of Berenger; as the admirable Anselm † had maintained the better reason and sounder doctrine against the dangerous subtleties of Roscellinus ‡; so St. Bernard, in his turn of controversy, was *Peter* confronted with the most ingenious Scholastic of the age, *Abelard*. Peter Abelard. This celebrated doctor was born in Brittany, in 1079; and while St. Bernard was shaping his character and his intellect after the rigid model of Augustin, Abelard was learning a dangerous lesson of laxity in the school of Origen. We shall not trace the various and almost opposite heresies § into which he was betrayed by the obtuse subtilty of his principles; still less shall we investigate the oblique paths by which he reached those conclusions. It may suffice to say, that he was charged with being, at the same time, an Arian, a Nestorian, and a Pelagian, and with as much justice, perhaps, as such charges were usually advanced by the Roman Catholic Church against its refractory children.

The history of the crimes and the misfortunes of Abelard is known to every

* Excepto sane per omnia originali peccato, quod aliam constat habere rationem—S. Bernardi ‘Tractatus de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio.’

† Anselm was probably born at Aosta in 1034, and died in 1105; and though he is claimed by the Gallican church as its noblest ornament since the fifth century, his history belongs more properly to our own. He wrote several works: against the ‘Greek Doctrine of the Holy Procession,’—‘On the Trinity and Incarnation,’ against Roscellinus,—‘On the Immaculate Conception,’—‘On the Fall of the Devil,’—‘On Freewill,’—‘On Original Sin,’—‘Necessity,’—‘Predestination,’—on which latter subjects he had drawn at the well of St. Augustin. ‘His obsequies (says the writer in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*) were preceded, attended, and followed by some miracles; but the holy prelate had performed a vast number more during his lifetime.’ His *Life*, as given in the *Histoire Littéraire*, is an abridgment of that by the Monk Edmen, his pupil and panegyrist.

‡ During the infancy of St. Bernard.

§ The opinions generally attributed to him are, that he considered the doctrine of the Trinity to have been known to certain ancient philosophers, and revealed to them in recompense for their virtues,—that the Son bore the same relation to the Father, as the species does to the genus; as a certain power to power; as *materiatum* to *materia*; as man to animal; as a brazen seal to brass;—that he denied the Atonement, and reasoned against the murder of an innocent being as the means of appeasing God’s anger;—that he consequently denied the Redemption, though he received the Incarnation as the properest method for illuminating the world with divine light and love;—that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, but not from their substance; and that it was the soul of the world;—that it is not the fault, but the penalty, of original sin which we derive from Adam;—that free will, without the help of grace, was sufficient for salvation. In addition to these, and many other imputations, he was also charged before the Council of Soissons (1121) with Tritheism, and, at the same time, with having asserted, that the Father alone was almighty.

one. When the Abbot of Clairvaux, in the course of his official visitation, inspected the nunnery of the Paraclete, he found the establishment well conducted, and he approved of every regulation. Only, in the version of the Lord's prayer there in use, he observed these words,—‘ Give us this day our super-substantial (ἐπιούσιον) bread’—and he thought it insufferable that the very prayer which the Deity had deigned to communicate to man for His own service, should be thus senselessly corrupted by the infection of Aristotle. Abelard defended his version; and hence arose the first recorded altercation between those celebrated theologians. The strictures of St. Bernard irritated that vain Scholastic; and as it happened that a large assembly of the Clergy of France was appointed to meet in the city of Sens, on some occasion deemed important *, Abelard challenged his rival to make good, in the presence of that august body, his repeated charges of heresy. St. Bernard would willingly have declined that conflict: he feared the superiority of an experienced polemic;—‘ I was but a youth †, and he a man of war from his youth. Besides, I judged it improper to commit the measures of divine faith, which rested on the foundations of eternal truth, to the petty reasonings of the schools.’ However, the counsel of his friends prevailed; after some hesitation he accepted the challenge, and appeared on the appointed day.

Louis VII. honoured the assembly with his presence; the nobles of his court, the leading prelates and abbots, and the most learned doctors of the kingdom were there; and the highest expectations were formed, from one end of the realm to the other, by the rumour of this theological monomachy. The two champions were confronted. Bernard arose: ‘ I accuse not this man; let his own works speak against him. Here they are, and these are the propositions extracted from them. Let him say—I wrote them not; or let him condemn them, or let him defend them against my objections.’ The charges were not entirely read through, when Abelard interrupted the recital, and simply interposed his *appeal to the Pope*. The assembly was astonished at his hasty desertion of the field, which he had so lately sought. ‘ Do you fear,’ said St. Bernard, ‘ for your person? You are perfectly secure; you know that nothing is intended against you; you may answer freely, and with the assurance of a patient hearing. Abelard only replied, ‘ I have appealed to the Court of Rome;’ and retired from the assembly. ‘ I know nothing,’ says Milner ‡, ‘ in Bernard’s

* For the translation of the body of some saint into the cathedral church. The assembly took place in 1140.

† The Abbot probably meant a youth *in controversy*,—for as to age, he was then forty-nine, and his adversary only two years older. Milner, whose account of this transaction has great merit, seems to have understood him literally.

‡ Church Hist. Cent. xii. ch. 2. This author is probably nearer to truth in his praise of Bernard, than in his censure of the ‘ heretic.’ The reason of Abelard’s sudden appeal to a higher court was, unquestionably, his distrust of that before which he stood: he might doubt its impartiality, or he might certainly have discovered its determined prejudice against him; and that it was, in fact, very provident in him to appeal betimes from its decision is clearly proved by a passage in the Account, which certain Bishops of France addressed to the Pope, of the proceedings at Sens. ‘ As the arguments of the Abbot of Clairvaux . . . convinced the assembled bishops that the tenets which he opposed were not only false, but heretical, they, *sparing his* (the heretic’s) *person out of deference to the apostolic see*, condemned the opinions.’ *A loco et iudice quem sibi ipse elegerat, sine læsione, sine gravamine, ut suam prolongaret iniquitatem, Sedem Apostolicam appellavit. Episcopi autem, qui propter hoc in unum convenerant, vestræ Reverentiæ deferentes nihil in personam ejus egerunt, sed tantummodo capitula librorum ejus,* &c. &c. It is therefore manifest that this appeal saved him from some personal infliction.—This Letter is published among the works of St. Bernard, p. 1560, edit. Lutet. Paris. 1640. After all, it is some

history more decisively descriptive of his character, than his conduct in this whole transaction. By nature sanguine and vehement, by grace and self-knowledge modest and diffident, he seems on this occasion to have united boldness with timidity, and caution with fortitude. It was evidently in the spirit of the purest faith in God, as well as in the most charitable zeal for divine truth, that he came to the contest.'

We shall now proceed to consider St. Bernard in another (if, indeed, it is another) character,—that of a zealous defender of the power and prerogatives of the church; and we shall observe how far the same principle engaged him, on the one hand, in the support of papal authority, and in the extirpation of heresy on the other. We willingly omit all mention of the miracles which are so abundantly ascribed to him, and which, if they are not merely the fabrications of his panegyrists, are equally discreditable to his honesty and his piety. We defer to a future chapter any notice of the very equivocal zeal which urged him to preach a holy war, to proclaim its predestined success with a prophet's authority, and then to excuse the falsification of his promises by a vulgar and contemptible subterfuge. Yet were all these transactions very certain proofs of his attachment to the principles of the Roman Catholic church. Of the same nature were the eulogies which he so warmly lavished, in one of his treatises, upon the newly instituted order of the Templars. But we pass these matters over, and proceed directly to observe the expressions by which he characterised the Bishop of Rome. 'Let us inquire,' says he, in his letter to Pope Eugenius III.*, 'yet more diligently who you are, and what character you support for a season in the Church of God. Who are you?—a mighty priest, the highest pontiff. You are the first among bishops, the heir of the apostles; in primacy Abel, in government Noah, in patriarchate Abraham, in order Melchisedech, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judgment Samuel, *in power Peter, in unction Christ*. You are he to whom the keys have been delivered, to whom the flock has been entrusted. Others, indeed, there are who are doorkeepers of heaven, and pastors of sheep; but you are pre-eminently so, as you are more singularly distinguished by the inheritance of both characters. They have their flocks assigned to them, each one his own; to you the whole are entrusted, as one flock to one shepherd; neither of the sheep only, but of their pastors also; you alone are the pastor of all. Where is my proof of this?—in the Word of God. For to which, I say,—not of bishops, but of apostles,—was the universal flock so positively entrusted? "If thou lovest me, Peter, feed my sheep." . . . Therefore, according to your canons, others are called to a share of the duty, you to a *plenitude of power*. The power of others is restrained by fixed limits; yours is extended even over those who have received power over others. Are you not able, if cause arise, to exclude a bishop from heaven, to *depose him from his dignity*, and even to consign him over to Satan? These your privileges stand unassailable, both through the keys which have been delivered, and the flock which has been confided to you,' &c. Thus the authority of St. Bernard, which was extremely great, both in his own age and those which immediately followed, was exerted to subject the minds of religious men to that spiritual despotism, which was already swollen far beyond its just limits, and was threatening a still wider and more fatal inundation.

satisfaction to record, that Abelard died (in 1142) in quiet obscurity, in the Monastery of Cluni.

* 'De Consideratione,' lib. ii., c. viii.

Among the numerous discourses of St. Bernard, two* were more especially directed against the heretics of the day; and the preacher declares, that he was moved to this design by ‘the multitude† of those who were destroying the vine of Christ, by the paucity of its defenders, by the difficulty of its defence.’ In the discharge of this office he inveighs against the innovators in the usual terms of theological bitterness; and at the same time charges them with those flagrant violations of morality and decency, which were so commonly imputed to seceders from the church, though they were, in truth, inconsistent with the first principles of civil society. We shall not repeat those charges, nor copy his ardent vituperations; but there is one passage (in the sixty-sixth sermon), which possesses some historical importance, and which exposes besides the principles of the orator. ‘In respect to these heretics, they are neither convinced by reasons, for they understand them not; nor corrected by authority, for they do not acknowledge it; nor bent by persuasion, for they are wholly lost. It is indisputable that they prefer death to conversion. Their end is destruction; the last thing which awaits them is the flames. More than once the Catholics have seized some of them, and brought them to trial. Being asked their faith, and having wholly denied, as is their usage, all that was laid against them, they were examined by the *Trial of water* ‡, and found false. And then, since further denial was impossible, as they had been convicted through the water not receiving them, they seized (as the expression is) the bit in their teeth, and began with pitiable boldness, not so much to make confession as profession of their impiety. They proclaimed it for piety; they were ready to suffer death for it; and the spectators were not less ready to inflict the punishment. Thus it came to pass that the populace rushed upon them, and gave the heretics some fresh martyrs to their own perfidy. I approve the zeal, but I do not applaud the deed; because faith is to be the fruit of persuasion, not of force. Nevertheless, it were unquestionably better that they should be restrained by the sword,—the sword of him, I mean, who wears it not without reason,—than be permitted to seduce many others into their error; ‘for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. . . . Some wondered that the offenders went to execution not only with fortitude, but, as it seemed, with joy; but those persons had not observed how great is the power of the devil not only over the bodies, but even over the hearts of men, which have once delivered themselves into his possession. . . . The constancy of martyrs and the pertinacity of heretics has nothing in common; because that which operates the contempt of death in the one is piety,—in the other, mere hardheartedness.’ . . . Marcus Antoninus, in the insolence of empire and philosophy, insulted by a similar distinction the firmness of those sainted sufferers, to whom the Abbot of Clairvaux addressed, as to heavenly Mediators, his daily and superstitious supplications. And now again, after another long revolution of centuries and of principles, those despised outcasts, whom St. Bernard, in the loftier pride of ecclesiastical infallibility, consigned, with no better spirit, to eternal condemnation, are

* Sermons ‘Super Cantica,’ lxx. et lxxvi.

† In other places he acknowledges the same fact. ‘Et item de hæresi, quæ clam pæne ubique serpit, apud aliquos sævit palam. Nam parvulos Ecclesiæ passim et publice deglutire festinat.’ &c. &c. De Consid., lib. iii., c. i.

‡ This was one of the most popular among ‘The Judgments of God.’

revered *by us* as victims in a holy cause, the earliest martyrs of the Reformation!

In the same work in which the office and prerogatives of the Pope were so highly exalted, the writer boldly exposed some of the favourite abuses of the system; and dictated, from his cell at Clairvaux, rules for its better administration, and for the guidance of the autocrat of the church. His instructions were wise, because they were virtuous, and proceeded from a true sense of spiritual duties and dignity. His general exhortations to Eugenius to cast aside the unworthy solicitude respecting secular matters, which at once embarrassed and degraded the Roman see, and to emulate the venerable patriarchs of the ancient church; to leave to kings and their ministers the jarring courts of earthly justice*, and to content himself with distributing the judgments of heaven—these lessons were conceived in the loftiest mood of ecclesiastical exaltation, and with the justest sense of ecclesiastical policy; but the venom had already sunk too deep, and the healing admonitions of the reformer failed to arrest for a moment the progress of corruption.

St. Bernard next addressed his censures more particularly to the practice of appeal to Rome, which was then growing into a notorious abuse. After enumerating some of the evils thus occasioned, the delay, the vexation, the positive perversion of all the purposes of justice, ‘How much longer,’ he exclaims, ‘will you shut your ears, whether through patience or inadvertency, against the murmur of the whole earth? How much longer will you slumber? How much longer will your attention be closed against this monstrous confusion and abuse? Appeals are made in defiance of law and equity, of rule and order. No distinction is made in place, or mode, or time, or cause, or person. They are commonly taken up with levity, frequently too with malice; that terror which ought to fall upon the wicked, is turned against the good; the honest are summoned by the bad, that they may turn to that which is dishonest; and they tremble at the sound of your thunder. Bishops are summoned, to prevent them from dissolving unlawful marriages, or from restraining or punishing rapine and theft and sacrilege, and such like crimes. They are summoned, that they may no longer exclude from orders and benefices unworthy and infamous persons. . . . And yet you, who are the minister of God, pretend ignorance, that that, which was intended as a refuge for the oppressed, has become an armoury for the oppressor; and that the parties who rush to the appeal are not those who have suffered, but those who meditate injustice.’

Another papal corruption, against which St. Bernard inveighed with equal zeal was the abuse of exemptions. ‘I express the concern and lamentations of the churches. They exclaim that they are maimed and dismembered. There are none, or very few, among them which do not either feel or fear this wound: Abbots are removed from the authority of their Bishops, Bishops from that of their Archbishops, Archbishops from that of their Patriarchs and Primates. Is the appearance of this good? Is the reality justifiable? If you prove the plenitude of your power by the frequency of its exercise, haply you have no such plenitude of justice.

* Quænam tibi major videtur et potestas et dignitas; dimittendi peccata, an prædia dividendi? Sed non est comparatio. Habent hæc infima et terrena iudices suos et reges et principes terræ. Quid fines alios invaditis? Quid falcem vestram in alienam messem extenditis? Non quia indigni vos; sed quia indignum vobis talibus insistere, quippe potioribus occupatis. De Consid., lib. i., c. vi.

You hold your office, that you may preserve to all their respective gradations and orders in honour and dignity, not to grudge and curtail them.' . . . If the virtuous Abbot was moved to such boldness of rebuke by the delinquencies of the eleventh century—the earliest and perhaps the most venial excesses of pontifical usurpation—with what eyes had he beheld the court of Innocent IV., or the chancery of John XXII.! with what a tempest of indignation had he visited the enormities of later and still more degenerate days—jubilees and reservations, annates and tenths and expectative graces—the long and sordid list of Mammon's machinations! The halls of Constance and Basle would have rung with his lamentation and his wrath, and both Gerson* and Julian would have shrunk before the manifestation of a spirit greater far than themselves.

But the inquisition of St. Bernard was not confined to the courts of the Vatican. It penetrated into the dwelling-places and into the bosoms of prelates and of monks. 'Oh, ambition, thou cross of those who court thee! How is it that thou tormentest all, and yet art loved by all? There is no strife more bitter, no inquietude more painful than thine, and yet is there nothing more splendid than thy doings among wretched mortals! I ask, is it devotion which now wears out the apostolical threshold, or is it ambition? Does not the pontifical palace, throughout the long day, resound with *that* voice †? Does not the whole machine of laws and canons work for its profit? Does not the whole rapacity of Italy gape with insatiable greediness for its spoils? Which is there among your own spiritual ‡ studies that has not been interrupted, or rather broken off, by it? How often has that restless and disturbing evil blighted your holy and fruitful leisure! It is in vain that the oppressed make their appeal to you, while it is through you that ambition strives to hold dominion in the church.' . . . In another place §—'The unsavoury contagion creeps through the whole church, and the wider it spreads the more hopeless is the remedy; the more deeply it penetrates, the more fatal is the disease. . . . They are ministers of Christ, and they are servants of Anti-Christ. They walk abroad honoured by the blessings of the Lord, and they return the Lord no honour: thence is that meretricious splendour everywhere visible—the vestments of actors—the parade of kings: thence the gold on their reins, their saddles, and their spurs, for their spurs (*calcaria*) shine brighter than their altars (*altaria*): thence their tables splendid with dishes and cups; thence their gluttony and drunkenness—the harp, the lyre, and the pipe, larders stored with provision, and cellars overflowing with wine . . . For such rewards as these men wish to become, and do become, rectors of churches, deans, archdeacons, bishops, archbishops—for these dignities are not bestowed on merit, but on the thing which walks in darkness.' . . . A considerable portion of another composition || is devoted to the exposure of monastic dege-

* John Gerson was a great admirer of St. Bernard. He frequently cited his authority, and composed one discourse expressly in his honour. We always watch with anxiety, and record with respect, the expressions in which one great man has celebrated the excellence of another. But in Gerson's 'Sermo de Sancto Bernardo' we can discover little but fanciful and mystical rhapsody.

† *Annon quæstibus ejus tota legum Canonumque disciplina insudat?*

‡ This passage is from the 'Third Book of the Consideratio.' It is addressed, we should recollect, to Pope Eugenius, who had been educated in the monastery of Clairvaux.

§ 'Super Cantica Ser. xxxiii.

|| Ad Guillelmum Abbat. Apologia—An Apology to William, Abbot of St. Thierry. The *pretext* for this Apology was, to defend himself and his own reformed order of Cisterciaus from the charge of calumniating the rival order, their more opulent brethren, of

neracy. 'It is truly asserted and believed that the holy fathers instituted that life, and that they softened the rigour of the rule in respect to weaker brethren, to the end that more might be saved therein. But I cannot bring myself to believe that they either prescribed or permitted such a crowd of vanities and superfluities, as I now see in very many monasteries. It is a wonder to me whence this intemperance, which I observe among monks in their feasting and revels, in their vestures and couches, in their cavalcades and the construction of their edifices, can have grown into a practice so inveterate, that where these luxuries are attended with the most exquisite and voluptuous prodigality, *there* the order is said to be best preserved, there religion is held to be most studiously cultivated. . . . For behold ! frugality is deemed avarice ; sobriety is called austerity ; silence is considered as moroseness. On the other hand, laxity is termed discretion ; profusion, liberality ; loquacity, affability ; loud laughter, pleasantness ; delicacy and sumptuousness in raiment and horses, taste ; a superfluous change of linen, cleanliness ; and then, when we assist each other in these practices, it is called charity. This is a charity indeed which destroys all charity ; it is a discretion which confounds all discretion ; it is a compassion full of cruelty, since it so serves the body, as mortally to stab the soul.' . . . Again—' What proof or indication of humility is this, to march forth with such a pomp and cavalcade, to be thronged by such an obsequious train of long-haired attendants, so that the escort of one abbot would suffice for two bishops ? I vow that I have seen an abbot with a suite of sixty horsemen and more*. To see them pass by, you would not take them for fathers of monasteries, but for lords of castles ; not for directors of souls, but for princes of provinces.' . . . St. Bernard then proceeds to censure the show of wealth which is exhibited *within* the monasteries†, and subsequently exposes the secret motive of such display. 'Treasures are drawn towards treasures ; money attracts money, and it happens that where most wealth is seen, there most is offered. When the relics are covered with gold, the eyes are struck, and the pockets opened. The beautified form of some Saint is pointed out, and the richer its colours the greater is deemed its sanctity. Men run to salute it—they are invited to give, and they admire what is splendid more than they reverence what is holy. To this end circular ornaments are placed in the churches, more like wheels than crowns, and set with gems which rival the surrounding lights. We behold inventions like trees erected in place of candlesticks, with great expense of metal and ingenuity, also shining with brilliants as gaily as with the lights

Cluni. St. Bernard did not lose that opportunity of generally inveighing against monastic abuses.

* 'Mentior,' says the holy abbot, 'si non vidi abbatem sexaginta equos et eo amplius in suo ducere comitatu. Dicas, si videas eos transeuntes, non patres esse monasteriorum, sed dominos castellorum ; non rectores animarum, sed principes provinciarum.'

† 'Omitto Oratorium immensas altitudines, immoderatas longitudines, supervacuas latitudines, sumptuosas depolitiones, curiosas depictiones, quæ dum orantium in se detorquent aspectum impediunt et affectum, et mihi quodammodo representant antiquum ritum Judæorum. Sed esto—fiant hæc ad honorem Dei. Illud autem interrogo monachus monachos, quod in gentilibus gentilis arguebat—

Dicite, Pontifices, in sancto quid facit *aurum* ?

Ego autem dico, Dicite *Pauperes* ! Non enim attendo versum sed sensum—Dicite, inquam, pauperes, si tamen pauperes, in Sancto quid facit aurum ?'—Loc. Citat. It seems probable that St. Bernard, in the interval of his theological labours, had studied the Roman Satirists with pleasure, and not without advantage.

they hold. Say, whether of the two is the object in these fabrications—to awake the penitent to compunction, or the gazer to admiration? Oh vanity of vanities, and as insane as it is vain! The church is resplendent in its walls, it is destitute in its poor. It clothes its stones with gold—it leaves its children naked. The eyes of the rich are ministered to, at the expense of the indigent. The curious find wherewithal to be delighted—the starving do not find wherewith to allay their starvation.*

Such was the Abbot of Clairvaux; in profession and habits a monk—in ecclesiastical polity at once a reformer and a bigot—in piety a Christian. His single example (if every page in history did not furnish others) would suffice to show that a very great preponderance of excellence is consistent with many pernicious errors; and that innumerable ensamples of purity and holiness have flourished in every age, as they doubtless still flourish, in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. Because many Popes were ambitious and many prelates profligate, it would be monstrous to suspect that righteousness was nowhere to be found in that communion; it would be unreasonable to suppose that the great moral qualities, which distinguished St. Bernard, were not very common among the obscurer members and ministers of his church. His genius, indeed, was peculiarly his own. The principles which least became him were derived from his church and his age; but his charity and his godliness flowed from his religion, and thus they found sympathy among many, respect and admiration among all. These were the crown of his reputation; and while they fortified and exalted his genius, they also gave it that commanding authority which, without them, it could never have acquired. From this alliance of noble qualities St. Bernard possessed a much more extensive influence than any ecclesiastic of his time—more, perhaps, than any individual through the mere force of personal character has at any time possessed; nor is it hard to understand, if we duly consider the imperfect civilization of that superstitious age, that monarchs, and nobles, and nations should have respectfully listened to the decisions of a monk, who gave laws from his cloister in Burgundy to the Universal Church.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Pontificate of Innocent III.

[From 1198 to 1216.]

Prefatory facts and observations—Circumstances under which Innocent ascended the chair—Collection of Canons—Condition of the clergy—Ecclesiastical jurisdiction—by what means extended—Innocent's four leading objects—(1.) To establish and enlarge his temporal power in the city and ecclesiastical states. Office of the Prefect—Favourable circumstance, of which Innocent avails himself—his work completed by Nicholas IV.—(2.) To establish the universal pre-eminence of papal over royal authority. His claims to the Empire—His dispute with Philippe Auguste of France—he places the kingdom under interdict—submission of Philippe—His general assertions of supremacy—particular applications of them—to England and France, Navarre, Wallachia and Bulgaria, Arragon and Armenia—His contest with John of England—Interdict—the Legate Pandulph—Humiliation of the King—(3.) To extend his authority within the church. Italian clergy in England—his general success in influencing the priesthood—Power of the Episcopal Order—The fourth Lateran Council. Canons on transubstantiation—on private confession—against all

* ‘O vanitas vanitatum, sed non vanior quam insanior. Fulget ecclesia in parietibus, et in pauperibus eget. Suos lapides induit auro et suos filios nudos deserit. De sumptibus egenorum servitur oculis divitum. Inveniunt curiosi quo delectentur, et non inveniunt miseri quo sustententur.’

heretics—(4.) To extinguish heresy. The Petrobrussians—their author and tenets. Various other sects, how resisted. The Cathari—supposition of Mosheim and Gibbon—the more probable opinion—The Waldenses—their history and character—error of Mosheim—Peter Waldus—his persecution. The Albigensis or Albigenses—their residence and opinions—attacked by Innocent—St. Dominic—title of Inquisitor—Raymond of Toulouse—holy war preached against them—Simon de Montfort—resistance and massacre of the heretics—Continued persecution of the Albigensis—Death of Innocent—Remarks on his policy.

DURING the period of one hundred and thirteen years, which intervened between Gregory VII. and Innocent III., the progress of ecclesiastical power and influence was very considerable; and the latter ascended the pontifical chair unembarrassed by many of the difficulties which impeded the enterprises of the former. The principal causes of that progress may be traced, perhaps, in a few sentences. In the first place, new facilities to learning had been opened during the twelfth century, of which the clergy had availed themselves very generally, and which the laity had as generally neglected. It is true that the kind of learning then in fashion possessed, for the most part, no substantial or permanent value; still it was a weapon as powerful, perhaps, for the government of the ignorant, as if its polish had been brighter, or its edge more keen; and, as its real inefficiency was unknown, it equally answered the end of exciting a blind respect for those who had the exclusive use of it. In the next place, the discipline of the church had undergone an important reformation, the honour of which we are bound to ascribe to the vigorous exertions of Gregory, imitated, with more advantage perhaps, by feebler successors. Three Lateran Councils (the first General Councils of the Western Church) were held during the twelfth century; and the second and third of these, assembled respectively in 1139 and 1179, by Innocent II. and Alexander III., more particularly directed their attention to the extirpation of ecclesiastical abuses, to the confirmation of ancient canons, and the introduction of such others as might amend the discipline and consolidate the interests of the church. This object was materially advanced by the labour of a monk of Bologna, named Gratian, who published, in 1151, his celebrated Collection of Canon Laws*. And this branch of study, thus facilitated, received further encouragement from Eugenius III., who instituted the degrees of Bachelor, Licentiate, and Doctor in that science. By the advance of learning among the sacred profession, by the greater precision and more general knowledge of the canons of the church, and by the rigour with which they were frequently enforced, the morals of every rank of the clergy were essentially improved. The two notorious scandals of the former age, concubinage and simony, if not effectually removed, were at least restrained within more decent limits; and the extreme licence, in some other respects, which had prevailed for at least two centuries before Gregory VII., was checked and repressed. So that Innocent was called to the command of a more enlightened, a more orderly, a more moral, and therefore a more influential priesthood.

It may be true, as Mosheim asserts, that the revenues of the Pope had received no considerable augmentation between the ninth century and the time of Innocent; but those of the clergy, *Ecclesiastical property.* and especially of the monastic orders, had been swelled during the same period by the most abundant contributions. Indeed, in most countries the territorial domains of the church

* The accidental discovery of the Pandects of Justinian, in 1137, may have furnished to Gratian the notion, as it certainly supplied the model, of his work.

were at that time spread so widely, as almost to justify the complaint that they comprehended half the surface of Europe; nor should we omit to mention that the clergy, though in some kingdoms liable to annual donatives, and to arbitrary plunder in all, were still legally exempt from taxation, and from every regular contribution to the service of the state. From such immunity, though it was occasionally violated, and the violation usually attended with outrage, they must, nevertheless, have reaped great advantage, and especially in peaceful periods. But such partial profits have always a drawback in the jealousy which the distinction occasions, and which exposes those who enjoy it to the distrust and dislike of their fellow-subjects.

We have already observed how extensive, and, at the same time, how indefinite, were the rights of jurisdiction, which were partly conferred on the church and partly confirmed to it by Charlemagne,—rights, which were scarcely less important to the general influence of the clergy, than their learning or their revenues. During the tumults of the three following centuries, they were transgressed or exceeded as the civil or ecclesiastical portion of the state happened in any country to preponderate; but they appear to have sustained no permanent alteration, either in abridgment or increase, until the beginning of the twelfth century. About that time the ecclesiastical tribunals commenced a system of encroachment, which made great progress even before the pontificate of Innocent, and was carried by that Pope and his successors to still greater excess, and seemed to threaten the entire subversion of the secular courts*. It was the first step in this usurpation to multiply the number of *persons* subject to the jurisdiction of the church; the next, to extend almost without limit the *offences* of which it took cognizance. The first of these objects was accomplished by the indiscriminate Tonsure, which we have before mentioned to have been so generally given by the bishops. This sign of the clerical state did not indicate ordination or any spiritual office; but it conferred the use of the ecclesiastical habit, and with it the various privileges and immunities enjoyed by that order, without the restraint of celibacy†, to which it was liable. This very numerous class, though for the most part engaged in secular professions and occupations, was subject to no other than the episcopal tribunals‡; and we may remark, that all the moveable property of this body fell under the same jurisdiction§.

Another very large class, under the denomination of ‘*miserabiles personæ*’ (persons in distress), was also exclusively subjected to the episcopal courts. It comprehended, even in the first instance, a multitude of the lowest orders; and it was presently so enlarged as to include orphans and widows, the stranger and the poor, the pilgrim and the leper||. Again;

* Tirate tutte le cause d’ appellazione in Roma, si procurò d’ ampliare la giurisdizione del Foro Episcopale, e stendere la conoscenza de’ Giudici Ecclesiastici sopra più persone ed in più cause, sicchè poco rimanesse a’ magistrati secolari d’ impicciarsene. Giannone, Ist. di Napoli, lib. xix., c. v., sect. iii.

† In this respect, those persons were placed in the condition of the priests of the Greek church: they were allowed to marry once only, and a virgin.

‡ In the kingdom of Naples, under the dynasty of Anjou, this matter afterwards went so far (says Giannone), that even the *concubines* of the clergy enjoyed immunity from secular jurisdiction.

§ In conseguenza di quella massima mal intesa, *mobilia sequuntur personam*.—Giannone, loc. cit.

|| We refer to the seventh chapter of Mr. Hallam’s Middle Ages. It is a bold and, in most respects, an accurate disquisition on papal history.

the opportunity offered by the Crusades was not neglected in the progress of usurpation; and in this case the arm of ecclesiastical justice extended itself not only over all who engaged in the expedition, but over those too who had bound themselves by the vow.

A great facility was also afforded for enlarging the boundaries of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by the want of definiteness in the nature of the offences subject to it. These were designated by one name, *spiritual*; but it is clear that, in an ignorant age, that term might be so extended by an artful priesthood as to embrace every sin and almost every crime; since there are no sins* and few crimes which do not indicate some disease of the soul, and touch its eternal safety.

The general term, under which ecclesiastics contrived to comprise the greatest number of causes, was *Bad Faith*; as being unquestionably a sin, yet such, that an action could seldom occur, in which both parties were clear from the suspicion of it. Thus they claimed for their tribunals all trials on executions of contracts, because the contract was founded on oath. They also claimed to be natural interpreters and executors of all wills and testaments, as being matters peculiarly connected with the *conscience*; and thus they gradually extended the spiritual net over the entire field of civil litigation †. But they forgot that that which properly belonged to them was censure, not jurisdiction; or they affected artfully to confound the office of penal chastisement with that of penitential correction. The encroachments of the church were aided by the negligence, as they were almost justified by the incompetence, of the lay tribunals; and they had already made considerable advances, with little apparent opposition, and acquired extensive conquests in the domains of secular jurisdiction, at the time when Innocent III. took possession of the pontifical chair.

From the above circumstances, we have reason to presume that in actual authority, not less than in moral influence, the church had

* ‘*Si peccaverit frater tuus, dic Ecclesiæ.*’ This seems to have been the *text* on which ecclesiastical jurisdiction was mainly founded. It had a much better foundation in the superior intelligence and moral principles of ecclesiastics.

† Having once interfered in the matter of wills, the bishops proceeded in some countries to arrogate the power of making wills for the laity, *ad pias causas*; and the interests of the church were advanced by that piety. Some were found who even claimed the property of all intestate persons. Again, when the interests of a clerk were involved in *connexion* with those of laymen, the decision was claimed by the Ecclesiastical Court. So also, when the cause was very difficult in point of reason, in case of the incompetence, negligence, or suspiciousness of the lay judge, the matter was referred to the Episcopal Tribunal. So likewise, under the name of *forum mixtum*, it claimed its share in all cases of bigamy, usury, sacrilege, adultery, incest, concubinage, blasphemy, sortilege, perjury, as in those of tithes and pious legacies. So in all causes arising from marriage, as being a Sacrament of the church. And lastly, there were some Roman doctors who maintained that every condemned person in every country should be sent to Rome for punishment; seeing that Rome was the common country and metropolis of all men, that the world was Roman, and all its inhabitants citizens and subjects of Rome.—Giannone, loc. cit. The following lines were intended to comprehend the jurisdiction of the spiritual court:—

Hæreticus, Simon, fœnus, perjurus, adulter,
Pax, privilegium, violentus, sacrilegusque;
Si vacat Imperium; si negligit, ambigit, aut sit
Suspectus judex; sit subdita terra, vel usus,
Rusticus et servus, peregrinus, feuda, viator.
Si quis pœniteat, miser! omnis causaque misfa—
Si denunciat Ecclesiæ quis, judicat ipsa.

We shall take a future opportunity of recurring to the subject of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

acquired growth and strength since the era of Gregory VII.; and that the sacred militia, whom Innocent was appointed to command, and by whose aid he meditated and almost accomplished the destruction of the temporal authorities, then exerted a much more powerful control over every department of society, than it had ever possessed at any former period.

We shall obtain a more distinct knowledge of the designs and success of that celebrated pope, if we examine separately the principal points to which his exertions were directed, than we could gain by a chronological narrative of his pontificate. According to such a distribution, we may properly consider these objects to have been four; not, indeed, that they were thus minutely analysed in the mind of Innocent, or that his daring schemes subject to any such classification: but the historian who contemplates great transactions after an interval of many centuries, and a change in many principles, is bound to consider particular actions as parts of the whole mighty drama, in the respect they bear to the circumstances of the actors, and the character of the age. Thus it is, that in studying the actions of Innocent III., our observation is necessarily most directed to the following points:—

I. To establish the temporal power of the Holy See in the city of Rome, and in the ecclesiastical states; and to enlarge their boundaries. II. To fix the pre-eminence of the papal over the royal authority, throughout all the kingdoms of the west, and to reduce all princes to the condition of vassalage to the Pope; which was, indeed, merely a continuation of the scheme of Gregory. III. To enlarge the pontifical authority and influence within the church. IV. and lastly, To secure the unity of the faith by the extirpation of heresy. All these were at that time becoming essential parts of the papal polity; and almost all the important acts of Innocent may be traced to some one of them.

I. As the policy of the Holy See becomes more and more entangled in temporal transactions, as we observe the spiritual majesty of the apostolical chair gradually degenerating into the *Court of Rome*, it is fit that we employ a few sentences on the character of the people which was subject to its immediate sway; partly because we shall thus discover what

The temporal power of the Pope. sort of instruments for their secular designs the Popes possessed at home, and partly that we may learn, whether the great moral blessings were more abundantly diffused among the subjects of an ecclesiastical monarchy. For this purpose we shall select two very well known authorities, the one from the tenth, the other from the thirteenth century, only premising that, though the particular facts which they convey may be highly coloured, the general consent of history confirms the substance. Luitprand*, who was sent as legate from Otho the First to the Eastern Emperor, expressed in this language the sort of reputation then possessed by the

Character of the Romans. Roman people:—‘We Lombards despise them so deeply, that for our very enemies, when most moved against them, we can find no designation more contumelious, than

Roman. In this single term, I mean Roman, we intend to comprehend all that is base, all that is cowardly, all that is avaricious, all that is luxurious, all that is false and lying—aye, every vice that has a name.’ The

* See Luitpr. Legatio, apud Muratori Script. Ital. vol. ii.; also Dissertat. 40 ejusd. auct.

evidence of St. Bernard on the same subject is more particular, and scarcely more honourable to the descendants of the Gracchi:—‘Why should I mention the people? the people is Roman. I have no shorter, nor have I any clearer term to express my opinion of your parishioners (parœcianis.) For what is so notorious to all men and ages as the wantonness and haughtiness of the Romans? A race unaccustomed to peace, habituated to tumult—a race merciless and intractable, and to this instant scorning all subjection, when it has any means of resistance. . . . Whom will you find, even in the vast extent of your city, who would have you for Pope, unless for profit, or the hope of profit*? And it is then most that they seek to rule, when they profess to serve. They promise fidelity, to have the better means of injuring those who trust them. . . . They are men too proud to obey, too ignorant to rule, faithless to superiors, insupportable to inferiors; shameless in asking, insolent in refusing; importunate to obtain favours, restless while obtaining them, ungrateful when they have obtained them; grandiloquous and inefficient; most profuse in promise, most niggardly in performance; the smoothest flatterers, the most venomous detractors,’ &c. ‘Among such as these you are proceeding as their pastor, covered with gold and every vanity of splendour. What are your sheep looking for? . . . If I dared to use the expression, I should say, that it is a pasture of demons rather than of sheep.’ . . .

Many of the features in this revolting picture are common to the courts of every climate and religion—to the sycophants of every race and age. The exclusive appropriation of meanness and treachery—the monopoly of human baseness—could not truly be ascribed even to the people of Rome. But there is one among the vices imputed to them which was indeed their characteristic—restless and turbulent insubordination. Shall we consider this defect as the corruption of an ancient virtue? Certainly even a cursory review of the government (if government it can be called) under which the imperial city had struggled for above four centuries, will show that the vice, whether indigenous or not, received much encouragement and excuse from extraneous circumstances. We have already mentioned the doubtful limits of the authority respectively exercised by the Patrician and the Bishop under the Greek emperors. When that rule finally passed away, Charlemagne (and before him Pepin) assumed the temporal administration of Rome under the same name, Patrician; and during his reign the imperial supremacy was in practice felt, as it was undisputed in right. Weaker princes, and ages almost of anarchy succeeded. Nevertheless, the supreme dominion of the emperors, which

* Eugenius III. The passage in the *De Consideratione*, lib. iv. Cap. ii. We have purposely omitted some parts of it in the text, the following for instance:—‘*Et nunc experire paucis noverimne et ego aliquatenus mores gentis. Ante omnia sapientes sunt, ut faciant mala, bonum autem facere nesciunt. Hi invisi terræ et cælo utrique injecere manus, impii in Deum, temerarii in sancta, seditiosi in invicem (qu. judicem?) æmuli in vicinis, inhumani in extraneos; quos neminem amantes amat nemo. Et cum timeri affectant ab omnibus, omnes timeant necesse est. Hi sunt qui subesse non sustinent,’ &c. . . . Ita omne humile probro ducitur *inter Palatinos*, ut facilius, qui esse quam qui apparere humilis velit, invenias. Timor Domini simplicitas vocatur, ne dicam fatuitas,’ &c. . . . These Palatines seem to have been the eminent Ecclesiastics resident at the Holy See. The cardinals, who formed the nucleus of the future court of Rome, though now gradually rising in dignity, were not yet, probably, in possession of any corporate prerogatives. We shall only add one more testimony, that of John of Salisbury, the contemporary and countryman of Adrian IV., against the Roman clergy:—‘*Provinciarum diripunt spolia, ac si thesauros Cræsi studeant reparare. Sed recte cum iis egit Altissimus, quoniam et ipsi aliis et sæpe vilissimis hominibus dati sint in direptionem.*’ . . .*

may have been partially suspended, was re-established by Otho; 'their title and image were engraven on the Papal coins, and their jurisdiction was marked by the sword of justice which they delivered to *the Prefect* of the city*.'

On the other hand, the residence of the Emperor was remote, and the communication slow and precarious. Once only, in the course perhaps of a long reign, he presented himself to his Roman subjects. The purpose of that visit was to receive his crown from the pontifical hand, and the ceremony was usually attended with tumult and bloodshed. Again—at that coronation he thrice repeated the royal oath, to maintain the liberties of Rome. The ancient fable, too, was continually inculcated, and perhaps universally believed, that Constantine had consigned the temporal sceptre to the hand of the Bishop. And in those ages of superstitious darkness, the prejudices of mankind saw nothing incongruous in the double character of a sacerdotal monarch. These circumstances were on both sides unfavourable to the welfare of Rome, for while they neutralized, and almost destroyed the power of the Prefect, they gave no substantial foundation to that of the Pope. So that in the uncertainty thus created, as to where the civil executive authority really was placed, the people were left without any efficient control. Their inclination would naturally lead them to respect most the power, which was more nearly and immediately exercised. But the short reigns of most of the Popes; the tumultuous scenes which commonly disgraced their election, and which were prolonged so obstinately whenever there was a rival for the chair; the very circumstance, that the choice of a ruler was influenced by the rabble—all conspired to lower his dignity, and to lessen the efficacy of his temporal authority. It is true, that during the latter half of the twelfth century, after the constitution of Alexander III. (in 1179), these evils were in some degree abated. Still there were no principles of stability in the civil administration; and it is scarcely too much to assert that, from the time of Charlemagne to that of Innocent, the pontifical city had never once felt either the restraint or the blessing of a strong government.

The regulation of Alexander III. was an omen of greater improvements. But a change of more importance in the civil history of Rome was the establishment of the Senate; and this is referred, as a permanent act, to the year 1144. In the meantime, the dignity of 'Prefect of the City' had gradually declined to a municipal office, filled from the families of the native nobility. Even the name was, for a short time, abolished, and succeeded by that of Patrician, though it was speedily restored, together with the original ensigns of power. But at length Innocent III. broke off the last link of the imperial power. He rejected at the same time its ancient emblem; and while he absolved the Prefect from all dependence of oaths or service on the German Emperors, he removed the sword from his hand, and substituted a peaceful *banner* in its place.

But the tranquillity of Rome was not secured by its independence; and other changes succeeded, in the difficult attempt at self-government by a people educated almost in anarchy. In the first instance, the name and authority of the Senate was condensed in the office of a single magistrate—the *Senator*; and soon afterwards in that of two colleagues. The most jealous precautions† were taken to secure their integrity, or, at least, their

* See Gibbon's 69th chapter.

† According to the laws of Rome (in the fifteenth century), the Senator was required to be a Doctor of Laws, an alien, of some place at least forty miles distant, and unconnected,

harmlessness. But they were still Romans; and the turbulence of the subjects seems to have been rivalled by the rapacity of the rulers. Another scheme, which had been elsewhere successful, was then applied to the disorders of Rome. In the dearth of native virtue, or at least in the despair of domestic disinterestedness and impartiality, she called to the helm of state a foreign governor. It was about the year 1250, that Brancaloneo of Bologna was chosen Senator; and, in the progress of seventy-eight years, the same office was filled and dignified by Charles of Anjou (about 1265), by Pope Martin IV. (in 1281), and lastly, by Lewis of Bavaria; 'and thus (says Gibbon) both the sovereigns of Rome acknowledged her liberty by accepting a municipal office in the government of their own metropolis.' A government susceptible of such strange anomalies could not hope for peace or permanence. Even the secession of the Popes to Avignon did not emancipate Rome from their occasional sway, and their ceaseless persecution. And thus the people were doubly sufferers—they suffered, when subject, from the weakness of an absent sceptre—they suffered, when independent, from the perpetual struggles which were made to reduce them. After seventy years of foreign residence, the Pontiffs returned to their legitimate abode. But the schism, which immediately followed the restoration, still further enfeebled a grasp already trembling with the weight of the temporal sword. That inveterate turbulence, transmitted through so many ages, continued for some generations longer; and it was not until the middle of the fifteenth century, that the pontifical city became permanently subject to pontifical government.

From this short anticipation of some future events, we return to observe the working of that powerful hand, which influenced so deeply the destinies of the Church, and which influenced them almost wholly for evil—and in no one respect more so, than when it constructed the temporal fabric for the support of a power essentially spiritual, and waved before those brilliant portals the dark bloodstained edge of the material sword. Possibly the powerful mind of Innocent was seduced into those projects by the inviting circumstances of the moment. During his entire pontificate the situation of the empire was extremely favourable to any hostile schemes. The legitimate sovereign (afterwards Frederic II.) was a minor, and the sceptre was for some time disputed by two princes (Philip and Otho IV.), to each of whom the patronage of the Pontiff was equally important. At a later period, after the death of Philip, the dissension was renewed, in another form, but with the same character, between Otho and Frederic; and the latter of these rivals now became as anxious to cultivate the friendship of the Pope, as heretofore the former. Innocent availed himself of these advantages to enrich and fortify the Church at the expense of all those disputants, or at least of the empire which they disputed. Accordingly, one of the earliest acts of his reign was to disarm the Prefect of all authority derived from abroad, and thus to erase the last remaining vestige of German domination. Again, the extensive donation of territory which the Princess Matilda had made to the Roman see, during the administration of Gregory VII., had been unceasingly contested by the empire; and the greater force had generally constituted the better right.

to the third canonical degree, with any Roman inhabitant. The election was annual; the departure from office was attended with a severe scrutiny; nor could the same person be re-elected until after two years. The salary was 3000 florins. Gibbon, c. 70.

Innocent, towards the end of his pontificate, was enabled so far to profit by the weakness of Frederic, as to obtain from that prince a formal confirmation of the grant; at the same time, a considerable territorial cession, made to the see by the Count of Fundi, received the same ratification. It is proper, indeed, to ascribe the completion of this work to Nicholas IV., who ruled about seventy years afterwards. That Pope reduced under his dominion some cities, which had hitherto owned a nominal allegiance to the Emperor; and extended the states of the Church to those nearly which are their present boundaries. But to Nicholas no higher celebrity is due, than that he pursued with success the policy which had descended to him from his predecessors, and which had received its first impulse from Innocent; for, until his pontificate, the temporalities of the see, notwithstanding the successive donations (pretended* or real) of Constantine, and Pepin, and Charlemagne, and Lewis the Meek, and even Matilda, formed, in fact, if not a mere field for incessant contention, at best a very precarious and unprofitable possession.

II. *On the Usurpations of Papal over Royal Authority.*—In respect to this part of the pontifical system, we have already seen that the equivocal glory of creating it is not due to Innocent; he received it from former (perhaps from better) ages, among the established duties of the apostolical office. It was sealed by the consent of many venerable Pontiffs; by the authority of Gregory VII. It was congenial to the unconverted pride of the human heart—that passion, which burnt most fiercely in the breast of Innocent, and which the waters of the gospel were seldom invited to allay. His was indeed the character formed, under whatsoever ordination of Providence, to fill up the outlines so daringly traced, and to pursue the scheme which his great predecessor had bequeathed to him. The same circumstances which forwarded his other temporal projects were, as far as they extended, favourable to this. Once more he drew his strength from the divisions of the empire. He deposed Philip—Philip denied his right—but it was willingly acknowledged by the rival Otho, who did not scruple to accept (in 1209) the diadem from the pontifical hand. Only three years afterwards the Pope pronounced, in the same plenitude of power, the same sentence of anathema and deposition against Otho. With what justice could Otho dispute the power by which he had deigned to rise? The vacant throne was then conferred upon Frederic.

A purely spiritual despotism can rest on no other ground than popular prejudice—commands which have no visible power to enforce them will only be obeyed through a general predisposition to believe, that they proceed from some still superior authority. The monarch would have derided the sentence of deposition, had it not found attention and respect among his subjects. That it should ever have acquired such general respect may indeed seem strange, and the causes which were then sufficient for that end could only have operated in a very blind and ignorant age. For instance, the mere ceremony of coronation by the Pope, to which the Emperors, in imitation of Charlemagne, had almost invariably submitted, would seem to afford no trifling pretext for the claims of the former; since it was in those days an easy inference that the crown, which for many gene-

* Sismondi (Repub. Ital. c. iii.) remarks that 'as the act of Pepin's donation is lost, we know not on what conditions it may have been made.' He also expresses a reasonable doubt, whether this donation, though nominally confirmed by Charlemagne and Lewis, was ever effectuated.]

rations had been habitually received from the hand of the Pope, could not legally be worn except through such presentation; and then it followed, since there were many who zealously inculcated the consequence, that the gift conferred was in fact the *property* of the donor*, who again had power to recall his gift, and present it to some worthier candidate. At the same time we should never lose sight of that *general* veneration for the throne of St. Peter, which at that period especially overspread the prostrate nations, and overawed the reason of man; for it was, in truth, not an uncommon belief that the blessed Apostle invisibly presided over the altar of his martyrdom, and guarded and sanctified with mysterious majesty the chair of his successors.

The eagerness with which the emperors generally courted the ceremony of coronation, though it was attended by circumstances very humiliating to their pride, certainly proves that there existed among their subjects a strong feeling as to its propriety, perhaps its necessity. But that which gave the greatest colour to the extreme pretensions of the See, was the readiness with which princes acknowledged them, when they found their profit in the acknowledgment. The very edicts which they rejected with scorn when addressed to themselves, they embraced and effectuated when levelled against a rival. The right, as a general right, was never contested. The partial interests of the moment overpowered every consideration of a broader policy; and thus amid the ever-reviving jealousies and dissensions of monarchs and pretenders, the consistent perseverance of the Vatican established the most groundless claims, and accomplished the most extravagant purposes. Of course the agents for the dissemination of its principles and the instruments of its success were the ecclesiastical orders, and especially the monks; and the very general union and co-operation which at this time prevailed (more perhaps than at any other period, more certainly than at any later period) between the Pope, the clergy, and the monasteries, facilitated the execution of Innocent's boldest designs.

The first interference of that pontiff in the affairs of the French court was defended by precedents, and occasioned by an offence at all times peculiarly liable to spiritual jurisdiction. *Contest with Philippe Auguste* having espoused a Danish princess, named Ingelburg, or Isemburg, hastened on the very day following the nuptials to divorce her. He pretended to have discovered that they were connected by too near a degree of affinity; and after some investigation, at which two legates and Pope Celestine assisted, the marriage was declared null. Innocent, probably considering that concession as extorted from the timidity of his predecessor, lost no time in setting aside the divorce, and commanding the king to take back his bride. He refused, and an interdict was immediately thrown on the whole kingdom. The public offices of worship were suspended; even the doors of the churches were closed; the Sacrament of Christ was no longer administered†, and the rites of marriage and sepulture remained unperformed. We

* This inference required, of course, a large share of zeal in the teacher and docility in the disciple. The Patriarch of Constantinople had possessed from the earliest ages the office of crowning the Greek emperor, without ever dreaming that he acquired any sort of interest in the crown itself by the performance of an ordinary ceremony. But ecclesiastical matters were very differently conducted in the west.

† We should mention, that even under the oppression of the severest interdict, the sacraments of Baptism, Confession, and Extreme Unction still continued to be administered. But it was attended by other prohibitions, not strictly of a religious nature, calculated to inspire gloom and fanaticism. The hair, for instance, and the beard were to be left

should here recollect, that with the mass of an ignorant people professing a corrupt form of faith, the public exercise of religion constituted, in fact, its entire substance. Deprived of that, they had no refuge in private prayer, or the consolations of internal devotion. To such persons the sentence of an interdict must have fallen like an immediate edict of rejection and separation from heaven; and such in the twelfth century was the multitude of every class. Philippe Auguste was a prince of uncommon resolution and address. Nevertheless he found it expedient to bend before the tempest, and obey the pontifical mandate.

This was the earliest triumph of Innocent, and it encouraged his ambition to attempt more daring achievements. At least he did not long confine it to objects which offered any particular justification, but advanced on the broadest ground of universal interference. In a bull published in 1197, he declared, 'that it was not fit that any man should be invested with authority, who did not serve and obey the Holy See.' At another time he proclaimed, 'that he would not endure the least contempt of himself, or of God, whose place he held on earth, but would punish every disobedience without delay, and convince the whole world that he was determined to act like a sovereign.' 'As the sun and the moon are placed in the firmament, the greater as the light of the day and the lesser of the night, so are there two powers in the church, the pontifical, which, as having the charge of souls, is the greater; and the royal, which is the lesser, and to which only the bodies of men are trusted.*' 'Though I cannot judge of a fief,' said Innocent to the kings of France and England, 'yet it is my province to judge when sin is committed, and my duty to prevent all public scandals.' This was indeed the loftiest and the most respectable ground on which the Papal pretensions could be placed; and if the Bishops of Rome had really been contented with the exercise of a beneficial authority—if they had employed the mighty power with which they found themselves invested, *only* for the reconciliation of enmities, for the concord, the morality, the most obvious interests of the human race, then, indeed, we might have forgotten the origin of that power in its blessed uses, and pardoned to the Vicar of Christ his presumptuous appellation, when we saw him engaged in doing the works of Christ, and consoling his children upon earth.

However, the interference, even of Innocent III., was not always for evil. On the strength of his delegated authority he dictated a truce to Philippe and Richard, and after some difficulties obliged both parties to submit to it. It was about the same time that he directed one of his legates to compel the observance of peace between the Kings of Castille

unshaven; the use of meat was forbidden; and even the ordinary salutation was prohibited. But the suspension of sepulture, the exposure of the corpses to dogs or birds, or even their promiscuous interment in unhallowed ground, was probably in practice the most appalling part of the sentence. From the learned treatise, 'De l'Origine et du Progrès des Interdits Ecclésiastiques,' by Pierre Pithou, it appears that there were *indications* of such an exercise of ecclesiastical power in very early ages; though it was not applied to any grand purpose, as a pontifical implement, until the time of Hildebrand.

* Innocent's famous *Rescript* to the emperor of Constantinople (in which the above allegory is produced) respected chiefly the immunity of clerks; and as it was founded on the maxims published by Gratian, which were themselves founded on the False Decretals, so itself became in process of time a new Decretal, the groundwork, if necessary, of other still more inordinate pretensions. It was thus that the system grew.

† The general cognizance of causes relating to fiefs had escaped, as it would seem, ecclesiastical usurpation.

and Portugal, if necessary, by excommunication and interdict. He moreover enjoined the King of Arragon to restore to its intrinsic value the coin which he had lately debased, thereby oppressing and defrauding his subjects. The mere wanton display of power may *not* have been his motive—some generous considerations may sometimes have influenced him. ‘A great mind (says Hallam), such as Innocent III. undoubtedly possessed, though prone to sacrifice every other object to ambition, can never be indifferent to the beauty of social order and the happiness of mankind.’

Not contented to influence the most vigorous monarchs of the most powerful kingdoms of the age, he descended to issue his edicts to inferior princes. He sent forth instructions to the King of Navarre respecting the restoration of certain castles to Richard. He distributed the insignia of royalty to Briscislaus, Duke of Bohemia, and to the Dukes of Wallachia and Bulgaria. He conferred the crown of Arragon on Peter II. as his subject and tributary. And finally (that no race or clime might seem inaccessible to his arm), he gave a king to the Armenian nation, dwelling on the border of the Caspian Sea.

Yet, with all this extent of despotic sway, it was in England that his boldest pretensions were advanced, and advanced with the most surprising success. The circumstances are known to all *With John of* readers. In the year 1199, Richard I. was succeeded on *England.* the throne by John, the feeblest of the human race; and that prince was presently assailed by an outrage from the Holy See, which disturbed for some years the repose and allegiance of his subjects, and the stability of his throne. On the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, the monks in chapter publicly elected to that dignity John, Bishop of Norwich, who was recommended and confirmed by the King. At the same time they chose, at a private meeting, Reginald, their own sub-prior*, and sent him to Rome for institution. When this matter was referred to Innocent, he immediately reversed both elections, and nominated Stephen Langton, a Roman cardinal, of English descent. The chapter listened to the spiritual, in preference to the temporal, tyrant; and the monks were in consequence expelled from their residence, and their property was confiscated. The Pope proceeded with no less energy to enforce his asserted rights, and commanded the Bishops of London, Worcester, and Ely, to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict. There were some prelates, however, and several inferior ecclesiastics, who hesitated to enforce this edict; and since John made no concession, Innocent issued, in the following year (1201), a bull of excommunication against the name and person of the sovereign. This sentence, still ineffectual, was followed, in 1211, by another yet more appalling. The subjects of John were absolved from their allegiance, and commanded to avoid his presence. Yet as even this measure was insufficient for his entire success, he had then recourse to the last and most dangerous among the bolts of the Vatican. He pronounced the final sentence of deposition; and having declared the vacancy of the throne, gave force to his words by conferring it upon Philippe Auguste of France. At the same time he ordered that monarch to execute the sentence.

Philippe's obedience was secured by his ambition; he was joined by the exiles of his rival's tyranny; and to ensure his success, or, more probably,

* Pagi Brev. Pont. Rom. Vit. Innoc. III. Sect. 49.]

to complete the consternation of John, Innocent proclaimed a crusade against the English king as against an infidel or a heretic. The armies were assembled on both sides, and hostilities were on the point of commencing, when Pandulph, the legate of the Pope, presented himself at the camp at Dover. He there displayed the final demands of the Pope, and the King had courage to resist no longer. The demands to which he submitted were these,—that he should resign his crown to the legate, and receive it again as a present from the Holy See ; that he should declare his dominions tributary to the same See ; and that he should do homage and swear fealty to Innocent, as a vassal and a feudatory. The shame of this humiliation was increased by the ceremony attending it ; by the multitude of sorrowful or indignant witnesses ; by the very *manner* * in which the haughty legate bore himself on his triumph. Yet, to the eye of an earnest and fervent Papist, is the degradation of England's monarch, while he stood waiting, amid his nobles and his soldiers, to accept his crown from the suspended hand of Pandulph—is it, after all, a spectacle of such lofty exultation—is it a picture so flattering to his spiritual, even to his ecclesiastical, pride—as the half-naked form of the imperial penitent of older days, shivering, with his scanty train of attendants, before the castle gates of Gregory ?

III. *The Increase of Pontifical Authority within the Church.*—The description of John's humiliation, and of the steps which led to it, connects the second with the third part of this inquiry—for, in the first place, it shows the extent to which Innocent carried his claims to patronage within the Church ; and in the next, it exhibits one motive of the general anxiety evinced by the see to extend that internal influence. The Interdict, which was now become the favourite instrument of papal usurpation, however formidable in name and deed, was an empty denunciation, unless enforced by the personal exertions of the Bishops, and even of the inferior clergy of the kingdom subjected to it—as we, indeed, observed, that in England the sentence of Innocent failed of its full effect, through the opposition of a part of the clergy. And thus, in any project of temporal aggrandizement which a Pope might undertake, success could never be secured unless he could command the co-operation of the very great proportion of the ecclesiastical body. It was partly for this reason that so many foreign, and especially Italian, prelates were placed, for many ages, in English sees. In Germany, too, Innocent showed the same anxiety to extend his right of appointment ; by a formal capitulation with Otho IV. he obtained that of decision in disputed cases ; and it is obvious to what easy abuse it was liable. In other countries he advanced the same claim, which had been so fatally disputed in England, with less resistance and equal success. His example was imitated by following Pontiffs : and the facility thus acquired, of exciting rebellion amongst a restless nobility and a superstitious people, against a weak and arbitrary government, terrified the boldest monarchs, and frequently led them to sacrifice the future security of the crown to the hopes or apprehensions of the moment.

On the other hand, the very great progress made by Innocent in extending the papal influence among the priesthood, *The Saladin tax.* was counteracted by a measure which may have been necessitated by other causes, but which cer-

* Among other circumstances it is related, that Pandulph did actually keep the crown in his possession for some minutes. The annual tribute stipulated was 1000 marks.

tainly was ill calculated to increase the attachment of that body. Not contented to exact from them very considerable occasional contributions, he imposed a regular tax on ecclesiastical property, and he was the first Pope who ventured upon that measure. It was called the Saladin tax; and it is true that the service of *religion*,—whether in Languedoc or in Palestine, for the murder of Saracens or of heretic Christians,—was alike the pretext, and in part the motive, for those exactions. Nevertheless, they were advanced with reluctance; and the innovation was the less tolerable, as it would certainly become a precedent for future and more oppressive extortions.

It is also necessary to observe, that the collective power of the episcopal order was not so great at that time as it had been in the ninth or tenth, or even in the earlier part of the eleventh century, owing to the gradual disuse of those national synods which, in former ages, controlled the conduct of kings. But we should at the same time remark, that the authority thus lost by the hierarchy was not gained by the sovereign. It changed owners, indeed, but it did not pass out of the possession of the church. It was merely transferred from one part of that body to another; from the members to the head; from the prelacy to the Pope: and by him it was exercised with a reckless audacity, an unity of design, and a consistent perseverance, which could not possibly have directed a long series of local and dependent councils. So that the change in the constitution of the church, by which it became less aristocratical, (if we may so apply that term,) and more despotic, though it considerably altered the relative positions of the crown and the mitre, did not at all increase the preponderance of the former; on the contrary, the greater concentration of ecclesiastical authority in one instead of many hands, made it a more dangerous rival to the civil government. The advance of pontifical power was very closely connected with the improvement of discipline, and the progress of that system of uniformity, which was designed entirely to pervade and bind together the *Universal Church*.

Among the most important acts of Innocent's pontificate was the convocation of the fourth Lateran Council,—the most numerous and most celebrated of the ancient assemblies *The fourth Lateran Council*. of the Latin church. This august body consisted of nearly five hundred* archbishops and bishops, besides a much greater multitude of abbots and priors, and delegates of absent prelates, and ambassadors from most of the Christian courts of the west and of the east. It met together in the November of 1215, for the professed consideration of two grand objects. The first was the recovery of the Holy Land; the second was the Reformation of the church in faith and in discipline. Seventy canons were then dictated by Innocent, and received its obsequious confirmation. It does not appear that its deliberations (if they may so be called) were attended with any freedom of debate; and within a month† from the day of its opening, having executed its appointed office, it was dismissed.

Among the articles on that occasion enacted, there were several wisely constructed for the welfare of the Roman Catholic church: they amplified the body of the canon law, and regulated in many respects the practice

* The numbers are, of course, variously stated; that of the archbishops at seventy-one or seventy-seven, that of the bishops generally at four hundred and twelve, that of the abbots and priors at eight hundred.

† This fact alone proves that the canons in question were not made matter of *discussion* with that numerous assembly.

of ecclesiastical procedures, which is followed to this day. But as we cannot in this work pursue such a variety of matter into its detail, we shall select only those which were the most important in substance or in consequence.

If any doubt hitherto remained in the orthodox church respecting the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were *Transubstantiation*. present at the Eucharist, it was on this occasion removed by Innocent, who unequivocally established, or rather confirmed*, that which is now, and which had then been for some time, the doctrine of Roman Catholics. Moreover, as he well knew the efficacy of a *name* to propagate and perpetuate a dogma, and also that he might have a fixed verbal test whereby to try the opinions and obviate the evasions of heretics, he invented and stamped upon that tenet the name of 'Transubstantiation.'

Another canon (the twenty-first) strictly enjoined to all the faithful of both sexes, to make, at least once in the year, a private confession of their sins, and that to their own priest or curate; and to fulfil the penance which he might impose on them. They were at the same time prohibited from confessing to any other priest, without the special permission of their own†. They were also directed, under severe ecclesiastical penalties in case of neglect, to receive the Eucharist *Sacramental confession*. at Easter, unless a particular dispensation should be granted them, also by their own priest. By this regulation, the

system of auricular confession was indeed carried to very refined perfection; and there is no reason to doubt that a canon, which imparted even to the lowest of the priesthood such close and searching influence over the conscience and conduct of a superstitious generation, was speedily brought into universal operation. That in some instances, that on very many *particular* occasions, the effect of this influence has been beneficial to society; that sinful dispositions have been frequently repressed and crimes prevented by the present and immediate control of a pious minister, is not merely probable, but indisputable. But as a *system* of morality, that could not possibly be creative of righteous principles which held out, through bodily penance, a periodical absolution from sin,—even if the hands which administered it were always pure. But when we consider the abuse to which such a power is necessarily liable, and how greatly, too, it would increase through the abuse, we cannot fail to perceive that it was a machine too powerful to be entrusted to the necessary infirmity, to the possible caprice or wickedness, of man.

By the proposed reformation in the faith of the Church, nothing was in fact meant, except the extirpation of heresy, and this *Extinction of heresy*. was the first object presented to the attention of the council. After a formal exposition of faith, upon those points especially on which the existing errors were sup-

* Mosheim is probably wrong in supposing that full liberty had hitherto been left to pious persons to interpret the doctrine according to their own reason. The sense of the church was sufficiently expressed by the councils which were held against Berenger; or had it not been so, at least the Council of Piacenza confirmed the doctrine explicitly declared on former occasions. It only remained to Innocent to ascertain and consolidate the doctrine by the term.

† The sacrament was taken immediately after confession. 'This is the first canon, as far as I know,' says Fleury, 'which imposes the general obligation of sacramental confession. There was then a particular reason for it, on account of the errors of the Vaudois and Albigeois touching the sacrament of penance.' At the Council of Toulouse, in 1228, the confession and sacrament were enjoined *thrice* in the year; but this again was in the very focus of heresy.

posed to have arisen, the Pope and the Prelates immediately proceeded (in the third canon) to anathematize every heresy. As soon as they are condemned (says the Council), they shall be abandoned to the secular power, to receive the suitable punishment. The goods of laymen shall be confiscated; those of clerks applied to the uses of their respective churches. Those who shall only be suspected of heresy, if they do not clear themselves by sufficient justification, shall be excommunicated. If they remain a year under the suspicion, they shall be treated as heretics. The secular powers shall be advised, and, if need be, constrained by censures, to make public oath that they will exile all heretics marked out by the Church. If the temporal lord, on admonition, shall neglect to free his territories from their pollution, he shall be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and the other Bishops of the province; and if he should not submit within a year, the Pope shall be informed; to the end that he may pronounce his vassals absolved from the oath of fidelity, and expose his domain to the conquest of the Catholics. These, after having expelled the heretics, shall peaceably possess and preserve it in doctrinal purity—saving the right of the liege lord, provided he offer no obstacle to the execution of this decree. . . . It is remarkable that this decree, which placed secular authorities directly at the disposal of the spiritual, and on the penalty, not of spiritual censures only, but of subjugation and military possession, was enacted in the presence, and with the consent, of the ambassadors of several sovereigns. But this subject has already led us to the last division of the chapter, into which we shall properly enter with a general inquiry as to the forms which heresy assumed in that age, and the measures which Innocent actually adopted for its extinction.

IV. *On the Extirpation of Heresy.*—Since the termination of the controversy concerning images, nearly four hundred years had elapsed, during which the Church had been very rarely disturbed by doctrinal dissension; and amid the various vices which may have stained, in so long a space, her principles and her discipline, she was at least free from the blackest of all her crimes, since her hands were free from blood. The eucharistical opinion of Johannes Scotus, as it had been nourished by the partial brightness of the ninth century, and overshadowed, but not oppressed, by the stupid indifference of the tenth, so, when revived by Berenger, it disappeared in the superstition of the eleventh, without violence or outrage. Not, perhaps, because the ecclesiastics of that age were tolerant or temperate, but rather, because its advocates were not sufficiently numerous or formidable to make a general persecution necessary for its suppression. But in the dawning light of the twelfth age some new heresies were called into life, and others, which had previously lain hid, were discovered and exposed: so that the attention of men was more generally turned to the subject, and the rulers of the Church were roused from their long and harmless repose. Since it was even thus early that several of the Protestant opinions were publicly professed, and expiated by death; and since these may be traced, under a variety of forms and names, but with the same identifying character, from the beginning of the twelfth century to the Reformation; it is proper to notice the first obscure vestiges which they have left in history. In so doing, we shall first describe those sects which were founded (in the West at least) at that time; we shall then proceed to the mention of the Vaudois, to whom a still earlier existence is, with great probability, ascribed.

About the year 1110, a preacher, named Pierre de Bruys, began to declaim against the corruptions of the Church, and the vices of its ministers. The principal field of his exertions was the south of France, Provence and Languedoc, and he continued, for about twenty years, to disseminate his opinions with success, and, what may seem more strange, with impunity. Those opinions may probably have contained much that was erroneous; but they are known to us only through the representations of his adversaries. In a Letter or Treatise, composed against his followers (thence called Petrobrussians), by the Venerable Abbot of Cluni*, they are charged with a variety of offences, which the writer reduces under five heads—(1.) The rejection of infant baptism. (2.) The contempt of churches and altars, as unnecessary for the service of a spiritual and omnipresent Being. (3.) The destruction of crucifixes, on the same principle, as instruments of superstition. (4.) The disparagement of the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist, in asserting that the body and blood was not really consecrated by the priests. (5.) Disbelief in the efficacy of the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living for the salvation of the dead. These errors, howsoever various in magnitude, are controverted with equal warmth by Peter the Abbot; but that which appears to have been most dangerous to the heretic, was the third; at least we learn, that in the year 1130, the Catholic inhabitants of St. Giles's in Languedoc were roused by their priests to holy indignation against *that* sacrilege; and consigned the offender to those flames, which his own hand had so frequently fed with the images of Christ. He was burnt alive in a popular tumult; and this may possibly be the suffering to which St. Bernard, in a passage already cited, has made allusion. But the errors were not thus easily consumed; the list, on the contrary, was enlarged by many additional notions, proceeding, some from the piety, others from the ignorance, of his followers.

One of these †, named Henry, an Italian by birth, obtained a place in the contemporary records, and gave an appellation to a sect, from him called Henricians. This enthusiast traversed the south of France, from Lausanne to Bourdeaux, preceded by two disciples, who carried, like himself; long staves, surmounted with crosses, and were habited as Penitents. His stature was lofty, his eyes rolling and restless; his powerful voice, his rapid and uneasy gait, his naked feet and neglected apparel, attracted an attention, which was fixed by the fame of his learning and his sanctity. These qualities gave additional force to his eloquence; and as it was not uncommonly directed against the unpopular vices of the clergy, he gained many proselytes, and excited some commotions. Eugenius III. sent forth, for the suppression of this evil, a legate named Alberic; but it appears that his mission would have been attended with but little success, had he not prevailed on St. Bernard to share with him the labour and the glory of the enterprise. Henry was then in the domain of Alfonso,

* Petri Venerabilis, Lib. contra Petrobrussianos, in Biblioth. Cluniensi.

† Henry is generally described as a disciple and fellow-labourer of Pierre de Bruys. The objection to this opinion, urged by Mosheim, is, that Henry was preceded in his expeditions by the figure of the cross, whereas Pierre consigned all crucifixes to the flames. Without supposing that the objection of Pierre might be to the image of the Saviour, not to the form of the cross, the objection is far from conclusive. Some account of the heresies of the twelfth century is given by Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. 12 Siecle*, c. vi.

Count of St. Giles and Toulouse; and St. Bernard wrote * to prepare that prince for his arrival, and to signify his motives. 'The churches (he said) are without people; the people without priests; the priests without honour; and Christians without Christ. The churches are no longer conceived holy, nor the sacraments sacred, nor are the festivals any more celebrated. Men die in their sins—souls are hurried away to the terrible tribunal—without penitence or communion; baptism is refused to infants, who are thus precluded from salvation.' He added many reproaches against Henry, whom he accused of being an apostate monk, a mendicant, a hypocrite, and a debauchee. The biographers of that Saint relate, that he was received, even in the most contaminated provinces, like an angel from heaven; and at Albi, the place most fatally infected, an immense multitude assembled to hear his preaching. The day which he skilfully selected for their conversion, was that of St. Peter. He examined in succession the various peculiarities of their belief, and showed their deviation from the Catholic faith. He then required the people to tell him which of the two they would have. The people immediately declared their horror of heresy, and their joy at the prospect of returning to the bosom of the Church. 'Return, then, to the Church (replied St. Bernard); and that we may the better distinguish those who are sincere, let all true penitents lift up their hands.' They obeyed this injunction with one consent: and though St. Bernard, in the course of a leisurely journey from Clairvaux to Albi, had performed many extraordinary miracles, 'this (as the simple Chronicler reports) was the mightiest of all.' Henry himself appears to have fled to Toulouse, whither the eager Abbot pursued him. Thence he once more escaped, and once more St. Bernard followed, purifying the places infected by that pestilence. At length the fugitive was seized and convicted at Rheims, before Eugenius in person, and consigned to prison (in 1148), where he presently afterwards died.

About the same time it would appear that certain other sects, differing in some less important points among themselves, but united in a sort of desultory opposition to the Roman Church, had gained footing, not in France only, but in Flanders, in Germany, and even in the north of Italy. Without any formal separation from the Church, or an entire disregard of its public offices, they had their own ministers, both Bishops and Priests †, to whom they paid a more observant deference, and whom they affirmed to be the only legitimate descendants from the apostles. The opposition of these heretics seems to have been more particularly directed against the wealth and temporal power of the Catholic clergy—but at the same time they rejected infant baptism, the intercession of saints, purgatory—and pro-

* Epistol. 240. (Lutet. Paris. 1640.) It begins, 'Quanta audivimus et cognovimus mala quæ in ecclesiis Dei fecit et facit quotidie Henricus hæreticus! Versatur in terra vestra sub vestimentis ovium lupus rapax,' &c.

† Milner, Cent. xii. c. iii., cites the following passage from Evervinus's Letter to St. Bernard, preserved by Mabillon, and written about 1140:—'There have been lately some heretics discovered among us, near Cologne, though several have with satisfaction returned again to the Church. One of their Bishops, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, in the presence of the Archbishop, and many of the nobility, defending the heresies by the words of Christ and the apostles. Finding that they made no impression, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, on which they might bring their teachers to a conference, promising to return to the Church, provided they found their masters unable to answer the arguments of their opponents; but that, otherwise, they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this declaration, having been admonished to repent for three days, they were seized by the people in the excess of zeal, and burnt to death. And what is amazing, they came to the stake, and bare the pain, not only with patience, but even with joy.'

fessed, in fact, to receive only those truths which were positively delivered by Christ or his apostles. They are described to have been extremely ignorant, and confined to the lowest classes. But it is at least certain, that in the principality of Toulouse, the nobility had engaged with some obstinacy in the heresy of the Paulicians—less through error than through design, and a malicious satisfaction in the humiliation of the clergy. But the same motives are not less likely to have operated, wheresoever the same or similar opinions were promulgated.

Another religious faction had at that time considerable prevalence, which, under the various names of Cathari (or *Heresy of the Cathari and Paulicians.* Catharists—Puritans), Gazari, Paterini, Paulicians or Publicans, Bulgari or Bugari*, was more particularly charged with Manichæan opinions. The origin of these heretics has been the subject of much controversy; for while some suppose their errors to have been indigenous in Europe, there are others who derive them in a direct line from the heart of Asia. It is certain that a very powerful sect named Paulicians, and tainted, though they might affect to disclaim it, with the absurdities of Manes, spread very widely throughout the Greek provinces of Asia during the eighth century. It is equally true, that after a merciless persecution of about one hundred and fifty years, their remnant, still numerous, was permitted to settle in Bulgaria and Thrace. Thence, as is believed by Muratori, Mosheim, and Gibbon, they gradually migrated towards the West; at first, as occasions of war, or commerce, or mendicity (another name for pilgrimage) might be presented; and, latterly, in the returning ranks of the crusaders. It is asserted, that their first migration was into Italy; that so early as the middle of the eleventh century, many of their colonies were established in Sicily, in Lombardy, Insubria, and principally at Milan; that others led a wandering life in France, Germany, and other countries; and that they everywhere attracted, by their pious looks and austere demeanour, the admiration and respect of the multitude. It is moreover maintained, that these widely scattered congregations were organized in united obedience to a Primate, who resided on the confines of Bulgaria and Dalmatia. In confirmation of the authorities on which these opinions rest, it should be observed, that among the various forms of heresy which were detected by the keen eyes of the early Inquisitors, there was scarcely one which escaped the charge of Manichæism †.

Admitting, then, that this charge was very commonly invented for the purpose of making the others more detestable, we cannot question that it was sometimes founded in truth. And while, on the one hand, we are far removed from an opinion, that would refer the origin of all the earliest Western sects to the emigrants from the East—that would consider, not only the Cathari, but the Petrobrussians, Henricians, and even the Vaudois themselves, as descendants from the family of Manes—it is equally

* About the middle of the thirteenth century, the Emperor Frederic II. enumerated all the forms, or rather names, of heresy then most scandalous, in the opening of an edict published against them. It begins as follows:—'Catharos, Patarenos, Speromistas, Leonistas, Arnaldistas, Circumcisos, Passaginos, Josephinos, Garatenses, Albanenses, Franciscos, Beghardos, Commissos, Valdenses, Romanolos, Communellos, Varinos, Ortulenos, cum illis de Aquâ Nigrâ, et omnes hæreticos . . . damnamus,' &c. See Limborch. Hist. Inquisit. lib. i. c. 12.

† The first canon of Innocent's Lateran Council distinctly states the church doctrine respecting the Unity of the Deity, in opposition to that of the Two Principles—a sufficient declaration, that many Manichæans were *believed* to be found among the heretics.

unreasonable to contend, that his wild opinions had no existence in the West of Europe; or even to dispute their perpetuation through parties of Paulicians; who, from time to time, may have migrated into Sicily or Italy. It is indeed unquestionable, that such was the case; and it is not impossible, that they may have formed, even after their dispersion throughout Europe, a distinct and characteristic sect. But it would be absurd to ascribe to their influence the formation of sects, of which the leading principles were wholly distinct, if not entirely at variance, with those of the Asiatics. Even in the dawn of returning knowledge, the faintest glimmerings of reason were sufficient to light the mind to the detection of papal delinquency, of the aberrations of the Church and its ministers. It required not a star from the East to indicate, even in those dark times, how distinct were the principles of the Church from the precepts of the Gospel; or to contrast the deformities of the Clergy with the purity of their heavenly Master. Such incongruities obtrude themselves perhaps the most forcibly upon illiterate minds, and excite the deepest disgust in the simplest conscience. It is to this cause, that the heresies of those early ages may most confidently be traced—they may indeed have been infected, in a greater or less degree, with some of the notions of the Paulician colonists—but that assuredly was not the source from which they flowed.

As we have been careful to distinguish the Catharists, who may have been semi-Manichæan, from the other sects of reformers who were scattered throughout Europe, so we *The Vaudois*. must again consider the Vaudois or Waldenses as a separate race among these latter,—that we may not fall into the error of Mosheim, who ascribes the origin of that sect to an individual named Waldus. Peter Waldus, or Waldensis, a native of Lyons; was a layman and a merchant; but, notwithstanding the avocations of a secular life, he had studied the real character of his church with attention, followed by shame. Stung by the spectacle of so much impurity*, he abandoned his profession, distributed his wealth among the poor, and formed an association for the diffusion of scriptural truth. He commenced his ministry about the year 1180. Having previously caused several parts of the Scriptures to be translated into the vulgar tongue, he expounded them with great effect to an attentive body of disciples, both in France and Lombardy. In the course of his exertions he probably visited the valleys of Piedmont; and there he found a people of congenial spirits. They were called Vaudois or Waldenses (Men of the Valleys); and as the preaching of Peter may probably have confirmed their opinions, and cemented their discipline, he acquired and deserved his surname by his residence among them. At the same time, their connexion with Peter and his real Lyonnese disciples established a notion of their identity; and the Vaudois, in return for the title which they had bestowed, received the

* It is said that the worship of the Host, which was first enforced about this time, was the particular superstition which awakened the indignation of Peter Waldus. If, indeed, that practice was generally established in 1180, there remained little for Innocent to add to the sanctity of the sacrament thirty-five years afterwards. There is no mention of it in the ancient canonical books of the church,—those of Alcuin, Amalarius, Walfridus, and Micrologus. There is proof, however, that it existed in France, both at Paris and at Tours, a century at least before Innocent III. In Germany there is also evidence of its previous existence. But in the Roman church it does not appear to have been established before the pontificate of Boniface VIII. See Pagi, Vit. Innoc. III. ad finem.

reciprocal appellation of Leonists: such, at least, appears the most probable among many varying accounts*.

There are some who believe the Vaudois to have enjoyed the uninterrupted integrity of the faith even from the apostolic ages; others suppose them to have been disciples of Claudius Turin, the evangelical prelate of the ninth century. At least, it may be pronounced with great certainty, that they had been long in existence before the visit of the Lyonnese reformer. A Dominican, named Rainer Saccho, who was first a member and afterwards a persecutor of their communion, described them, in a treatise which he wrote against them, to the following purpose: 'There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: first, it is the most ancient,—some say as old as Sylvester, others as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated: there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Thirdly, while other sects are profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing respecting God which is not good; only they blaspheme against the Roman church and the clergy, and thus gain many followers'†. The author of this passage lived about the middle of the following century; and if the sect against which he was writing had really originated from the preaching of Peter some eighty years before, the Dominican would scarcely have conceded to it the claim of high and unascertained antiquity. Again, St. Bernard in one place admits, in substance, 'that there is a sect, which calls itself after no man's name‡, which pretends to be in the direct line of apostolical succession; and which, rustic and unlearned though it is, contends that the church is wrong, and that itself alone is right. It must derive (he subjoins) its origin from the devil; since there is no other extraction which we can assign to it.'

At the same time we must admit that the direct historical evidence is not sufficient to prove the apostolical descent of the Vaudois §. Aleuin, the tutor of Charlemagne, may have complained 'that auricular confession was not practised in the churches of Languedoc and the Alps in his time.' Claudius of Turin may have presided over a reformed and Christian diocese. Somewhat later (in 945), Atto, Bishop of Vercueil||, may have lamented 'that there were *some* in his diocese who held the divine services in derision.' And lastly, at the Synod of Arras, in 1025, it may have been deplored, 'that certain persons, coming from the borders of Italy, had introduced heretical doctrines,'—and such as the Waldenses, indeed, professed. It still appears that the name is not mentioned in any writing before the twelfth century; and there is no direct specific evidence of the previous existence of the sect. Nevertheless, as its origin was confessedly immemorial in the thirteenth century, and as there has not,

* There are some who derive the surname of Peter from some town or hamlet in the vicinity of Lyons; others contend that he never personally preached among the Vaudois of Piedmont.

† Bibliotheca Patrum, apud Lenfant, Guerre des Hussites, liv. ii., sect. v.

‡ Quære ab illis suæ sectæ auctorem, neminem dabit. Quæ hæresis non ex hominibus habuit proprium hæresiarcham? Manichæi Manem habuere principem et præceptorem, Sabelliani Sabellium, &c. Ita omnes ceteræ hujusmodi pestes singulæ singulos magistros homines habuisse noscuntur, a quibus originem simul duxere et nomen. Quo nomine istos titulove vocabis? Nullo; quoniam non est ab homine illorum hæresis,....sed magis et absque dubio per immissionem et fraudem dæmoniorum, &c. Sermo super Cant. lxvi. ad init.

§ We refer to Mr. Gilly's well-known work on this subject.

|| A city situated between Turin and Milan.

perhaps, existed in the history of heresy any other sect to which some origin has not been expressly ascribed, we have just reason to infer the very high antiquity of the Vaudois.

Many will think it more important to learn their doctrines, than to speculate on their origin. On almost all material points they were those of the Reformation*. In their discipline they endeavoured to attain the rigid simplicity of the primitive Christians, and in that endeavour, perhaps, they exceeded it; for while they maintained and imitated the divine institution of the three orders in the priesthood, they also reduced their clergy to the temporal condition of the apostles themselves; they denied them all worldly possessions, and while they obliged them to be poor and industrious, they compelled them to be illiterate also.

The persecution of Peter Waldensis, and the dispersion of his followers, occasioned, as in so many similar instances, the dissemination of the opinions; and, notwithstanding some partial sufferings which were inflicted in Picardy by Philippe Auguste, they were a numerous and flourishing sect at the conclusion of the twelfth century. They were often confounded in name with the Vaudois, in crime and calamity with the Catharists and Petrobrussians, and other adversaries of Papacy.

But of these various descriptions, such as were found in France during the pontificate of Innocent, were known by the general name of Albigeois or Albigenses. A city in Languedoc, named Albi†, which was peculiarly prolific of heresy, is usually supposed to have given a common designation to these numerous forms of error. Such, very briefly described, were the factions which distracted the church on the accession of Innocent III. It now remains to observe the measures which he adopted to repress them. And let us first inquire to what extent he might plead the previous practice of the church.

It appears that, at a Synod held at Orleans, in the year 1017, under the reign of Robert, a number of persons, of no mean condition or character, were accused of heretical opinions. Manicheism was the frightful term, employed to express their delinquency; but it is more probable that their real offence was the adoption of certain mystical notions, proceeding, indeed, from feelings of the most earnest piety, but too spiritual to be tolerated in that age and that church. It is said that they despised all external forms of worship, and rejected the rites, the ceremonies, and even the sacraments of the church; that they valued none save the religion within,—the abstracted contemplation of the Deity, and the internal aspirations of the soul after things celestial. Some philosophical speculations they may also have admitted respecting God, the Trinity, and the human soul, which

* Reiner, the Dominican, already cited, also divides the crimes of the Vaudois into three classes: 1. Their blasphemies against the church, its statutes, and its clergy; 2. Errors touching the sacraments and the saints; 3. Detestation of all honest customs approved by the church; which really means, objections to the administration, the sacraments, and the practices of the Roman Catholic church. Mosheim treats the subject at Cent. xii., p. ii., ch. v. Pierre d'Ailly, in a discourse composed at the Council of Constance, alleges as their principal errors, that they refused temporalities to the priesthood, and asserted that the church of God only lasted till the endowment by Constantine. Then arose the church of Rome,—the other being extinct, except in as far as it was perpetuated in themselves.

† According to the *Histoire Générale de Languedoc*, by the Benedictine monks, the term is more accurately derived from Albigesium, the general denomination of Narbonne Gaul in that century. See Mosh., note on Cent. xiii., p. ii., ch. v., sect. vii.

excited the fears of that generation*, in the same degree that they surpassed its comprehension. Accordingly, they were accused and convicted of heresy; and as they firmly persisted in their errors, and as the king had no repugnance to enforce the sentence, they were finally consigned to the flames.

In this barbarous transaction, which was rather in anticipation of the policy of later ages, than in accordance with that of the eleventh, we have found no proof of papal interference; nor, indeed, have we observed any very important pontifical edicts for the extirpation of heresy, earlier than the reign of Alexander III. That Pope, in a council held at Tours in 1163, published a decree to this effect: 'Whereas a damnable heresy has for some time lifted its head in the parts about Toulouse, and has already spread its infection through Gascony and other provinces, concealing itself like a serpent within its own folds; as soon as its followers shall have been discovered, let no man afford them a refuge on his estates; neither let there be any communication with them in buying or selling; so that, being deprived of the solace of human conversation, they may be compelled to return from error to wisdom†.'

The same pontiff, in the third Lateran Council, held in 1179, published other edicts against the heretics, variously named Cathari, Paterini, Publicani, &c., pursuing them with anathemas, refusal of Christian sepulture, and other spiritual chastisements. But it does not appear that he invoked, on either occasion, the secular arm to his assistance. Nevertheless, without that aid, his power was sufficient to expel Peter Waldensis from his native city, and subsequently to pursue him from Dauphiny to Picardy, and thence to Germany, till he found his final resting-place among the Bohemian mountaineers, the ancestors of Huss and Jerome. The fugitive died in that country about the year 1180.

When the torch of persecution was transmitted to Innocent‡, the two principal seats of religious disaffection were the valleys of Piedmont and the cities of Languedoc; with this difference, however, that the Vaudois flourished in comparative and perhaps despised security, while the latter, more

* Such, at least, is the opinion of Mosheim (Cent. xi., p. ii., ch. v.) The history of this Synod of Orleans is found in Dacherius's *Spicilegium Veter. Script.* (tom. ii., p. 670, Edit. Paris,) and the charges there alleged (besides the usual calumny of promiscuous prostitution) respect the nativity, the death and resurrection of Christ, and impute a disbelief in the efficacy of baptism, in the change wrought by consecration in the eucharistical elements, and in the meritoriousness of prayers to martyrs and confessors. In the place of this faith they substituted 'celestial food,' 'angelic visions,' 'the companionship of God,' &c. . . . and when the prelate sitting in judgment on them laid down the orthodox doctrine respecting some of those points, the heretics replied, 'You may tell such tales as those to men whose wisdom is of this world, and who believe the fictions of carnal men, written on the skins (membranis) of animals. But to us, who have a law inscribed on the inward man by the Holy Spirit, and who have no other wisdom than that which we have learnt from God the creator of all things, you preach superfluous vanities, deviating from real holiness. Wherefore, cease from your discourse, and do what you will with us. Already do we behold our King reigning in the heavens, who exalts us with his right hand to immortal triumphs, and to the joys which are above.' We should recollect that this account (like almost every other in which any heretical opinions are described) comes to us from the pen of an enemy.

† The original is given by Pagi, *Vit. Alexandri III.*, sect. xlii. He continues to apply to them, according to the ordinary confusion, the name of Waldenses.

‡ That Innocent was very ready to take his turn in this lampadepophory appears from several epistles, written to various prelates in the very first year of his pontificate, in which

particularly denominated Albigois, were rendered more notorious, as well as more dangerous, by the protection publicly afforded them by Raymond VI., Earl of Toulouse*. Against these, therefore, the Pope's earnest and most assiduous efforts were directed; and first, observing that the bishops in those provinces were deficient in true Catholic zeal for the Unity of the Church, he sent, in 1198, two legates into the rebellious districts; but rather, as it would seem, for the purpose of exploring and menacing, than of actually commencing the contest. Presently afterwards, a more numerous commission, the advance of his array, invaded the haunts of heresy, and brought argument and eloquence in support of intimidation. This body again received great additional efficiency from the accession of a Spaniard, named *Dominic*, a young ecclesiastic, remarkable for the severity of his life, the extent of his learning, the persuasiveness of his manner, and the ardour of his zeal. These qualities, and some successful services, infused a new spirit into the ranks of the orthodox. It would also appear that their exertions were no longer restricted to verbal exhortation and reproof; but that they also aimed to animate the civil authorities in their favour, and to enforce the infliction even of capital punishment, whenever they had influence to do so. This expedition lasted six or seven years; and, at the end of that time, the spiritual missionaries engaged in it were generally known by the title of *Inquisitors*,—a name, not indeed honourable or innocent even in its origin, but not yet associated with horror and infamy.

Still matters did not proceed with the rapidity desired by the pontiff; and then the missionaries had recourse to a new and very harmless expedient to accelerate success. They laid aside the pomp and dignity of their train and habits, discharged the unpopular parade of servants and equipage, and continued their preaching with the more imposing pretension of apostolical humility. But neither had this method the result which was hoped from it. At length, in the year 1207, Innocent at once addressed himself to the arms of Philippe Auguste. He easily exhorted that monarch to march into the heretical provinces, and extirpate the spiritual rebels by fire and sword.

About the same time one of his legates or inquisitors, Pierre de Castelnovo† (or Chateau-neuf), was assassinated by the populace in the states of Raymond. The act was imputed to the connivance, if not to the direct instigation, of that prince‡. The Pope immediately launched the bolt of excommunication; and his emissaries, by his command, proceeded to those measures which introduced a new feature into the history of inter-Christian warfare. They proclaimed a general campaign of all na-

he exhorts them to gird themselves for the work of extirpation, and to employ, if necessary, the arms of the princes and of the people. This last suggestion was provident. The populace might sometimes be excited to an act of outrage, when the authorities were neutral in the quarrel.

* Limborch, in the first book of his History of the Inquisition (cap. viii.), very clearly shows, both from the 'Sententiæ Inquisitionis Tolositaneæ,' and other evidence, that the Vaudois, while they held some opinions in common with the Albigenses, had many more points of difference, in rites as well as in doctrine; for instance, the Manichean errors imputed to the latter are never ascribed to the Vaudois.

† Some write the name Castronovo.

‡ Historians differ as to the probability of his guilt; also as to the fact whether the first appeal of Innocent to the court of France preceded or followed the death of his legate. On this point we incline to the former opinion. Respecting the charge against Raymond, there seems to be no clear proof on either side; it is known that he favoured the heretics, and that circumstance might occasion either the crime or the calumny. The latter is, *perhaps*, the more probable

tions against the Albigeois, and at the same time promised a general grant of indulgences and dispensations to all who should take arms in that holy cause. Having thus reduced those dissenting Christians to the same level in a religious estimation with the Turk and the Saracen, they let loose an infuriated multitude of fanatics against them; and the word 'Crusade,' which had hitherto signified only religious madness, was now extended to the more deliberate atrocity of sectarian persecution.

Several monks and some prelates were the spiritual directors of this tempest; but the military leader was Simon, Count *de Montfort*, 'a man like Cromwell, whose intrepidity, hypocrisy and ambition marked him for the hero of a holy war*.' To irritate his ambition, the Pope artfully held out to him the earldom of Toulouse, as the recompense of his exertions in the service of the church. His hypocrisy was displayed and hardened by the seeming devotion with which he continually perpetrated the most revolting enormities, and his intrepidity was exercised by the resistance of the heretics. It would be a painful office, and of little profit, in the present prevalence of reason and of humanity, to pursue the frightful details of religious massacre †. It is sufficient to say, that after many conflicts and some variety of success, but no intermission of barbarity, the triumph rested with the Catholics. It was not, however, so complete as either to exterminate the rebels, or to place the promised sceptre in the hand of the persecutor. In the year 1218, Montfort was killed in battle before the walls of the city ‡, which Innocent had vainly bestowed on him.

The contest was continued by succeeding Popes according to the principles of Innocent; and eight years after the *Council of Toulouse*, death of Montfort, Louis VIII. king of France was engaged to gird on the sword of persecution. Another crusade was preached, and in 1228 a system of Inquisition was permanently established within the walls of Toulouse. In the same, or

* Hallam, Middle Ages. Simon de Montfort was descended, by an illegitimate branch, from Robert king of France. He was connected on his mother's side with the Earls of Leicester.

† It was said in this war, when the Crusaders were on the point of storming Beziers, that some one inquired how the Catholic were to be distinguished from the heretical inhabitants in the massacre about to take place: 'Kill them all (replied Arnold, a Cistercian abbot, who happened to be present), God will know his own.' 'Cædite—novit Dominus, qui sunt ejus.' His advice appears to have been followed, and about seven thousand of all persuasions suffered.

The Life of Innocent III. apud Muratori, (which is more properly the History of Montfort's wars,) mentions many instances in which small bodies of heretics chose to be burnt, rather than return to the Catholic faith.

‡ The recorded circumstances of his death seem well to illustrate one trait at least in his character. He was at matins (on June 25,) when he was informed that the enemy were in arms, and concealed in the fosse of the fortress. He instantly armed also, and hastened to church to hear mass. Mass was just begun, and he was engaged in earnest prayer, when news were brought him that the Tulousans had made a sally, and were attacking his machines—'Let me finish the mass (he replied) and see the sacrament of our redemption.' Instantly afterwards another courier arrived, and said, 'Hasten to the succour; our men are pressed, and can hold out no longer.' 'I will not stir (he answered) until I have seen my Saviour.' But as soon as the priest had lifted up the Host, according to the usage, the Count, with his knees still on earth, and his hands raised to heaven, exclaimed, '*Nunc dimittis*,' and he then added, 'Let us now go and die, if necessary, for Him who has died for us.' Accordingly he went forth and died. Yet, after all, it were too much to ascribe this conduct to pure hypocrisy; much of fanaticism was undoubtedly mixed with it; and when religious enthusiasm is united, as has too commonly happened, with religious hypocrisy, it is impossible even for the person possessed with them to distinguish their limits.

the following year, a Council there assembled published decrees, which obliged laymen, even of the highest rank, to close their houses, cellars, forests, against the heretical fugitives, and to take all means to detect and bring them to trial; heretics voluntarily converted were compelled to wear certain crosses on their garments; those who should return to the church, under the influence of fear, were still to suffer imprisonment at the discretion of the bishop; all children of the age of twelve or fourteen were compelled by oath, not only to abjure every heresy, but to expose and denounce any which they should detect in others; and this code of bigotry was properly completed by a strict prohibition to all laymen to possess any copies of the Scriptures*.

Still the Count, who succeeded to the sceptre and to the moderation of Raymond, manifested not sufficient ardour in the Catholic cause, and it was not till the Archbishop of the city was formally associated with him in the office of destruction, that the work was thought to proceed with becoming rapidity†. At length, in 1253, the Count entered seriously on the hateful task; and from that moment the remnant of the Albigeois were consigned, without hope or mercy, to the eager hands of the inquisitors.

Innocent did not himself live to behold the success of his measures; and the cause which is assigned for his premature death is the more remarkable‡, as it arose out of *Death and Character of Innocent.* the most triumphant exploit in his life. Since the humiliation of John, the crown of England had been considered by the Pope as a possession valuable to his ambition no less than to his avarice:

* Some of the statutes of this Council are worth citing, as they show not only how far the system, strictly speaking inquisitorial, was carried in that early age, but also how closely the laity at that time co-operated with the clergy for the unity of the church:—
‘Statuimus itaque ut archiepiscopi et episcopi in singulis parochiis, tam in civitatibus quam extra, sacerdotem unum et duos vel tres laicos vel plures etiam, si opus fuerit, juramenti religione constringant, quod diligenter, fideliter et frequenter inquirent hæreticos in iisdem parochiis, domos singulas et cameras subterraneas aliqua suspitione notabiles perscrutando, et appensa seu adjuncta in iis tectis ædificia, seu quæcunque alia latibula (quæ omnia destrui præcipimus) perquirendo repererint hæreticos, credentes, fautores et receptatores seu defensores eorum, &c. . . . Solliciti etiam sint domini terrarum circa inquisitionem hæreticorum, in villis, domibus et nemoribus faciendam; et circa hujusmodi appensa, adjuncta, seu subterranea latibula destruenda. Statuimus igitur ut quicumque in terra permittat scierit morari hæreticum . . . et fuerit inde confessus et convictus, amittat in perpetuum totam suam terram, et corpus suum sit in manu domini ad faciendum inde quod debet. Illam domum in qua fuerit inventus hæreticus diruendam decernimus; et locus sive fundus ipse confiscetur,’ &c.—See Spicileg. Dacherii (vol. ii. p. 621. Edit. Paris.) under the head, ‘Varia Galliæ Concilia.’

† We read in Matthew Paris, that about the year 1236, the Fratres Predicatores and other divines were still making great exertions for the conversion of the misbelievers. One of those preachers, named Robert, was so powerful in prostrating an adversary as to have obtained the name of Malleus Hæreticorum—the Hammer of Heretics. Nor was this only meant in a spiritual sense, ‘since there were many of both sexes whom, being unable to convert, he caused to be burnt to death; so that within two or three months there were about fifty persons whom he occasioned either to be burnt or buried alive.’—Matth. Paris, Henric. III., ad an. 1236. We should add, however, for the honour of pontifical humanity, that only two years afterwards the cruelties of Robert were arrested by an order from Rome, and the persecutor (who, by the way, had previously been a heretic) was himself convicted of some less equivocal offences, and imprisoned for life.

‡ Some writers make no mention of this circumstance, but merely assert that Innocent died rather suddenly, while on his way to reconcile some differences between the Pisans and Genoese, which impeded his grand crusading projects.—See the Chron. of Richardus de S. Germano, and of Urspergensis Abbas. ap. Pagi, Vit. Innoc. III. Sect. 104. It is certain that his death took place at Perugia, on July 16, 1216, after a reign of eighteen years and six months.

and when, on the deposition of John, Louis of France was proclaimed, and actually proceeded to occupy the country in spite of the Pontiff's determined opposition, Innocent was indignant at the affront and the injury. He preached a sermon on some public occasion, and selected for his text, 'Even say thou, the sword, the sword is drawn—for the slaughter it is furbished*.' In the course of his passionate harangue he pronounced a solemn sentence of excommunication against Louis and his followers; and immediately afterwards, as it is said, while in the act of dictating to his secretary some very harsh censures against Philippe and his kingdom, he was seized by that fatal fever, which was ordained, perhaps, to prevent some new enterprise of warfare and desolation.

If we would reconcile the lofty panegyrics with the violent vituperation, which are alike bestowed upon the name of Innocent III., we must first distinguish his private from his public character, and next reflect how different and even opposite are the principles on which the latter has, in different ages, been judged. The very same exploits which would naturally call forth loud approbation from the Catholic historians of those days, nay, from some perhaps even at this moment, are made the subjects of severe censure by Protestant writers. This difference is less properly historical than moral. It does not respect the reality of the questionable acts ascribed to him, but only the light in which we are bound to regard them. But in respect to the private qualities of Innocent there is no ground for such diversity; and that they were great and noble is attested by most of his biographers. That he was gifted with extraordinary talents—that he was a profound canonist, and generally conversant with the learning of his time—that he was frequent in charitable offices, and generous in the distribution of his personal revenues—that his moral conduct was without reproach, and that he was sometimes not untouched by sentiments of piety, is clear from the evidence of contemporary authors and of his own writings. But great personal virtues are perfectly consistent with great public crimes; and it is a truth which leads to melancholy reflection, that some of the heaviest evils which have ever been inflicted upon churches and nations, have proceeded from the weak or even wicked policy of men of immaculate private characters.

Such was Innocent III.; charitable to the poor who surrounded his palace, steeled against the wretch who deviated from his faith—generous in the profusion of his private expenditure, avaricious in the exactions which he levied for the apostolical treasury—humane† in his mere social relations, merciless in the execution of his ecclesiastical projects—pious in the expressions of internal devotion, impious and blasphemous in his repeated profanation of the name of God and of the cross of Christ.

Again: if we confine our retrospect to the public acts of this Pontiff, we observe that they bear, perhaps without any exception, the same stamp—that of a temporal and worldly policy. Innocent subjected the civil authority of the Imperial Prefect to his own. He extended, with great diligence, the boundaries of the Ecclesiastical States. He found means to control a great portion of the secular power of Europe, so that he might hold it at

* Ezekiel, c. xxi. v. 28.

† Simon de Montfort killed Peter of Arragon in battle, and took his son prisoner. The widow, unable to prevail with Montfort for the release of the boy, supplicated the interference of Innocent. There is no proof that his policy was, in this matter, concerned on either side, so he commanded the liberation of the captive, and for once humanity had its triumph.

his disposal; whether it was his will to overthrow a pretender, or to depose a king, or to extinguish a heresy. For the accomplishment of his most important objects his final and most confident appeal was invariably made to the material sword. Again: as if it were little to submit the consciences of men to the dominion of the Holy See, he endeavoured to comprehend in its grasp their property also. Heretofore the Popes had been contented with the exercise and the rewards of a spiritual tyranny—they had been satisfied with the obedience, the ecclesiastical fidelity, the ghostly services of their clergy; but Innocent opened a more direct and, as he thought, a more solid path to power. He availed himself of the pretext of the crusades to levy pecuniary contributions, immediately on the clergy, and, through the clergy, on the people. *This* was the most essential change which he introduced into the system of the church. From this epoch its history takes another, and we need not hesitate to say, a lower character; and though this was not instantly developed, but awaited the profligacy of Avignon, and the vices and necessities of the Schism, to bring it to full perfection, still it was from this crisis that the revolution must be dated; here originated that gradual substitution of worldly objects and vulgar motives for the splendour of spiritual pretension, which led, through a succession of pitiful disputes and sordid usurpations, to mere naked avarice and avowed and shameless venality.

In the comparison which we might here be tempted to draw between Innocent III. and the greatest among his predecessors, there is perhaps no point on which the preference could be refused to Gregory. Both availed themselves of the divisions of the empire; but the favourable circumstances which Innocent found, Gregory in a great measure created. The design of universal monarchy, which was carried so far into execution by the one, was conceived and transmitted to him by the other. With Innocent the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre was made the excuse for pecuniary exactions; with Gregory it was the lofty aspiration of erring magnanimity, earnest, and attended by a determination to devote his repose and person to the cause which he deemed holy. In the treatment of heretical delinquency, the one was moderate * beyond the principles of his age and the passions of his clergy; the other urged the course and heated the rage of persecution, and by his perversion of the crusading frenzy into that channel, identified in the popular hatred dissent with infidelity, and established the law of vengeance, and multiplied the crimes of his posterity. And after all, how severely soever we may condemn the means which have created it, there is something of majesty and magnificence in the character of a spiritual despotism—an invisible power which enthralled mankind without the aid of physical force, and even in defiance of it; which humbles the mightiest sceptre, and blunts the sharpest sword by a menace or a censure; a power mysterious and undefinable, swaying the human race by the name—the much-abused name—of religion. If we look, indeed, to its origin, it is only an empire over man's ignorance and credulity. Still it is the empire of intellect; and as such it stands on loftier ground than that worldly fabric which employed the ambition of Innocent; the mere temporal sovereignty of arms and opulence, supported by corruption and massacre.

* It is true, that Gregory offered to Sweno, King of Denmark, a province occupied by heretics. But in this matter his temporal ambition was probably more interested than his ecclesiastical bigotry.

CHAPTER XIX.

The History of Monachism.

(I.) *Origin of Monachism*—Early instance of the monastic spirit in the east—Pliny the philosopher—The Therapeutæ or Essenes—The Ascetics—their real character and origin—The earliest Christian hermits—dated from the Decian or Diocletian persecutions—Cœnobites. Pachomius and St. Anthony—originated in Ægypt—account of the monks of Ægypt—Basilius of Cæsarea—his order and rule—his institution of a vow questionable—Monasteries encouraged by the fathers of the fourth and fifteenth ages—from what motives—Vow of celibacy—Restrictions of admission into monastic order—Original monks were laymen—Comparative fanaticism of the east and west—Severity of discipline in the west—motives and inducements to it—contrasted with the Oriental practice—Establishment of nunneries in the east. (II.) *Institution of Monachism in the West*—St. Athanasius—Martin of Tours—Most ancient rule of the western monasteries—their probable paucity and poverty—Benedict of Nursia—his order, and reasonable rule, and object—Foundation of Monte Cassino—France—St. Columban—Ravages of the Lombards and Danes—Reform by Benedict of Aniane—The order of Cluni—its origin, rise, and reputation—its attachment to papacy and its prosperity—The order of Cîteaux—date of its foundation—Dependent Abbey of Clairvaux—St. Bernard—its progress and decline—Order of the Chartreux. (III.) *Canons Regular and Secular*—Order of St. Augustin—Rule of Chrodegangus—Rule of Aix-la-Chapelle—subsequent reforms. (IV.) Connexion between the monasteries and the Pope—mutual services. *The Military orders*—(1.) The Knights of the Hospital—origin of their institution—their discipline and character—(2.) Knights Templar—their origin and object—(3.) The Teutonic order—its establishment and prosperity. (V.) *The Mendicant orders*—causes of their rise and great progress—(1.) St. Dominic—his exertions and designs—(2.) St. Francis and his followers—compared with the Dominicans—apparent assimilation—essential differences—disputes of the Franciscans with the Popes, and among themselves—Inquisitorial office of the Dominicans, their learning and influence—quarrels with the Doctors of Paris—Austerity of the Franciscans—the Fratricelli—(3.) The Carmelites—their professed origin—(4.) Hermits of St. Augustin—Privileges of these four orders. (VI.) *Various establishments of Nuns*—their usual offices and character—General remarks—The three grand orders of the Western Church (suited to the ages in which they severally appeared and flourished)—The Jesuits—The Monastic system one of perpetual reformation—thus alone it survived so long—its merits and advantages—The bodily labour of the Monks—their charitable and hospitable offices—real piety to be found among them—superintendence of education, and means of learning preserved by them—limits to their utility—their frequent alliance with superstition—their early dependence on the Bishops—gradual exemption, and final subjection to the Pope—Their profits and opulence, and means of amassing it—Luther a mendicant.

It is not through inadvertence, nor any blindness to the magnitude and importance of the subject, that a particular account of the monastic system has been so long deferred. We have had frequent occasion to recognize its existence and its influence on the general character of the Church; and it was reasonable perhaps to expect some earlier notice of its origin and progress. But as it is absolutely necessary for the correct comprehension of ecclesiastical history, that the scheme of monachism be understood aright; as that end could scarcely be accomplished, unless by presenting the entire institution at a single view; and as it is much more instructive, in the order of historical composition, to retrace some steps and to revisit such periods as have been examined imperfectly, rather than to anticipate events and ages which are remote and wholly unexplored—for these reasons we have abstained from a partial or premature treatment of this extensive subject. Moreover, when we consider the successive mutations which have perpetually varied the aspect of monasticism, it will appear, perhaps, that the present, as being the epoch of its latest change, is the moment most proper for the delineation of the whole structure. That latest change (we speak only of changes preceding the Reformation) was the institution of the Mendicant Orders—an event which arose out of the ministry of St. Dominic, and immediately followed the death of Innocent III. This appendage completed the

anomalous fabric: and while it was so closely intermixed with the peculiar circumstances of the age, that its nature could not have been rightly comprehended, unless described in connexion with them; it was at the same time an innovation so essentially affecting the form and character of monachism, that any account, not embracing it, would have conveyed very imperfect and even erroneous notions. Led by such considerations, we have selected the present period for this purpose; not unmindful how little justice after all can possibly be done to materials so ample within such scanty limits, and almost despairing to throw any new light on a subject which has exercised the genius, and deserved—as it still deserves—the deepest meditation both of historians and philosophers.

SECTION I.

The origin of Monachism and its progress in the East.

THE monastic spirit was alike congenial to the scenery and climate of the East, and to the peculiar character of its inhabitants. Vast solitudes of unbroken and unbounded expanse; rocks, with the most grotesque outlines, abounding in natural excavations; a dry air and an unclouded sky, afforded facilities—might we not say temptations—to a wild, unsocial, and contemplative life. The serious enthusiasm of the natives of Egypt and Asia, that combination of indolence with energy, of the calmest languor with the fiercest passion, which marks their features and their actions, disposed them to embrace with eagerness the tranquil but exciting duties of religious seclusion. And thus, even in earlier ages, before the zeal of devotion superseded all other motives to retirement, we observe, without any surprise, the mention of that practice, as indigent and immemorial.

Pliny* the philosopher has recorded the existence of an extraordinary race, who lived on the borders of the Dead Sea, the associates of the palm trees; and who *Therapeutæ* or *Essenes*, had been perpetuated (as it was said) through thousands of ages without women and without property. Satiety and disgust with the business of life, rather than any religious feeling, are mentioned as the motives of their seclusion. Again, it is certain that the *Therapeutæ* or *Essenes* inhabited the deserts both of Egypt and of Syria, as early as the days of our Saviour. They had probably dwelt there long before that time; and they appear to have sought to exalt the merit of their retirement by the practice of great austerities. Some Roman Catholic writers, being anxious to prove Monachism coeval with Christianity, have asserted, on the authority of Eusebius †, Sozomen, and Cassian, that the *Therapeutæ* were Christians; and that they scattered the seeds of the monastic life through the populous villages of Lower

* Lib. v. cap. xvii. Ab occidente Judææ litore Esseni fugitant; gens sola et in toto orbe præter cæteras mira, sine ulla fœmina, omni Venere abdicata, sine pecunia, socia palmarum. Indiem ex æquo advenarum turba renascitur, longe frequentantibus quos vita fessos ad mores eorum fortuna fluctibus agit. Ita per sæculorum millia (incredibile dictu) gens æterna in qua nemo nascitur. Tam fœcunda illis aliorum vitæ penitentia est. The most important references on this subject are collected by Hospinian. Orig. Monach.—Lib. I. cap. v.

† Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. xvi. He applied to the Christians that which Philo had written about the Jewish Essenes. Such at least is the opinion of Marsham, a very impartial as well as learned writer, in his *Προσύλαιον* to Dugdale's *Monasticon*.—See Joseph, de Bell. Judaic, lib. ii. cap. vii. for a particular description of that sect.

Egypt, whilst St. Marc, their founder, presided over the Church of Alexandria. But the opinion is more probable, that they were, for the most part, Jews by religion as well as by birth; and of a much earlier origin. Nevertheless, it may well be, that such of them as became converts to the faith, still retained their rigid eremitical life; nor can it be doubted, that the example of their severities, and the popular respect which followed them, would excite the attention and emulation of surrounding Christians.

This is one of the causes to which we may attribute the very early existence of a sect unquestionably Christian, called *The Ascetics*, the Ascetics; and these also have been erroneously confounded with the original Monks. The term Ascetic was applied by early * Christian writers to the most rigid and zealous among the primitive converts, whether they exhibited their fervour in unusual assiduity in prayer and the offices of charity, or extended it to the more equivocal merits of fasting and celibacy. But these persons did not withdraw themselves from the world; they merely exercised with ardour, perhaps in extravagance, the virtues which best qualified them to benefit and amend it. Possibly, in their rigid devotion to the duties of society, they may have shunned with aversion even its most innocent amusements. But such pious excess, which has ever marked the best forms and ages of Christianity, was eminently useful to its propagation, and should be sparingly censured under any circumstances †. It is at least manifest, that the rule of the Ascetics was essentially at variance with the monastic principle; they dwelt and associated with their fellow Christians; and perhaps they might never have acquired the historical distinction of a name, had it not been, that they affected a different garb, and assumed the philosophical cloak as the badge of their sect. Their origin is attributed by Mosheim ‡ to the double doctrine of morals, which he supposes to have prevailed in the second century—so that, while vulgar Christians were contented to obey the *precepts* of the Gospel, those who aimed at higher perfection, professed to be also directed by its *counsels*. This notion is unquestionably borrowed from heathen philosophy; and, if it really existed to any extent among the Ascetics, it affords another proof of their connexion with the schools of Greece. But the unsettled condition of the Church in those days, and the jealousies and sufferings to which it was subjected, the general demoralization of the pagan world, the example of popular austerities in another religion, and the melancholy genius of Egypt, where Ascetism chiefly prevailed, were causes alone sufficient to have produced—as they did produce—forms of enthusiasm far less rational, than any which can justly be ascribed to the Ascetics.

But about the middle of the third century the monastic spirit exhibited itself in a much less equivocal shape; and we may observe that the

* Bingham (Christ. Antiq. b. vii.) confirms his account of the Ascetics by numerous and conclusive authorities.

† The Ascetics were of all ranks and professions. Eusebius calls them *οἱ σπουδαῖοι*—the zealous. Clemens Alexandrinus *ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι*—the more elect among the elect. These expressions imply nothing more than a greater fervour (or at least greater pretension) of piety.

‡ The same writer (Cent. iii., p. 2., ch. ii.) seems disposed to attribute the rise of Monks and Hermits to the influence of the mystical theology. Yet he admits, in the same paragraph, that that method of life was very common in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia even before the coming of Christ.

purest and most legitimate character of seclusion was that which it first assumed. Flying from the fury of the Decian persecution, a number of Christians took refuge in caves, in deserts, or *Anchorets*, inaccessible islets, where they exercised their proscribed religion in solitary security. Egypt and Syria, and Mesopotamia, and the wildest parts of Asia Minor, were suddenly visited by a race of exiles, in whom devotion, irritated by injustice and fed by seclusion, sometimes sank into sullen and gloomy fanaticism. These probably were the earliest Christian Hermits or Anchorets; they professed an absolute religious solitude, occasionally interrupted indeed by the pious importunity of the neighbouring inhabitants, but never broken by any regular connexion or association with each other. Their numbers were further increased by the severities of Diocletian; and still more, perhaps, by the reverence and sympathy, which the spectacle of their austere piety excited among the vulgar. They continued for some time to deserve by their habits the title of Solitaries; nor do we learn that they were formed into assemblies until after the establishment of the Church by Constantine.

The first institution of persons *living in common* for religious purposes, and therefore called *Cœnobites*, is attributed to St. Anthony, the contemporary and friend of Athanasius, and his fellow-*Cœnobites*, labourer in the same soil. And it is obvious to remark, that while the greater of those champions of the ancient Church was engaged in defending the purity of the Christian faith, in the schools of Alexandria, the other was scattering in the same soil, with the same applause and success, the seeds of a system directly at variance with some of its best practical principles. Another Egyptian, named Pachomius, divides with St. Anthony the fame of this enterprise; in as far at least as he immediately extended to the Upper Thebaid the work which Anthony commenced in the Lower*. He even ventured thus early to enlarge upon the first scheme of religious union; and introduced the custom, which in much later ages was so generally adopted in the Western Church, of combining several monasteries into one Society, or 'Congregation.' These events took place during the first half of the fourth century; and it is from this epoch that we properly date the origin of the monastic system.

The multitudes who instantly embraced that manner of life, and thronged the primitive edifices of Upper Egypt, were, no doubt, exaggerated, when calculated at nearly half the population of the country. But it is certain, that the 'New Philosophy' (it was early designated by that name) was eagerly adopted by a crowd of proselytes; nor is this wonderful; since those to whom its advantages were the most obvious, and its duties the most easy, were the lowest of mankind—and since in Egypt, more than in any other land, religious novelties have flourished from the remotest ages with a peculiar fecundity.

Since the original monks of Egypt are praised by Roman Catholic writers, as the true models of monastic perfection, and since some accounts of them remain, *The Monks of Egypt*, which may be followed with little suspicion, it is proper to employ some additional attention on that subject. John Casian, a native of Scythia, a deacon by the ordination of St. Chrysostom, and an inmate of the Monastery of Palestine, near Bethlehem, went forth, about the year 395, to explore the holy solitudes of Egypt, and draw from

* Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Dissert. Prélim.

its more perfect institutions a profitable lesson of religious instruction; and seven years devoted to those inquiries give weight and credit to the descriptions which he published. The latter part of his life was passed in retirement at Marseilles; and to the two convents which he there established, he prescribed a rule founded on the venerable practice of the East. According to his account, the recluses of Egypt were divided into three principal classes:—the Anchorets, the Cœnobites, and the Sarabaites. The two former, whose numbers were nearly equal, formed the respectable and genuine portion of the profession. The last were independent, and were regarded as spurious and unworthy brethren. The Anchorets occupied, either in perfect solitude or in very small societies, the rudest and most secluded recesses of the desert. ‘We are not destitute of parental consolation, (said the Hermit Abraham to Cassian, who was beginning to sigh after the more agreeable solitudes of Asia and Europe,) nor devoid of means of easy sustenance—were we not bound by the command of our Saviour to forsake all and follow Him. We are able, if it seemed good, to build our cells on the banks of the Nile, instead of bringing our water on our heads from four miles’ distance—were it not, that the Apostle has told us, that “every man shall receive his reward according to his labour.” We know that in these our regions there are some secret and pleasant places, where fruits are abundant, and the beauty and fertility of the gardens would supply our necessities with the slightest toil—were it not that we fear “to receive in our lifetime our good things.” Wherefore we scorn these things, and all the pleasures of this world; and we take delight in these horrors, and prefer the wildness of this desolation, before all that is fair and attractive, admitting no comparison between the luxuriance of the most exuberant soil and the bitterness of these sands*.’

The establishments of the Cœnobites, which were spread from one end of the country to the other, contained, severally, from one hundred to five thousand inhabitants. In some instances, the wall which confined them inclosed also their wells and gardens, and all that was necessary for their sustenance, so as to leave no pretext even for occasional intercourse with a world, which they had deserted for ever. The discipline to which they were subjected was rigid, but neither barbarous nor at all charged with injurious austerities. We read nothing of those chains and collars of iron, which formed a necessary part of self-devotion in the Syrian convents, nor is there any mention of sackcloth or flagellation, or any other voluntary torture. The whole severity of their practice consisted in abstemiousness; but even that was moderate; positive fasting was not encouraged; nor was it thought necessary to macerate the body in order to purify the soul. Bread and water was indeed the only nourishment allowed to the healthy devotee; but the bread was abundantly supplied; and those who have drawn from their infancy the sweet waters of the Nile

* Cassianus, Collationes, lib. xxiv. c. 2. Such passages are illustrated by other writers of the same, or nearly the same age. Among many others, the description of the Egyptian monks by Gregory Nazianzen (in Orat. xxi. *Eis τὸν Μέγαν Ἀθανάσιον*) is perhaps worth citing: *Οἱ κόσμου χωρίζοντες ἑαυτοῦς, καὶ τὴν ἔρημον ἀσπαζόμενοι ζῶσι Θεῷ πάντων μᾶλλον τῶν στεφομένων τῷ σώματι. Οἱ μὲν τὸν παντὴ μοναδικὸν καὶ ἄμικτον διαβλοῦντες βίον ἑαυτοῖς μόνοις προσλαλοῦντες καὶ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον κόσμον εἰδότες ὅσον ἐν τῇ ἔρημίᾳ γνωρίζουσι· οἱ δὲ νόμον ἀγάπης τῇ κοινωμίᾳ στέροντες ἔρημικαί τε ἡμοῦ καὶ μιγάδες, ταῖς μὲν ἄλλοις σέβνηκότες ἀνθρώποις ἄλλήλοις δὲ κόσμος ὄντες, καὶ τῇ παραθέσει τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐθήγοντες.* The same writer describes the character of a true monk with great minuteness and fervor in his XIIth Oration, (*Εἰρηνικός Α, Ἐπὶ τῇ Ἐνάσει τῶν Μοναζόντων.*)

seldom require or seek an artificial beverage. Neither was this rule enforced on all with indiscriminate rigour; but it was frequently modified according to age, or sex, or constitution.

They assembled to prayer twice in the twenty-four hours, at evening and during the night. Twelve psalms were chaunted, (the chaunt had been taught them by an angel,) each of which was followed by a prayer; and then two lessons were read from the Scripture to those who desired to be instructed in that volume. The hearers remained sitting during the greater part of the service, with very short interruptions of genuflexion or prostration. The signal which summoned them to prayer was a simple trumpet or horn; it was sufficient to break the silence of their deserts; and the hour of their night-prayer was indicated by the declining stars, which shine in that cloudless atmosphere with perpetual lustre. The offices of their worship were undisturbed by any sound of worldly care or irreverent levity. Their devotion, like their pyramids, was simple and solid, and they lived like strangers to the flesh and its attributes, like sojourners on earth and citizens of a spiritual community*.

Four objects were comprehended in their profession—solitude, manual labour, fasting, and prayer; and we cannot forbear to observe, how large a portion of their time was devoted to the second. Indeed, so strictly was the necessity of such occupation inculcated, that the moderation of their other duties might almost appear to have been prescribed with that view. A body, debilitated by the excess of fasting or discipline, would have been disqualified for the offices of industry which were performed by the monks of Egypt. Without any possessions, and holding it alike discreditable to beg or to accept †, they earned their daily bread by their skill and diligence in making mats or baskets, as cutlers, as fullers; or as weavers—insomuch, that their houses may seem to have resembled religious manufactories, rather than places consecrated to holy purposes; and the motive of their establishment is liable to the suspicion of being, in some cases at least, worldly and political. Yet in the descriptions of their practice, *both* objects were so united, that the prayer seems to have been inseparable from the labour ‡. To that end, the employments which they chose were easy and sedentary, so that the mind might be free to expatiate, while the hands were in exercise. At the same time, they maintained that perpetual occupation was the only effectual method to prevent distractions, and fix the soul on worthy considerations; that thus alone the tediousness of solitude, and its attendant evils, can be remedied; that the monk who works has only one demon to tempt him, while the monk unoccupied is harassed by demons innumerable §.

The Sarabaites || are described by Cassian in language of violent and almost unmitigated censure. Yet if we neglect those expressions, which

* See Fleury's admirable Eighth Discourse.

† Cassian. Collat. xxiv. s. 11, 12, 13.

‡ Ita ut quid ex quo pendeat haud facile possit a quopiam discerni—i. e. utrum propter meditationem spiritalem incessabiliter manuum opus exerceant; an propter operis jugitatem tam præclarum profectum spiritus, scientiæque lumen acquirant. Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. c. 14.

§ Unde hæc est apud Ægyptum ab antiquis Patribus sancta (al. sancita) sententia—operantem Monachum dæmone uno pulsari; otiosum vero innumeris spiritibus devastari. Cassiani Instit. lib. x. c. 23. It appears from Cassian's preceding chapter, that any superfluity which the monks might have acquired was frequently employed in charitable purposes, and especially in the redemption of captives.

|| The same sect, no doubt, which St. Jerome calls Remoboth, and stigmatizes as 'genus deterrimum atque neglectum.' Epist. xviii. ad Eustochium. De Custodia Virginitatis.

become suspicious through their very rancour, and adhere only to the facts which are mentioned as characteristic of that monastic sect, it appears, that they were seceders, or at least independent, from the Cœnobitical establishments. *The Sarabaites.* They claimed the name of Monks; but without any emulation of their pursuits, or observance of their discipline. They were not subject to the direction of elders, nor did they strive, under traditional institutions, to subject their inclinations to any fixed or legitimate rule. If they publicly renounced the world, it was either to persevere, in their own houses, in their former occupations under the false assumption of the monastic name, or building cells, and calling them monasteries, to dwell there without any abandonment of their secular interests. They laboured indeed with industry at least as sedulous, as their more regular brethren—but they laboured for their own individual profit, not for that of an instituted community*. From this hostile account, it would appear that the Sarabaites, if they were spurious monks, were at least useful members of society; and the union which they established of the religious profession with worldly occupations, seems to have revived, or rather perpetuated, the leading principle of ascetism.

From Egypt, the popular institution was immediately introduced into Syria by a monk named Hilarion; but the Syrians appear *St. Basil.* soon to have deviated from the simplicity and moderation of their masters into a sterner practice of mortification, and even torture. From Syria, it was transmitted to Pontus and the shores of the Black Sea, and there it found a respectable patron, the most eminent among its primitive protectors, Basilus, Archbishop of Cæsarea.

That celebrated ecclesiastic—who was a native of Cappadocia, the brother of Gregory of Nyssa, and the fellow-disciple (as is asserted) of the then future apostate Julian—has given his name to the single order, which has subsisted in the Greek Church †, with scarcely any variation or addition, from that period to the present moment; and it is this circumstance, as well as his superior antiquity, which has established him as the most venerable of the patriarchs of Monachism. His claim to that reputation is said to consist in this—he united the Hermits and Cœnobites already established in his diocese; and to his monasteries, so formed, he prescribed a rule, which was rigidly observed by them, and imitated by others: by this bond, he gave them a consistency and uniformity, which had hitherto been peculiar to the institutions of Egypt ‡. Besides which,

* Cassian. Collat. xviii. c. 7. Cassian's dislike for the Sarabaites was probably contracted in the cells of the Cœnobites, who viewed with a sort of sectarian jealousy the industry and the profits of rebels or of rivals.

† It is true that certain heretical orders, Maronites, Jacobites, Nestorians, &c. professed to follow the rule of St. Anthony; but St. Anthony delivered, in fact, no rule. When solicited to impose some code upon his disciples, he is recorded to have presented to them the Bible—an eternal and universal rule. Hospin. lib. ii. c. 4.

‡ It does not, however, appear, that his rule was in the first instance very generally observed. At least we find, that as much as thirty years later, Cassian (Institut. lib. ii. c. 2.) contrasted the diversity, particularly respecting the times and nature of the holy offices, which prevailed elsewhere, with the uniformity of the more ancient institutions of Egypt. 'In hunc modum diversis in locis diversum canonem agnovimus institutum, totque propemodum typos et regulas vidimus usurpatas, quot etiam monasteria cellasque conspeximus. Sunt quibus.... Quapropter necessarium reor antiquissimam patrum proferre constitutionem quæ nunc usque per totam Egyptum a Dei famulis custoditur,' &c. It is, indeed, the opinion of Hospinian (though it does not seem sufficiently founded), that St. Basil's Cœnobia were little more than theological schools, and that his

he strongly recommended * the obligation of a vow, on admission to the monastic state—an obligation which, whether it were actually established by St. Basil or not, had certainly no existence before his time. These advancements in the system were effected from the years 360 to 370 ; and thus the plant, which had first been nourished by Anthony and Pachomius with imperfect, but not improvident culture, grew up, within the space of twenty years, into vigorous and lasting maturity.

It is a fact demanding observation, that the Fathers of the ancient Church, who flourished about this period, among whom were many eloquent and learned and pious men, were favourable, without one exception, to the establishment of monasticism: for though it might be beneath the office of reason to investigate the motives of the illiterate enthusiasts who began the work, it would be improper to pass over without comment the considerate labours of the ecclesiastics who completed it. Moreover, as they were apt enough to differ on some other points, in which the interests of religion were concerned, and as they delivered, on all occasions, their particular opinions with great boldness and independence, their unanimity in the introduction of one grand innovation is, by that circumstance, still further recommended to our attention. Yet must we hesitate to ascribe to them motives altogether unworthy. We should be wholly mistaken if we were to attribute their conspiracy to any deep design for the establishment of priestly rule, or the increase of the wealth and authority of the Church beyond their just limits. These evil consequences did, indeed, result from the work, and spread, with fatal influence, over the western world ; but they could not be contemplated by the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, because they rose and grew with the growth of *papal* usurpation, of which, in those days, there was no fear nor thought. It was the alliance between papacy and monasticism which tended more, perhaps, than any other cause, to elevate and magnify, and at the same time to vitiate, both. But the eye of Athanasius, or Chrysostom, or Augustin, could not possibly foresee that union, nor penetrate the various circumstances which afterwards concurred to aggrandize the Bishop of Rome. So far may we safely acquit even the most sagacious among the Fathers of monasticism ; and as far as the spirit of the age can be held to excuse those whom, in appearance, it carries along with it, but who, in fact, encourage and influence it, so far may the conduct of those mistaken men be excused. And perhaps we might add, in further palliation, that the general demoralization of society, over which Christian principles were still contending for predominance with the pernicious remnants of paganism, seemed to permit so little hope of righteous conduct to persons busied in the world, as almost to justify retreat and seclusion. We should, moreover, in attempting to account for this agreement, always bear in mind, that the early patrons of monasticism were, with very few exceptions, Orientals or Africans ; men of ardent temperament, and impetuous imagination ; among whom the theory of religion too frequently tended

*Conduct of the
ancient Fathers.*

rule was no other than the ordinary form of school discipline. Such, as he thinks, were the monasteries of those days. Lib. iii. c. 2. The Rule commonly ascribed to that saint may be found, in Latin, in the same place.

* Bingham, Ch. Antiq. book vii. The author of the *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques* expressly asserts, that as monasteries were instituted by Anthony, and congregations by Pachomius, so the three vows (of chastity, poverty, and obedience) were the introduction of St. Basil. It is, at least, certain, that the *duties* of obedience and poverty were early and very rigidly practised by the Eastern monks.

to mysticism, and its practice to mere sensible ceremony, and bodily mortification. We have no reason to believe that any worldly premium to the new philosophy was held out by the princes or nobles of those days; nor even that the influx of oblations from the vulgar was the immediate fruit of the profession of poverty*, as was elsewhere the case in later times. The monasteries of the East were at no period so overgrown with opulence as those of the Roman Church; and in their origin they certainly offered no imaginable temptations to avarice or sensuality. On these and similar considerations, we may acquit the original founders of the monastic system of those odious motives, with which they have sometimes been charged; but we must censure their encouragement of popular superstition; we must condemn that rash enthusiasm, which exceeded what is written; and we must pronounce those to have been insufficient guides to religious knowledge, who, at a crisis of such infinite importance, inculcated any other rule of life, than such as tended directly, through the plain and practical precepts of the Gospel, to the general welfare of mankind.

The earliest age of monachism differed in many particulars from those which matured and perfected the system. The vow of *Early form of Monachism.* Celibacy was either not taken by the original monks, or not universally enforced; though the practice was usual, and held indicative of a higher condition of sanctity. Community of property was indeed established among them; but that property was chiefly acquired by the labour of their hands. The necessity of manual industry, which was coeval with the institution, was subsequently enforced by St. Augustin, as the best safeguard against the snares of the Tempter; and the spiritual motives to strict moral demeanour were encouraged by the absolute poverty of the individuals. Mendicity, which had an early existence in the system, was stigmatized with immediate censure. It does not appear that the primitive monks were positively prohibited by any vow from returning, if they thought fit, to the turbulence of the world; though such desertions were strongly discouraged, as early as the Council of Chalcedon, both by ecclesiastical denunciations, and perpetual exclusion from holy orders. Several restrictions were imposed with respect to admission into the monastic order. Of husbands and wives, the mutual agreement was necessary for the seclusion of either; servants were not admitted, unless with the approbation of their masters, nor children without the consent of their parents and themselves. These and other reasonable impediments to the abuse of monachism were first weakened by the superstitious improvidence of Justinian.

The original monks were, without exception, laymen; but in situations, where the only accessible place of worship was within the walls, one priest was added to the society, and he generally filled the office of Abbot or Hegoumenos. St. Jerome † has expressly distinguished the monastic

* Not that even the earliest monks have escaped the reproaches of the contemporary Fathers. St. Jerome especially (Epist. xxxv., ad Heliodorum Monachum) notices the birth of corruption:—‘Alii nummum addant nummo, et marsupium suffocantes matronarum opes venentur obsequiis; sint ditiores Monachi, quam fuerant sæculares; possideant opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete Diabolo non habuerant; et suspiret eos Ecclesia divites, quos tenuit mundus ante mendicos.’ . . . But notwithstanding this and other particular passages, the general expressions used by those writers respecting the monastic condition, prove its general respectability.

† Epist. V., ad Heliodorum Monachum. ‘Alia Monachorum est causa; alia clericorum. Clerici pascunt oves; ego pascor. Illi de altario vivunt; mihi, quasi infructuosæ arbori, securis ponitur ad radicem, si munus ad altare non defero.’ . . . Mihi antè

from the sacerdotal order; and Leo I., in a communication to Maximus, bishop of Antioch, forbade monks to usurp the office of religious instruction, which was properly confined to the priests of the Lord. It is true, indeed, that, very early in monastic history, those establishments were considered as schools and nurseries for the ministry, and that persons were selected for ordination from among their inhabitants; but those so ordained immediately quitted the cloister, and engaged in the duties of the secular clergy; and in Greece they were distinguished by the title of Hieromonachoi, or Holy Monks*.

There is no doubt, that Orientals are naturally more prone to acts of fanaticism and ascetic austerities, than the more rational, and, at the same time, more sensual nations of Europe; and we might have expected to find the most extraordinary instances of self-

Character of Oriental Monachism.

inflicted torture among those who originated that practice, and whose habits and passions peculiarly prepared them for it. It is uncertain whether this be so; for though it be true that the madness of the Stylites gained no prevalence in the Western Church, and that the Boskoi, or Grazing monks (an Asiatic order of the fifth century, which proposed to unite the soul to the Deity, by degrading the body to a condition below humanity) found no imitators in a more inclement climate; yet their mortifications and absurdities were rivalled, if not in the cells of the Benedictines, at least by the Flagellants, and some other heretics of the fourteenth century; and the discipline of the more rigid Franciscans was probably, in the early ages of that order, as severe as human nature could endure. But even among the regular orders of the Western Church, monastic austerity was carried, under particular circumstances, and in later times, to a more perfect refinement than it ever attained in the East. It is not difficult to account for this singularity. A variety of motives, and a complication of passions, entered into the monkish system of the Roman Church. Many were unquestionably actuated by superstition, many, perhaps, by purer sentiments of piety; but many more were impelled by personal ambition, by professional zeal, by the jealousy of rival orders, and, above all, by the thirst for that wealth, which so certainly followed the reputation of sanctity. On the other hand, the unvarying constitution, and the more tranquil character of the Eastern Church, presented fewer and feebler inducements to excessive severity. The passion which originally founded its monasteries, warm and earnest enthusiasm, continued still to animate and people them; but its ardour gradually abated; and the defect was not supplied in the same abundance, nor by the same sources, which sprang from the rock of St. Peter. From the earliest period, the Head of the Eastern Church was subject to the civil power, and he has always continued so; and thus, as he has at no time asserted any arrogant claims of temporal authority, nor engaged in any contests with the state, he possessed no personal

Presbyterum sedere non licet,' &c. . . . Hospinian, (lib. iii., c. 13), under the head 'Monachi ab initio non Clerici,' adduces strong reason (in spite of some contradictory decrees) to believe that they were permitted to take orders as early as the time of Pope Siricius, in 390; and that all the privileges of the secular priesthood were subsequently conferred on monastic priests, and confirmed by Gregory the Great. Still, as they continued to be bound by their vows, they acquired the clerical, without losing the monastic, character.

* The foundation of an order of Canons, attributed to St. Augustin, (which will presently be mentioned,) was a distinct institution.

or official interest in the aggrandisement of the monastic order. Again, the two grand political revolutions of the Eastern and Western empires produced effects precisely opposite on the condition of monachism in either. The overthrow of the latter by the Pagans of the North, the early conversion of the conquerors, and the subsequent establishment of the feudal system, became the means of enriching the monasteries, from private as well as royal bounty, with vast territorial endowments. Whereas the possessions of the Oriental Church, which, through less favourable circumstances, had already been reduced to more moderate limits, were still further despoiled by the fatal triumph of the Turks.

The institution of nunneries was contemporary with that of monasteries, and is also attributed to St. Anthony; but the earliest accounts incline us to believe that it was not equally flourishing. In countries where sterility is common, and the population either scanty or fluctuating, the government would doubtless discourage the seclusion of females. We learn, too, that their houses were less carefully regulated, and their vows less strictly observed in Asia than in the West of Europe. Athens is mentioned as the nurse of several such establishments; but it was lamented that the ladies of rank and wealth were not easily prevailed upon to devote themselves to religious seclusion. Of a convent which was founded at Constantinople by the Empress Irene (in 1108), the constitutions still remain*. But the Nuns of St. Basil were more numerous and more prosperous in the West, than in the climate of their origin; and in Sicily especially, and the South of Italy, they arrived, in later ages, at considerable wealth and importance †.

The original monastic establishments of every description were subjected, without any exception, to the Bishop of the diocese. The exemptions from that authority, which were afterwards introduced, through the pernicious progress of papacy, into the Western Church, had little prevalence, as, indeed, they had no strong motive, in the East.

SECTION II.

Institution of Monachism in the West.

It is very generally asserted ‡, that the monastic system was introduced into the West by Athanasius, during his compulsory sojourn at Rome, in 341. It is believed, that he carried in his train to the imperial city certain monks and anchorets, representatives of the Egyptian commonwealth, whose wild aspect and devout demeanour moved the reverence, and at the same time roused the emulation, of the Romans. Some monasteries were immediately founded; and many retired to lonely places for the exercise of solitary worship. From Rome, (if the above account be true,)

* *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, (Prem. Partie, Chap. xxviii.) By a regulation peculiarly oriental, it was herein ordained, that the steward, the confessor, and the two chaplains, the only males employed about the convent, should be eunuchs. We do not learn whether this precaution was usual in the nunneries of the East.

† Another class of religious females, called Virgins of the Church, had an early existence in the East. They continued to unite the discharge of their social duties with a strict profession of religious chastity—thus advancing one step beyond the *ascetism* of their forefathers.

‡ Baronius, (ann. 328), Mabillon, and Gibbon hold this opinion; but Muratori pretends that the first monasteries founded in Italy were erected at Milan. Mosheim more wisely pronounces the uncertainty of the fact.

the monastic practice was instantly diffused throughout Italy; and at Milan especially, it obtained a powerful support in the patronage of Ambrose. It speedily extended itself to France; and the labours of Martin of Tours, which were zealously directed to its diffusion, received at least this posthumous recompense, that nearly two thousand holy disciples assembled to do honour to his obsequies. The establishments, founded by Cassian at Marseilles, and in the neighbouring islands, were immediately thronged with brethren obedient to his Rule; and Honoratus, bishop of Arles, bears testimony (about the year 430) to the existence of ‘religious old men in the isle of Lerinus, who lived in separate cells, and represented in Gaul the Fathers of Egypt*.’

We may here observe, that, as in the wide wildernesses of the East, a secluded rock, or an unfrequented oasis—a spot cut off by the circumfluous Nile, or breaking the influx of the river into the sea—as such were the places usually selected by the original recluses, so their earliest imitators in the West, under different circumstances of soil and climate, adhered to the ancient preference for insular retirement. The islands of Dalmatia †, and others scattered along the coasts of the Adriatic, were peopled with holy inhabitants. Along the western shores of Italy ‡,

* The following are some of the passages which bear on this subject. St. Jerome, speaking of the time of Athanasius’s visit to Rome, says, (in Epist. 16, ad Principiam Virginem,) ‘Nulla eo tempore nobilium fœminarum noverat Romæ propositum Monachorum, nec audebat, propter rei novitatem, ignominiosum (ut tunc putabatur) et vile in populis nomen assumere. Hæc (Marcella) ab Alexandrinis prius sacerdotibus Papaque Athanasio, et postea Petro, . . . vitam B. Antonii adhuc tunc viventis, Monasteriorumque in Thebaide Pachumii et Virginum ac Viduarum didicit disciplinam, nec erubuit profiteri quod Christo placere agnoverat.’ Soon afterwards, when Jerome was at Rome, ‘fuerunt tam crebra Virginum Monacharumque innumerabilis multitudo, ut pia frequentia serventium Deo, quod prius ignominia fuerat, esset postea gloria.’ So also Augustin (De Morib. Eccles. c. 33) ‘Romæ etiam plura Monasteria cognovit, in quibus singuli gravitate atque prudentia et divina scientia pollentes, cæteris secum habitantibus præerant Christiana caritate, sanctitate et libertate viventibus.’ And the same Father (Confess., lib. viii. c. 6) attests, on the authority of one Pontitianus, that there existed at Milan ‘Monasterium plenum bonis Fratribus, extra urbis mœnia sub Ambrosio nutritore.’ Sulp. Severus mentions the success of St. Martin to have been so great, ‘ut ad exequias ejus monachorum fere duo millia convenisse dicantur. Specialis Martini gloria, cujus exemplo in Domini servitute stirpe tanta fructificaverat.’ . . .

† Jerome, Epist. xxxv., ad Heliodorum. ‘Quumque crederet quotidie aut ad Ægypti Monasteria pergere, aut Mesopotamiæ invisere choras, aut certe insularum Dalmatiæ solitudines occupare,’ &c.

‡ See Marsham’s *Προσφυλαϊον*, in Dugd. Monast. Respecting the monks of the isles of Gorgonia and Capraria, Rutilius Numatianus composed some verses, (in the year 416,) which have more of elegance (says Marsham) than of Christianity. The following are some of them:—

Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit;
Squallet lucifugis Insula plena viris.
Ipsi se Monachos Graio cognomine dicunt,
Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt.
Munera fortunæ metuunt, dum damna verentur.
Quisquam sponte miser, ne miser esse queat?
Sive suas repetunt ex fato ergastula pœnas;
Tristia seu nigro viscera felle tument.

Noster enim nuper Juvenis, majoribus amplis,
Nec censu inferior, conjugiove minor,
Impulsus furiis homines Divosque relinquit,
Et turpem latebram credulus exul agit.
Infelix putat illuvie cœlestia pasci,
Seque premit cæcis sævior ipse Deis.
Num, rogo, deterior Circæis secta venenis?
Tunc mutabantur corpora, nunc animi.

from Calabria, throughout the islets of the Tuscan Sea, the chaunts of monastic devotion everywhere resounded, as well as at Lerinus and the Stœchades, consecrated by the piety of Cassian. Such, in the first instance, were the favourite nurseries of the new institution. There is even reason to believe, that the rocks on the southern coast of Italy furnished the seeds of monachism to the churches of Carthage; and thus was transmitted, after the revolution of half a century, to the more Western Africans, the boon which their brethren of Egypt had first presented to the Christian world.

It is, indeed, unquestionable, that towards the end of the fourth, but especially during the fifth century, the monastic practice obtained universal prevalence, and became almost co-extensive with the belief in Christ. And on this circumstance there is one observation which it is proper to offer, which has indeed been made before, though in a somewhat different spirit, by Roman Catholic writers—that the period, which was marked by this great religious innovation, was the same in which the religion itself seemed in imminent danger, at least throughout the Western provinces, of utter extirpation. This was the very crisis in which the pagan inundation from the North spread itself most fiercely and fatally, and while it overthrew the bulwarks of the empire, menaced, at the same time, the foundations of the Faith. That the monastic institution was designedly interposed by Providence, in order to stay that wasting calamity, and supply new means of defence to His fainting soldiers, is a vain and even a presumptuous supposition. But it would equally be unjust to assert, that establishments of pious men, associated for religious purposes, were without their use in exciting respect in the enemy, and confidence in the Christian. Still less can we hesitate to believe, that they were the means of relieving much individual misery; that during the overthrow of justice and humanity, they derived power, as well as protection, from the name of God, and from the trust which they reposed in him; that their power was generally exerted for good purposes; and that their gates were thrown open to multitudes, who, in those days of universal desolation, could hope for no other refuge.

The rule commonly professed by the original Western monasteries was unquestionably that of St. Basil; and though it was not observed with any rigid uniformity, there was probably no material variation either in constitution or discipline throughout the whole extent of Christendom, excepting such as naturally resulted from the different climate, morals, and temperament of its inhabitants. At least, there was no distinction in order or dignity: all were united by one common appellation, extending from the deserts of Pontus to the green valleys of Ireland; and the monks of those days were sufficiently separated from the rest of mankind, and sufficiently disengaged from secular pursuits, to dispense with the baser

Many other islands are mentioned as having been thus consecrated, (or desecrated—as the describer might be an ecclesiastical annalist, or a pagan poet). The island Barbara, situated above the conflux of the Rhone and the Arar, boasted to have been one of the most ancient nurseries of the Holy Institution; and Jerome, in an epistle to Heliodorus, speaks of ‘*Insulas et totum Etruscum mare Volscorumque provinciam, et reconditos curvorum littorum sinus, in quibus monachorum consistebant Chori.*’ . . . See Mabillon, Pref. in Ann. Bened. Sæc. i. Giannone’s View of the Origin of the Monastic Life in the West (Stor. di Nap., lib. ii., cap. 8.) does not appear to be marked by the accuracy and perspicuity usual to that excellent historian.

motives to which they were afterwards reduced, of partial interest and rivalry. Some wealth, indeed, began already to flow into that channel; but the still remaining prevalence of hermits, who dwelt among the mountains in unsocial and independent seclusion, very clearly proves, that the more attractive system of the Cœnobites had not hitherto attained any luxurious refinement. No large territorial endowments had yet been attached to religious houses, and their support was chiefly derived from individual charity or superstition. And during the course of the fifth century the progression of monachism was probably more popular, and certainly more profitable, among Eastern nations, than it had yet become on this side of the Adriatic.

But in the following age a more determined character was given to that profession. A hermit named Benedict, a native of Nursia in the diocese of Rome, instituted, *Benedict of Nursia*, about the year 529, an entirely new order, and imposed a rule, which is still extant, for its perpetual observance. . . No permanent and popular institution has ever yet existed, however in its abuse it have set sense and reason at defiance, which has not some pretension to virtue or wisdom, and usually much of the substance of both, in its origin and its infancy. It was thus with the order of St. Benedict. That celebrated rule, which in after ages enslaved the devout and demoralized the Church—which became a sign and a watchword for the satellites of Papacy—was designed for purposes which, at the time of its promulgation, might seem truly Christian. Its objects were to form a monastic body, which under a milder discipline should possess a more solid establishment and more regular manners, than such as then existed; and also to ensure for those, who should become members of it, a holy and peaceful life, so divided between prayer, and study, and labour, as to comprehend the practical duties of religious education. Such was the simple foundation, on which all the riches, and luxury, and power, and profligacy of the Benedictines have been unnaturally piled up—consequences, which were entirely unforeseen by him who founded, and by those who immediately embraced, and by those who first protected*, a pious and useful institution.

It is proper to confirm these observations by some account of what is, perhaps, the most celebrated monument of ecclesiastical antiquity. The Rule of St. Benedict † is introduced by a quadruple division of those who professed the monastic life. The first class was composed of the Cœnobites or Regular Monks; the second, of the Anchores or Hermits, to whom he assigns even superior perfection; the third, of the Sarabaites, whom he describes as living without any rule, either alone or in small societies, according to their inclination; the fourth, of Gyrovagi or Vagabonds, a dissolute and degraded body. His regulations for the divine offices were formed, in a great measure, on the practice already described of the Monks of Egypt. Two hours after midnight they were aroused to vigils, on which occasion twelve psalms were chaunted, and certain lessons from the Scriptures read or recited. At day-break the matins, a service little differing from the preceding, were performed;

* Gregory the Great was a zealous patron of this institution, and so approved the moderation of the rule, that he has not escaped the suspicion of being its author.

† It is given at length by Hospinian.—*De Origine Monachatus*, lib. iv. cap. v.

‡ See Mabillon, *Pref. in sec. II. Annal. Benedict. and Hist. des Ord. Monast.*

and the intervening space, which in winter was long and tedious, was employed in learning the Psalms by heart*, or in meditating on their sense, or in some other necessary study. But besides these and the other public services, the duty of private or mental prayer was recognized in the Institutions of St. Benedict, and regulations were imposed which, while they restricted its duration, proposed to purify and spiritualize its character.

To the duty of prayer the holy legislator added those of manual labour and reading. The summer's day was so divided, that seven hours were destined to the former occupation, and two at least to the latter †. And should it so happen, (he observes,) that his disciples be compelled to gather their harvests with their own hands, let not that be any matter of complaint with them; since it is then that they are indeed monks, when they live by their own handy-work, as did our fathers and the apostles. During the winter season the hours of labour were altered, but not abridged; and those of study seem to have been somewhat increased, at least during Lent. The sabbath was entirely devoted to reading and prayer. Those whose work was allotted at places too remote from the Monastery to admit of their return to the appointed services, bent their knees on the spot and repeated their prayers at the canonical hours. The description of labour was not left to the choice of the individual, but imposed by the Superior. Thus if any possessed any trade or craft, he could not exercise it, except by permission of the Abbot. If anything were sold, the whole value was carefully appropriated to the common fund; and it was further directed, that the price should be somewhat lower than that demanded by secular artizans for the same objects—'to the end that God might be glorified in all things.'

In respect to abstinence ‡, the Rule of St. Benedict ordained not any of those pernicious austerities, which were sometimes practised by his followers. Notwithstanding the indulgence of a small quantity of wine to those whose imperfect nature might require it, it prescribed a system of rigid temperance, which among those original Cœnobites was well enforced by their poverty—but it contains no injunction of fasting or mortification. Those vain and superstitious practices, the fruits of mingled enthusiasm and indolence, scarcely gained any prevalence in the monasteries of the West, until increasing wealth dispensed with the necessity of daily labour. The monks slept in the same dormitory, in which a lamp was kept constantly burning, and strict silence was imposed. Even in the day, they spake rarely; and every expression partaking of levity, and calculated at all to disturb the seriousness of the community—every word that was irrelevant to its objects and uses—was absolutely prohibited within the convent walls. The Rule makes no mention of any

* In England the establishment of Monachism was contemporary with that of Christianity. 'Augustinus, Monasterii Regulis eruditus, instituit conversationem, quæ initio nascentis ecclesiæ fuit patribus nostris, quibus omnia erant communia—Monasterium fecit non longe a Doroverniensi Civitate, &c.' Bede, lib. i. c. xxii.

† It was ordained, that if any one were unable to read or meditate, some other occupation should be imposed on him. But as Latin, the language of religious study, was at that time the vulgar tongue, at least one great impediment to religious instruction, which was so powerful in after ages, did not then exist.

‡ In this matter St. Benedict relaxed from the rigour of the Eastern observance; but he did so with reluctance, regretting the necessary imperfection of a system, which he was compelled to accommodate to the gradually decreasing vigour of the human frame. Even Fleury (see his Eighth Discourse) does not disdain to combat this notion.

sort of recreation ; but it enjoins that, every evening after supper, while the brothers are still assembled, one among them shall read aloud passages from the Lives of the Saints, or some other book of edification.

As the Abbot was then chosen by the whole society without regard to any other consideration than personal merit, so in the government of the monastery he was bound to consult the senior brethren on lesser matters, and the whole body on the more important contingencies—it was ordained, however, that after he had taken such counsel, the final decision should rest entirely with himself. Obedience was the vow and obligation of the others.

The form prescribed for the reception of Novices was not such as to encourage a lukewarm candidate. In the first instance, he was compelled to stand for four or five days before the gates, supplicating only for admission. If he persevered, he was received first into the Chamber of Strangers—then into that of Novices. An ancient brother was then commissioned to examine his vocation, and explain to him how rude and difficult was the path to heaven. After a probation of two months the Rule was read to him ; again, after six other months ; and a third time, at the end of the year. If he still persisted, he was received, and made profession in the Oratory before the whole community. And we should remark, that that profession was confined to three subjects—perseverance in the monastic life ; correction of moral delinquencies ; and obedience*. Offences committed by the brethren were punished, according to their enormity, by censure, excommunication, or corporal inflictions ; expulsion was reserved for those deemed incorrigible. Nevertheless even then the gate was not closed against repentance ; and the repudiated member was re-admitted, on the promise of amendment, even for the third time. . . . Such in substance was the Rule of St. Benedict ; and even the very faint delineation here presented may suffice to give some insight into the real character of the original monasteries. Perhaps too it may serve to allay the bitterness, which we sometimes are too apt to entertain against the founders and advocates of the system, by showing, that though unscriptural in its principle and pernicious in its abuse, it was yet instituted not without some wisdom and foresight ; and was calculated to confer no inconsiderable blessings on those ages in which it first arose.

The monastery of Monte Cassino, which became afterwards so celebrated in Papal History, was the noblest, though not perhaps the earliest, monument *Progress of the Institution.* of St. Benedict's exertions. The moment was favourable to his undertaking ; and his name and his Rule were presently adopted and obeyed throughout the greater part of Italy. By St. Maur, his disciple and associate, an institution on the same principle was immediately † introduced into France, and became the fruitful parent of dependent establishments. Somewhat later in the same century, St. Columban propounded in Britain a rule resembling in many respects that of St. Benedict, but surpassing it in severity ; and it was propagated with some success on the Continent. But it is the opinion of the most learned writers, that the monasteries, which at first followed it, yielded

* All those ancient brothers were laymen. It does not appear that even St. Benedict himself held any rank in the clergy.

† About the year 542. It was destroyed by the Danes, but subsequently re-established about the year 934, by the Bishop of Limoges. A great number of abbeys presently grew up under its shadow.—*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques.*

after no long interval to the higher authority and more practicable precepts of the Nursian; whose genuine institution indeed was soon afterwards planted in the south of the island by the monk Augustine. At the same time the same system was spreading northward beyond the mountains of the Rhine; and though it may probably be true, that the 'Holy Rule' (*regula sancta*) was not universally received until the ninth century—until the practice had been vitiated by many corruptions—it is evident, that it obtained great prevalence long before that time, while it yet retained its original integrity; and it is equally clear, that its moral operation upon a lawless and bloodthirsty generation could not possibly be any other, than to restrain and to humanize.

During the greater part of the seventh and the beginning of the following age, frightful ravages were committed by the Lombards in Italy, and by the Danes in France and Britain, against which even the sanctity of the monastic profession furnished very insufficient protection. Throughout this period of devastation, while all other laws and establishments were overthrown, it was not probable that even those of St. Benedict should remain inviolate. The monastery of Monte Cassino was destroyed about fifty years after its foundation, and the holy spot remained desolate for almost a century and a half*. And though the respectable fugitives found an asylum at Rome, where the discipline was perpetuated in security, during that long period of persecution, others were less fortunate; and even in those which escaped destruction a more relaxed observance naturally gained ground, in the midst of universal licentiousness. Accordingly we learn, that, towards the end of the eighth century, the order of St. Benedict had so far degenerated from its pristine purity, that a thorough reform, if not an entire reconstruction, of the system was deemed necessary for the dignity and welfare of the Church.

The individual to whom this honourable office was destined, was also named Benedict; he was descended from a powerful Gothic family, and a native of Aniane in the diocese of Montpellier. Born about the year 750, he devoted his early life to religious austerities, exceeding not only the practice of his brethren, but the instruction of the founder. The Rule of St. Benedict was formed, in his opinion, for invalids and novices; and he strove to regulate his discipline after the sublimer models of Basil and Pachomius. Presently he was chosen to preside over his monastery; but in disgust, as is reported, at the inadequate practice of his subjects, he retired to Aniane, and there laid the foundation of a new and more rigid institution. The people revered his sanctity and crowded to his cell; the native nobles assisted him in the construction of a magnificent edifice; and endowments of land were soon conferred upon the humble Reformer of Aniane. Moreover, as he enhanced the fame of his austerities by the practice of charity and universal benevolence †, his venerable name deserved the celebrity which it so rapidly acquired. His Ascetic

* See Leo Ostiensis. *Chron. Cassinens*, lib. i. Gregory III. restored the monastery, and Zachary his successor granted to it (about the year 743) the privilege of exclusive dependence on the Bishop of Rome. But one blessing was still wanting to secure its prosperity—and that was happily supplied by the Abbot Desiderius in 1066. In exploring some ruins about the edifice, he discovered the body of St. Benedict! It is true that a pope was soon found to pronounce the genuineness of the relic. Nevertheless the fact was long and malevolently disputed by rival impostors.

† Besides the general mention of his profuse donations to the poor, it is particularly related respecting this Benedict, that whenever an estate was made over to him, he invariably emancipated all the serfs which he found on it. *Act. SS. Benedict.*, tom. v.

disciples were eagerly sought after by other monasteries, as models and instruments for the restoration of discipline; and as the policy of Charlemagne concurred with the general inclination to improvement, the decaying system was restored and fortified by a bold and effectual reformation.

When Benedict of Aniane undertook to establish a system, he found it prudent to relax from that extreme austerity, which as a simple monk he had both professed and practised. As his youthful enthusiasm abated, he became gradually convinced, that the rule of the Nursian Hermit was as severe as the common infirmities of human nature could endure*. He was therefore contented to revive that Rule, or rather to enforce its observance; and the part which he peculiarly pressed on the practice of his disciples, was the obligation of manual labour. To the neglect of that essential portion of monastic discipline the successive corruptions of the system are with truth attributed; and the regulations, which were adopted by the Reformer of Aniane, were confirmed (in 817) by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle. From this epoch † we may date the renovation of the Benedictine Order; and though, even in that age, it was grown perhaps too rich to adhere very closely to its ancient observance, yet the sons whom it nourished may nevertheless be accounted, without any exaggeration of their merits, among the most industrious, the most learned, and the most pious of their own generation.

It is not our intention to trace the numberless branches ‡ which sprang from the stem of St. Benedict, and overshadowed the surface of Europe. But there are three at least among them, which, by their frequent mention in ecclesiastical history, demand a separate notice,—the Order of Cluni, the Cistercian Order, and that of the Chartreux. The monastery of Corbie, also of great renown, was founded by Charlemagne for the spiritual subjugation of Saxony; but it is no way distinguished from the regular Benedictine institutions, than by its greater celebrity.

During the ninth century, the rapid incursions of the Normans, and the downward progress of corruption, once more reduced the level of monastic sanctity; and a fresh *The Order of Cluni.* impulse became necessary to restore the excellence and save the reputation of the system. The method of reformation was, on this occasion, somewhat different from that previously adopted.

* The duty of silence was very generally enjoined in monastic institutions. In the Rule of 'The Brethren of the Holy Trinity,' established by Innocent III., we observe for instance—'Silentium observant semper in Ecclesia sua, semper in Refectorio, semper in Dormitorio,'—and even on the most necessary occasions for conversation the monks were instructed to speak remissa voce, humiliter, et honeste.—See Dugdale, vol. ii. p. 830.

† It would not appear that these changes very much influenced the condition of monachism in England. The three great reformations in that system which took place in our church were, (1) that of Archbishop Cuthbert, in the year 747; (2) that of Dunstan, in 965, promulgated in the Council of Winchester, on which occasion the general constitution, entitled,—*Regula Concordiæ Anglicæ Nationis*,—was for the first time prescribed. It was founded partly on the Rule of St. Benedict, partly on ancient customs. (3) That of Lanfranc, in 1075, authorised by the Council of London, and founded on the same principle as the second. . . . Mabillon, a zealous advocate and an acute critic, sufficiently shows from John the Deacon, (who wrote the Life of Gregory the Great in 875,) that the Rule of St. Benedict was received in England before the second of those reformations. Our allusions to the ecclesiastical history of England are thus rare and incidental, because that Church is intended, we believe, to form the subject of a separate work.

‡ Such as the Camaldulenses, Sylvestrini, Grandimontenses, Præmonstratenses, the Monks of Valombrosa, and a multitude of others.

A separate order was established, derived indeed immediately from the stock of St. Benedict, yet claiming, as it were, a specific distinction and character—it was the order of Cluni. It was founded about the year 900, in the district of Maçon, in Burgundy, by William, duke of Aquitaine; but the praise of perfecting it is rather due to the abbot, St. Odo. It commenced, as usual, by a strict imitation of ancient excellence, a rigid profession of poverty, of industry, and of piety; and it declined, according to the usual course of human institutions, through wealth, into indolence and luxury. In the space of about two centuries it fell into obscurity; and after the name of Peter the Venerable (the contemporary of St. Bernard), no eminent ecclesiastic is mentioned as having issued from its discipline. Besides the riches, which had rewarded and spoiled its original purity, another cause is mentioned as having contributed to its decline—the corruption of the simple Rule of St. Benedict, by the multiplication of vocal prayers, and the substitution of new offices and ceremonies for the manual labour of former days. The ill effect of that change was indeed admitted by the venerable Abbot in his answer to St. Bernard.

But in the mean time, during the long period of its prosperity, the order of Cluni had reached the highest point of honourable reputation; insomuch that during the eleventh century, a bishop of Ostia (the future Urban II.) being officially present at a council in Germany, suppressed in his signature his episcopal dignity, and thought that he adopted a prouder title, when he subscribed himself ‘*Monk of Cluni*, and Legate of Pope Gregory*.’ Those two names were well associated; for it was indeed within the walls of Cluni, that Hildebrand fed his youthful spirit on those dreams of universal dominion, which he afterwards attempted to realize: it was there, too, that he may have meditated those vast crusading projects which were accomplished by Urban, his disciple. But however that may be, the cloister from which he had emerged to change the destinies of Christendom, and the discipline which had formed him (as some might think) to such generous enterprises, acquired a reflected splendour from his celebrity; and since the same institution was also praised for its zealous and active orthodoxy, and its devotion to the throne of St. Peter, shall we wonder that it flourished far and wide in power and opulence; and that it numbered, in the following age, above two thousand monasteries, which followed its appointed Rule and its adopted principles? Yet is there a sorrowful reflection which attends the spectacle of this prosperity. Through all the parade of wealth and dignity, we penetrate the melancholy truth, that the season of monastic virtue and monastic utility was passing by, if indeed it was not already passed irrevocably; and we remark how rapidly the close embrace of the pontifical power was converting to evil the rational principles and pious purposes of the original institution.

Howbeit, we do not read that any flagrant immoralities had yet disgraced the establishment of Cluni. Only it had attained a degree of sumptuous refinement very far removed from its first profession. This degeneracy furnished a reason for the creation of a new and rival community in its neighbourhood. The Cistercian order was founded in 1098 †,

* See Hist. Litter. de la France, Vie Urban II.

† Anno milleno, centeno, bis minus uno,
Pontifice Urbano, Francorum Rege Philippo,

and very soon received the pontifical confirmation. In its origin it successfully contrasted its laborious poverty and much show of Christian humility with the lordly opulence of Cluni; and in its progress, it pursued its predecessor through the accustomed circle of austerity, wealth, and corruption. This Institution was peculiarly favoured from its very foundation; since it possessed, among its earliest treasures, the virtues and celebrity of St. Bernard. One of the first of the Cistercian monks, [that venerated ecclesiastic established, in 1115, the dependent abbey of Clairvaux, over which he long presided; and such was his success in propagating the Cistercian order, that he has sometimes been erroneously considered as its founder. The zeal of his pupils, aided by the authority of his fame, completed the work transmitted to them; and with so much eagerness were the monasteries of the Citeaux filled and endowed, that, before the year 1250, that order yielded nothing, in the number and importance of its dependencies, to its rival of Cluni. Both spread with almost equal prevalence over every province in Christendom; and the colonies long continued to acknowledge the supremacy of the mother monastery. But the Citeaux was less fortunate in the duration of its authority, and the union of its societies. About the year 1350, some confusion grew up amongst them, arising first from their corruptions, and next from the obstruction of all endeavours to reform them. At the end of that century, they were involved in the grand schism of the Catholic church, and thus became still further alienated from each other; till at length, about the year 1500, they broke up (first in Spain, and then in Tuscany and Lombardy) into separate and independent establishments.

St. Bruno, with a few companions, established a residence at the Chartreuse, in the summer of 1084: the usual duties of labour, temperance, and prayer were enjoined with more perhaps than the usual severity*. But this community did not immediately rise into any great eminence; it was long governed by Priors, subject to the bishop of Grenoble; and its founder died (in 1101) in a Calabrian monastery. Nearly fifty years after its foundation, its statutes were written by a Prior, named Guignes †, who presided over it for eighteen years. By the faithful

Burgundis Odone duce et fundamina dante,

Sub Patre Roberto cœpit Cistercius Ordo.—Pagi, Vit. Urban II., sect. 73. The date of another celebrated Institution, which we have no space to notice, has been similarly (though less artificially) recorded:—

Anno milleno, centeno, bis quoque deno

Sub Patre Norberto Præmonstratensis viget Ordo.

Norbert was archbishop of Magdeburg, and in great repute with Innocent II. The site of the monastery was præmonstrated by a vision—hence the name. The rule was that of St. Augustine; the Brethren were confirmed by Calixtus II., under the designation of *Canonici Regulares Exempti*; and they spread to the extremities of the east, and the west.—Hospin. lib. v. c. xii.

* The earliest Cistercians, under Alberic, who died in 1109, affected a rigid imitation of the Rule of St. Benedict. They refused all donations of churches and altars, oblations and tithes. It appeared not (they said) that in the ancient quadripartite division the Monasteries had any share—for this reason, that they had lands and cattle, whence they could live by work. They avoided cities and populous districts; but professed their willingness to accept the endowment of any remote or waste lands, or of vineyards, meadows, woods, waters (for mills and fishing), as well as horses and cattle. Their only addition to the old rule was that of lay brothers and hired servants.—Frères Convers Laiques.

† Fleury, H. E. l. 67, s. 58. From these statutes it appears, that from September to Easter the monks were allowed only one meal a day; that they drank no pure wine; that fish might not be purchased except for the sick; that no superfluous gold or silver was permitted at the service of the altar; that the use of medicine was discouraged; but

observance of those statutes, though in its commencement far outstripped by its Cistercian competitors, it gradually rose into honourable notoriety; and at length, about the year 1178, its rule was sanctioned by the approbation of Alexander III. From this event, its existence as a separate order in the church is properly to be dated; and henceforward it went forth from its wild and desolate birth-place, and spread its fruitful branches over the gardens and vineyards of Europe. The rise of the Chartreux gave fresh cause for emulation to their brethren of older establishment; and the rivalry thus excited and maintained by these repeated innovations, if it caused much professional jealousy and doubtless some personal animosity, furnished the only resource by which the monastic system could have been brought to preserve even the semblance of its original practice. Still it should be remarked, that these successive additions to the fraternity implied no contempt of the institutions of antiquity: they made no profession of novelty, or of any improvement upon pristine observances; on the contrary, the more modern orders all claimed, as they respectively started into existence, the authority and the name of St. Benedict. The monk of Cluni, the Cistercian, the Carthusian, were alike Benedictines; and the more rigid the reform which they severally boasted to introduce, and the nearer their approximation to the earliest practice, the better were their pretensions founded to a legitimate descent from the Western Patriarch.

The rules of the reformed orders invariably inculcated the performance of manual labour; and the neglect of that *Institution of Lay Brethren.* injunction invariably led to their corruption. But an alteration had been effected in the general constitution of the body, which alone precluded any faithful emulation of the immediate disciples of St. Benedict. As late as the eleventh age the monks were for the most part laymen; and they performed all the servile offices of the establishment with their own hands. But in the year 1040, St. John of Gualbert introduced into his monastery of Vallombrosa a distinction which was fatal to the integrity of former discipline. He divided those of his obedience into two classes—lay brethren and brethren of the choir; and while the spiritual and intellectual duties of the intitution were more particularly enjoined to the latter, the whole bodily labour, whether domestic or agricultural, was imposed upon their lay associates*. Thenceforward the Monks (for the higher class began to appropriate that name) became entirely composed either of clerks, or of persons destined for holy orders; the religious offices were celebrated and chiefly attended by them; while the servant was commanded to repeat his *pater* without suspending his work, and presented with a chaplet for the numbering of the canonical hours. A reason was advanced for this change; and had not a much stronger been afforded by the inordinate accumulation of wealth, it might have seemed perhaps

that, to compensate for that prohibition, the monks were bled five times a year. It is proper to add, that during the same period they were permitted to shave only six times.

Some statutes of this order are given by Dugdale, *Monast.* vol. i. p. 951. Among them we observe a strict injunction to manual labour:—

Nunc lege, nunc ora, nunc cum fervore labora;

Sic erit hora brevis, et labor ille levis.

* In the *Ordres Monastiques*, p. iv. c. 18, two sorts of laymen are mentioned as living in French monasteries: (1) Such as gave themselves over as slaves to the establishment, and were called Oblats or Donnés. (2) Such as were recommended for support to monasteries of royal foundation by the king. But neither of these classes were, properly speaking, lay brethren.

not unsatisfactory. In earlier ages, Latin, the language of prayer, was also the vulgar tongue of all western Christians; but as that grew into disuse, and became the object of study, instead of the vehicle of conversation, the greater part of the laity were unable to comprehend the offices of the church. Accordingly it was deemed necessary to distinguish between the educated and the wholly illiterate brethren; and, in pursuance of the principle, which then prevailed, of confining all learning to the sacred profession, the former were raised to the enjoyment of leisure and authority, the latter condemned to ignorance and servitude. This distinction, being earlier than the foundation of the Cistercian, Carthusian, and all subsequent orders, was admitted at once into their original constitution; and therefore, however closely they might affect to imitate the most ancient models, there existed, from the very commencement, one essential peculiarity, in which they deviated from it.

According to the oldest practice, every monastery was governed by an abbot, chosen by the monks from their own body, and ordained and instituted by the bishop of *Papal Exemptions*. the diocess. To the superintending authority of the same the abbot was also subject; and thus abuses and contentions were readily repressed by the presence of a resident inspector. But when, in the progress of papal usurpation, those establishments were *exempted* from episcopal jurisdiction, and placed under the exclusive regulation of the Vatican, the facilities for corruption were multiplied; and a number of evils were created, which escaped the observation or correction of a distant and indulgent master. At the same time, the effect of this connexion was to infuse an entirely new spirit into the monastic system. Avarice, and especially ambition, took the place of those pious motives which certainly predominated in earlier days. The inmates of the cloister were associated in the grand schemes of the pontifical policy; they became its necessary and most obsequious instruments; they were exalted by its success,—they were stained by its vices: and the successive reformations, which professed to renovate the declining fabric, were only vain attempts to restore its ancient character. They could at best only expect to repair its outward front, and replace the symbols of its former sanctity; the spirit, by which it had been really blessed and consecrated, was already departed from it.

Great complaints respecting monastic corruption were uttered both at the Council of Paris in 1212, and at that of the Lateran, which met three years afterwards. But, though some vigorous attempts were, on both those occasions, made to repress it, the counteracting causes were too powerful; and the evil continued to extend and become more poisonous during the times which followed. It is singular that, at the second of those councils, it was proclaimed as a great evil in the system, that new orders were too commonly established, and the forms of monasticism multiplied with a dangerous fertility. And therefore, 'lest their too great diversity should introduce confusion into the Church,' it was enacted that their future creation should be discouraged. This is considered by some Catholic writers to have been a provident regulation; since the jealousy among the rival congregations had by this time degenerated from pious emulation (if it ever possessed that character) into a mere conflict of evil passions. But whatever may have been the policy of the statute, it was at least treated in the observance with such peculiar contempt, that the institution of the Mendicants, the boldest of all the innovations in the annals of monachism, took place almost immediately afterwards.

SECTION III.

Canons Regular and Secular.

The order of monks was originally so widely distinct from that of clerks, that there were seldom found more than one or two ecclesiastics in any ancient convent. But presently, in the growing prevalence of the monastic life, persons ordained, or destined to the sacred profession, formed societies on similar principles; and as they were bound, though with less severity, by certain fixed canons, they were called, in process of time, *Canonici* *. The bishop of the diocese was their abbot and president. It is recorded that St. Augustine set the example of living with his clergy in one society, with community of property, according to the canons of the church; but he prescribed to them no vow, nor any other statutes for their observance, except such instructions as are found in his 109th Epistle †. Nevertheless, above a hundred and fifty religious congregations have in succeeding ages professed his rule and claimed his parentage, and assumed, with such slight pretensions, the authority of his venerable name. The true origin of the order is a subject of much uncertainty. Onuphrius, in his letter to Platina, asserts that it was instituted by Gelasius at Rome, about 495 ‡, and that it passed thence into other churches; and Dugdale appears to acquiesce in this opinion. It is, moreover, certain, that Chrodegangus, Bishop of Metz, prescribed a rule, about the year 750, to the Canons of his own reformation; and that he made some efforts, though not perhaps very effectually, to extend it more widely. Still some are not persuaded that societies of clerks were subject to one specified form of discipline, till the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle §, under the direction of Louis le Debonnaire, confirmed and completed the previous enactments of Mayence (in 813), and imposed on them one general and perpetual rule.

The plausible principle on which the order of canons was founded, to withdraw from the contagion of the world those who had peculiarly devoted themselves to the service of God, was found insufficient to preserve them from degeneracy. A division was early introduced (in Germany, according to Trithemius, and in the year 977), by which the reformed were separated from the unreformed members of the community, in name as well as in deed. The former, from their return to the original rule, assumed the appellation of Canons-Regular; the latter, who adhered to the abuse, were termed, in contradistinction, Canons-Secular; and this sort of schism extended to other countries, and became permanent in many.

* The term Canon originally included not only all professors of the monastic life, but the very Hierodules and inferior officers of the Church. Mosheim (on the authority of Le Bœuf, *Mémoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, vol. i. p. 174.) asserts that it became peculiar to clerical monks (*Fratres Dominicis*) soon after the middle of the eighth century. But we should rather collect from the *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, that the distinction was not generally established till the eleventh age.

† It should be observed, that this epistle, which is cited by ecclesiastical writers as containing instructions for an institution of Canons, was in fact addressed to a convent of refractory nuns, who had quarrelled with their Abbess, and exhibited some unbecoming violence in the dispute.

‡ See Dugdale. *De Canonorum Ordinis Origine*. There may be found the Rule which St. Augustine is said to have prescribed.

§ The rule here published was borrowed, in many particulars, from that of St. Benedict. But the order still retained the name and banners of St. Augustine.—*Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*.

The discipline of the regular canons was more seriously enforced by Nicholas II. in the year 1059; and about eighty years later, Innocent II. subjected them to the additional obligation of a vow; for they seem hitherto to have been exempt from such profession. Nevertheless, in the course of the two following centuries, they once more relapsed into such abandoned licentiousness, as to require an entire reconstruction from Benedict XII. After that period, they rose into more consideration than in their earlier history they appear to have attained.

There were besides some other orders, both military and mendicant, which professed the rule, or rather the name, of St. Augustine—the Hospitallers, for instance, the Teutonic Knights, and the Hermits of St. Augustine. But they will be mentioned under those heads where we have thought it more convenient to place them, than to follow in this matter the perplexed method of the ‘Historian of the Monastic Orders.’

SECTION IV.

On the Military Orders.

We have thus shortly mentioned the three grand religious Orders, which have been diversified by so many names and rules, and regenerated by so many reforms; which began in austerity, and yet fell into the most shameless debauchery; which arose in piety, and passed into wicked and lying superstition; which originated in poverty, and finally fattened on the credulity of the faithful, so as to spread their solid territorial acquisitions from one end of Christendom to the other. Founded on the genuine monastic principle of devout seclusion, so venerable to the ignorant and the vulgar, they presently surpassed the secular clergy in the reputation of sanctity, and in popular influence. Thus were they soon recommended to the Bishop of Rome; and in his ambition to exalt himself above his brother prelates, he discovered an efficient and willing instrument in the regular establishments. At an early period, he granted them protection, and patronage, and property, with the means of augmenting it: presently, he accorded to certain monasteries exemption from the episcopal authority; and in process of time, he extended that privilege to almost all. Thus he gradually constituted himself sole visitor, legislator, and guardian of the numberless religious institutions which covered the Christian world. The monks repaid these services by the most implicit obedience—for obedience was that of their three vows which they continued to respect the longest—and to their aid and influence may generally be ascribed the triumphs of the pontiff in his disputes with the secular clergy. In his contests with the State, they were not less necessary to his cause; for, as his success in those struggles usually depended on the divisions which he was enabled to sow among the subjects of his enemy, and the strength of the party which he could thus create, so the monks, in every nation in Europe, were his most powerful agents for that purpose. And thus, when we consider the victory, which the spiritual sometimes obtained over the temporal power, as a mere triumph of opinion over arms and physical force, we do indeed, at the bottom, consider it rightly; but our surprise at the result is much diminished, when we reflect how extensive a control over men’s minds was everywhere possessed by the religious orders,—how fearlessly and unsparingly they exercised that control, and with what persevering zeal it was directed to the support and aggrandisement of papal power.

The Benedictines and Augustinians were the standing army of the

Vatican, and they fought its spiritual battles with constancy and success for nearly six centuries. The first addition which was made to them was that of the Military orders; and this proceeded not from any sense of the insufficiency of the veteran establishments, nor from any distrust in them, but from circumstances wholly independent of those or any such causes. They arose in the agitation of the crusades, and they were nourished by the sort of spirit which first created those expeditions, and then caught from them some additional fury.

The union of the military with the ecclesiastical character was become common, in spite of repeated prohibitions, among all ranks of the clergy. It was exercised by the vices of the feudal system; which had given them wealth in enviable profusion, but which provided by no sufficient laws or strength of government for the protection of that which it had bestowed—so that force was necessary to defend what had been lavished by superstition. The warlike habits which ecclesiastics seem really to have first acquired in the defence of their property, were presently carried forth by them into distant and offensive campaigns, and exhibited in voluntary feats of arms, to which loyalty did not oblige them, and for which loyalty itself furnished a very insufficient pretext. But these general excesses did not give birth to any distinct order professing to unite religious vows with the exercise of arms; and even the first of those, which did afterwards make such profession, was in its origin a pacific and charitable institution.

This was the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, or the Knights of the Hospital. About the year 1050, at the wish of some merchants of Amalfi trading with Syria, a Latin Church had been erected at Jerusalem, to which a hospital was presently added, with a chapel dedicated to the Baptist. When Godfrey de Bouillon took the city in 1099, he endowed the hospital: it then assumed the form of a new religious order, and immediately received confirmation from Rome, with a rule for its observance*. The revenues were soon found to exceed the necessities of the establishment; and it was then that the Grand Master changed its principle and design by the infusion of the military character.

The Knights of the Hospital were distinguished by three gradations. The first in dignity were the noble and military; the second were ecclesiastical, superintending the original objects of the institution; the third consisted of the 'Serving Brethren,' whose duties also were chiefly military. To the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, they added the obligations of charity, fasting, and penitence: and, whatsoever laxity they may have admitted in the observance of them, they unquestionably derived from that profession some real virtues which were not shared by the fanatics who surrounded them; and they softened the savage features of religious warfare with some faint shades of unwonted humanity. So long as their residence was Jerusalem, they retained the peaceful name of Hospitallers; but they were subsequently better known by the successive appellations of Knights of Rhodes and of Malta. Faithful at least to one of the objects of their institution, they valiantly defended the outworks of Christendom against the progress of the invading Mussulman, and never sullied their arms by the massacre of Pagans or heretics.

* The rule of the Hospitallers (as confirmed by Boniface) may be found in Dugdale's *Monasticon*, vol. ii. p. 493.

The Knights Templars received their name from their residence in the immediate neighbourhood of the Temple at Jerusalem. The foundations of this order were laid *The Knights Templars.* in the year 1118; and the rule, to which it was afterwards subjected, was from the pen of St. Bernard. This institution, both in its original purpose and prescribed duties, was exclusively military.—To extend the boundaries of Christendom, to preserve the internal tranquillity of Palestine, to secure the public roads from robbers and outlaws*, to protect the devout on their pilgrimage to the holy places—such were the peculiar offices of the Templar. They were discharged with fearlessness and rewarded by renown. Renown was followed by the most abundant opulence. Corruption came in its train; and on their final expulsion from Palestine, they carried back with them to Europe much of the wild unbridled license, which had been familiar to them in the East. But their unhappy fate, as it is connected with one of the most important periods in papal history, must be reserved for more particular mention in its proper place.

The Teutonic, or German Order, had its origin again in the offices of charity. During the siege of Acre, a hospital was erected for the reception of the sick and wounded. *The Teutonic Order.* This establishment survived the occasion which created it; and, to confirm its character and its permanency, it obtained a rule (in 1192) from Celestine III., and a place among the 'Orders Hospitable and Military.' On the termination of the Crusades, these knights returned to Germany†, where they enjoyed considerable possessions; and soon afterwards, by a deviation from the purpose of their institution, which might seem slight perhaps in a superstitious age, they turned their consecrated arms to the *conversion* of Prussia.

That country, and the contiguous Pomerania, had hitherto resisted the peaceful exertions of successive missionaries, and continued to worship the rude deities, and follow the barbarous manners, of antiquity. But where the language of persuasion had been employed in vain, the disciplined valour of the Teutonic Knights prevailed. It was recompensed by the conquest of two rich provinces; and the faith which was inflicted upon the vanquished in the rage of massacre, was perpetuated under the deliberate oppression of military government. This event took place about the year 1230; but in another generation, when the memory of its introduction was effaced, the religion really took root and flourished, by the sure and legitimate authority of its excellence and its truth. After that celebrated exploit, the Teutonic Order continued to subsist in great estimation with the Church; and this patronage was repaid with persevering fidelity, until at length, when they perceived the grand consummation approaching, the holy knights generally deserted that tottering fortress, and arrayed their rebellious host under the banners of Luther.

* An order, with a somewhat similar object, was founded in France about the year 1233, called the Order of the Glorious Virgin Mary. It was confined to young men of family, who associated themselves, under the title of *Les Frères Joyeux*, for the defence of the injured, and the preservation of public tranquillity. They took vows of obedience and *conjugal* chastity, and solemnly pledged themselves to the protection of widows and orphans.

† In the treaty between the empire and the popedom in 1230, we find that the interests of the three military orders were expressly stipulated for by the Pope; and also, that certain places were held in sequestration by Herman, Master of the Teutonic Order until the Emperor should have fulfilled his part of the engagement. Fleury, l. 79. s. 64.

SECTION V.

The Mendicant, or Preaching Orders.

UNTIL the end of the twelfth century the exertions of the Popes were almost entirely confined to the establishment of their own supremacy in the Church, and of their temporal authority over the State: and, through the faithful subservience of the two ancient orders, they had obtained surprising success in both undertakings. But the increasing light of the eleventh and twelfth ages, and the increasing deformities of the Church, brought into existence a number of heresies, occasioning dissensions, such as had not divided Christians since the Arian controversy. These moreover presented themselves not with one form, and one front, and one neck, but were scattered under a multitude of denominations, throughout all provinces, and among all ranks. The secular clergy, relaxed by habitual indolence and occasional immoralities, rather gave cause to this disaffection, than subdued it; and the regular orders, become sluggish from wealth and indulgence, wanted the activity, perhaps the zeal, which was required of them. To detect the latent error, to pursue it into its secret holds, to drag it forth and consign it to the minister of temporal vengeance, was an office beyond the energy of their luxuriousness; still less did they possess the talents and the learning to confute and confound it. Wherefore, as the experience of some centuries had now proved, that the existing orders, how often soever and completely reformed and reproduced, had an immediate tendency to subside again into degeneracy and decay, it seemed expedient to introduce some entirely different organization into the imperfect system.

The first notion of the new institution* was given by that body of ecclesiastics who were commissioned by Innocent III. *St. Dominic.* to convert the Albigeois; and among these the most distinguished was St. Dominic. . . That favourite champion of the Roman Church, the falsely-reputed inventor of inquisitorial torture, was a Spaniard of a noble family and of the order of Canons-Regular. In his spiritual campaigns (it were well had they been no more than spiritual) against the heretics of Languedoc, he became eminent by an eloquence which always inflamed and sometimes persuaded; and having felt the power of that faculty, which through the space of thirteen centuries had so rarely revisited the Roman empire, he became desirous to establish a fraternity devoted to its exercise. His project was not discouraged by Innocent III.; but that pontiff hesitated to give the formal sanction necessary to constitute a new order: since the Council of Lateran, acting according to his discretion, had pronounced it generally expedient to reform existing institutions, rather than to augment their number. But immediately after the death of that Pope, Dominic was established in the privileges of a 'Founder,' by the bull of Honorius III †.

* Hospinian's Sixth Book comprehends a quantity of valuable matter on the subject of the Mendicants; and chapters iv. v. and vi. should particularly be consulted. The author is laborious and learned, but not impartial. In the zeal of the Protestant he has forgotten the moderation of the Historian, and (might we not sometimes add?) the charity of the Christian.

† Fleury asserts, that the Frères Prêcheurs at first were not so much a new order, as a new congregation of the Canons-Regular; since it was only at a Chapter General held in 1220, that St. Dominic and his disciples embraced entire poverty and mendicity. This may be so—but at any rate their original condition was so extremely transient and destitute of all effects and characteristics, as to be wholly insignificant in history.

Contemporary with St. Dominic was his great compeer in ecclesiastical celebrity, the father of the rival institution. St. Francis was a native of Asisi in Umbria, without rank, without *St. Francis* letters, but of an ardent and enthusiastic temperament.

It is asserted—perhaps untruly—that his earlier age was consumed in profligacy, from which he was awakened by an opportune sickness, occasioned by his vices; and that his fears suddenly impelled him into the opposite extreme of superstitious* austerity. It is certain, that, as he inculcated, by his preaching, so he recommended by his example, the utmost rigour of the primitive monastic principle,—‘that there was no safe path to heaven, unless by the destitution of all earthly possessions.’ Popularity was the first reward of his humiliation: he was soon followed by a crowd of imitators; and the motive, which probably was pure fanaticism in himself, might be want, or vanity, or even avarice †, in his disciples. Howbeit they readily acquired an extensive reputation for sanctity; and in the year 1210 the formal protection of Innocent was vouchsafed to the new order.

It appears probable that the foundation of the Franciscan Order was laid in poverty only—not merely unaccompanied by any obligation of a missionary or predicatory character, but likewise free from the vow of mendicity. St. Francis himself, in the ‘Testament’ which he left for the instruction of his followers, enjoined manual labour in preference to beggary; though he permitted them, in case of great distress, to have recourse to the table of the Lord, begging alms from door to door ‡. It should be mentioned, too, that he at the same time prohibited them from applying to the Pope for any privilege whatever. But the sophistical and contentious spirit of the age precluded that simplicity. And their founder was scarcely consigned to the grave, when his disciples obtained from Gregory IX.§ a bull, which released them from the observance of his Testament, and placed an arbitrary interpretation on many particulars of his rule. It was thus that the necessity of labour was superseded, and honour and sanctity were preposterously attached to the profession of mendicity.

* The story of the Stigmata, or wounds of Christ, miraculously impressed upon his body, is known to all. The text on which this importance was founded (for it pleaded a text) was Epist. Galat. end. ‘From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.’ We read in Semler, ann. 1222, that a rustic, who made the same experiment on human credulity at about the same time, was imprisoned for life—*felicius cessit Francisco*, sec. xiii. cap. iii.

† Giannone, an impartial writer, thus begins a section (lib. xix. cap. v. sec. v.) entitled ‘*Monaci e Beni Temporalì*.’ ‘Henceforward we shall place together the subjects of “Monks” and “Temporalities;” since, as we have already observed, that he who pronounces “Monachism” (Religione,) pronounces “Riches;” so the Monks were now become incomparably more expert in the acquisition of wealth, than all the other ecclesiastics; and the monasteries in these days reaped profits to which those made by the Churches bore no proportion—so that the expressions “*New Religions*” and “*New Riches*,” became, properly speaking, synonymous. And this was the more monstrous, because it was in despite of their foundation in mendicity, (whence they had the name of *Mendicants*,) that their acquisitions and treasures were enormous.’—*Polit. Eccles. del decimo terzo secolo*.

‡ Fleury, *Dissertat. 8me*. St. Francis designated his disciples by the name *Fratercūi*—Little Brothers—and this became, in different languages, *Fratricelli*, *Fratres Minores*, *Frères Mineurs*, *Friars Minors*.

§ This Pope was at the same time a great patron of the rival order. In 1231 he wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Sorrento, in order to introduce the Dominicans to his patronage, in these terms:—‘*Dilectos Filios Fratres Ordinis Predicatorum velut novos Vinitores suæ vineæ suscitavit; qui, non sua sed quæ sunt Jesu Christi quærentes, tam contra profligandas hæreses, quam pestes alias mortiferas extirpandas se dedicârunt evangelizationi Verbi Dei, in abjectione voluntariæ paupertatis.*’ The passage is cited by Giannone.

Here then we observe the first point of distinction in the first constitution of the two orders. The Dominicans were, in their earliest character, a society of itinerant preachers—this was the whole of their profession—they were not bound, as it would seem, by any vow of poverty. But after a short space, when their founder had possibly observed that the Franciscans prospered well under that vow—that without possessing any thing they abounded with many things*—he thought it desirable to imitate such profitable self-denial: accordingly, he also imposed upon his disciples the obligation of poverty.

Again: when the Franciscans discovered that no little influence accrued to their rivals from the office of public preaching, they also betook themselves to that practice; and, perhaps, with almost equal success. Thus it came to pass, that, after a very few years, two orders, essentially different in their original, were very nearly assimilated in character, and even in profession, and entered upon the same career with almost the same objects and the same principles.

Nevertheless, in the features of their policy and the character of their ecclesiastical influence, they continued to be distinguished by many important diversities. The whole course of their history is more or less strongly marked by these. And if many of them were occasioned (as is unquestionably true) by the passionate jealousy which they bore to each other, and which they displayed upon all occasions, to the great scandal and injury of the Church, it is equally certain, that the difference in their first constitution ever contributed to cause a difference in their destinies. The original vow and rule of St. Francis was at no time perfectly erased from the memory of his followers. Attempts were soon made to revive it in its native austerity; and thus, in addition to the general contention with the rival order, the most violent intestine dissensions were introduced into the family of that Saint, which terminated in permanent alienation and schism.

Again: another evil was brought upon the Church by these disputes—sharpened as they also were by the scholastic subtleties which in those days perverted reason. The authority of the Pope interposed to set them at rest, but his interference produced the opposite effect †: it not only increased the animosity of both parties, but also raised up a powerful branch of the fraternity in avowed opposition to the pontifical supremacy. In the controversy in which these ‘indocile’ brethren engaged during the fourteenth age, against John XXII., they proceeded so far in rebellious audacity as formally to pass the sentence of heresy upon the Vicar of Christ, and to abet the efforts of Lewis of Bavaria to depose him! Such (as Fleury has observed) was the termination of their humility—the deposition of a pope! Owing to these internal contests, it has even been made a question with some, whether the institution of the Mendicants has not contributed, upon the whole, to the decline, rather than the advancement of the papal interests. But there is not sufficient reason for such a doubt. The wound which the Roman See may have received from the passionate insubordination of a faction of one of those orders, bears no comparison with the benefits which it has derived from the

* We read, in the ‘*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*,’ of Franciscan *monasteries* of very early foundation—residences inconsistent with the perpetual practice of beggary. But those mansions were probably the first profits of the trade, the first-fruits of the violation of the vow.

† The good and simple pope, St. Celestine, sanctioned the division among the Franciscans by establishing the congregation of the ‘*Poor Hermits*.’

faithful assiduity, the learning, the zeal, and the uncompromising devotedness of the other.

If the Dominicans surpassed the rival order in obedience to their common master, they also afforded a better example of internal harmony and discipline. Indeed, as they adhered very closely to the original object of their institution, the destruction of heresy, there was little reason why they should dispute with each other, and the strongest motive for concord with the Holy See. The destruction of heresy they were willing (as we have observed), in the first instance, to accomplish by the sword of the spirit; but, whether through the natural impatience of bigotry, or because the wisest among them began to suspect the weakness of their own cause, the futility of their sophistry, and the falsehood of their positions, after a very short attempt they abandoned *that* method of conversion, and betook themselves to the material weapon. The secular arm was summoned to their aid, and it became in process of time their favourite, if not their only, instrument.

Nevertheless those are in error who attribute the foundation of the Inquisition, as a fixed and permanent tribunal, to the hand of St. Dominic. It may seem indeed to have been the necessary consequence of his labours, the result to which his principles infallibly tended; and it is true that the administration of its offices was principally delegated to his order. But it was not anywhere formally established until ten or twelve years after his death*. In the mean time, the Dominicans, already trained to the chase, and heated by the scent of blood, eagerly executed the trust which was assigned to them. Over the whole surface of the western world they spread themselves in fierce and keen pursuit; and the distant kingdoms of Spain and Poland were presently inflicted with the same deadly visitation. Rome was the centre of persecution; the heart, to which the circulating poison continually returned—and whence it derived, as it flowed onward, a fresh and perennial supply of virulence and malignity.

The Dominicans, soon after their institution, seem to have appropriated most of the learning, then so sparingly distributed among the monastic orders. They applied themselves chiefly to the science of controversy, and soon became very formidable in that field—the more so, since they employed the resources of scholastic ingenuity in the defence of the papal government. The means and the end harmonized well; the prejudices of the age were to a great extent favourable to both; the exertions of reviving reason were perpetually baffled, and her friends discomfited and overthrown. . . We shall briefly notice one signal campaign of the Dominicans—that which they carried on for above thirty years against the University of Paris. . . That body, which was already the most eminent in Europe, thought it expedient, in the year 1228, to confine the Dominicans, in common with all other religious orders, to the possession of one of its theological classes, while those Mendicants warmly asserted their claim to two. Many violent contentions arose from this difference, and continued till the year 1255, with no decisive result: the matter was then referred to the wisdom of Pope Alexander IV. It is not difficult to anticipate the response of the Vatican. The University received an unqualified injunction to throw open to the Dominicans, not two classes

Dispute of the Dominicans with the University of Paris.

only, but as many chairs and dignities as it might seem good to them to occupy. For four years the refractory doctors resisted the execution of the sentence with a boldness worthy of a better age and a happier result. At length, terrified by the repeated menaces of the pontiff, they submitted. . . Nevertheless, the struggle had not been without its benefit. During the course of a protracted controversy, subjects had been handled of higher and more general importance, than the right of lecturing in the schools of Paris. While the discipline and principles of the Mendicants were examined and assailed, the power which upheld them did not escape from public reprehension. The possibility of error *even in the Church itself* was openly maintained; and the spirit of learning, which had hitherto ministered to ecclesiastical oppression, was at length aroused against it. The first efforts of the best principles are generally baffled and disappointed; but the example which they leave does not perish; but only waits till the concurrence of happier circumstances may bring the season for more successful imitation.

In the conduct of this dispute, as both parties became equally heated, the limits of reason were exceeded, with almost equal temerity, by both. Among many laborious productions, perhaps the most celebrated was that published by Guillaume de St. Amour, a doctor of Sorbon, and a powerful champion of the University, 'Concerning the Perils of the Latter Times.' The peculiarity which has recommended it to our notice is this. It was founded on the belief that the passage of St. Paul relating to 'the perilous times which were to come in the last days,' was fulfilled by the establishment of the Mendicants! . . . Every age has affixed its own interpretation to that text, and all have been successively deceived; and this might teach us some caution in wresting the mysterious oracles of God from their eternal destination to serve the partial views—to aid the transient, and perhaps passionate, purposes of the moment. Yet is there an undue value almost indissolubly attached, even by the calmest minds, to passing occurrences: however trivial and fugitive their character, they are magnified by close inspection, so as to exceed the mightiest events farther removed in time; and it is this, our almost insuperable inability to reduce present occurrences to their real dimensions—to place them at a distance, and examine them side by side along with the transactions of former days—to consider them, in short, disinterestedly and *historically*—it is this cause which has begotten, and which still begets, many foolish opinions in minds not destitute of reason; and which, among other fruits, has so frequently reproduced, and in so many shapes, the pitiable enthusiasm of the Millenarians.

Though both Dominicans and Franciscans professed to be at the same time mendicants and preachers, yet, in some sort of conformity with their original rules, the former continued to retain more of the predicator, the latter more of the mendicant, character. These last were consequently less distinguished by their literary contests, than by those which they waged against each other, respecting the just interpretation of the rule of their founder. In all other monastic institutions, the possession of property was forbidden to individuals, but permitted to the community; whereas the more rigid injunction of St. Francis denied every description of fixed revenues, even to the Societies of his followers. There were many among those who wished for a relaxation of this rule; and they obtained it without difficulty, both from Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. But another party, who called themselves the Spirituals, insisted on a strict

*Dissensions among
the Franciscans.*

adhesion to the original institution; they even refused to share the glorious title of Franciscan with those who had abandoned it. This feeling displayed itself with particular vehemence in the year 1247, when John of Parma, a rigid spiritualist, was chosen general of the order. But the more worldly brethren still adhered to their mitigated discipline; and their perseverance, which was favoured, perhaps, by the secret wishes of many of the opposite party, received the steady and zealous concurrence of the Holy See. For whatsoever value the popes might attach to the voluntary poverty of their myrmidons,—to the respect which it excited, and the spontaneous generosity which so abundantly relieved it,—they no doubt considered, that it was more important to the permanent interests of the Church to encourage the increase of her fixed and solid and perpetual possessions.

The success of the Dominicans and Franciscans encouraged the profession of beggary; and the face of Christendom was suddenly darkened by a swarm of holy mendicants, in such manner that, about the year 1272, Gregory X. endeavoured to arrest the overgrowing evil. To this end he suppressed a great multitude of those authorized vagrants, and distributed the remainder, still very numerous, into four societies,—the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustine.

The order of the Carmelites was, in its origin, Oriental and Eremitical. John Phocas, a monk of Patmos, who visited the Holy Places in 1185, thus concludes the narrative of *The Carmelites*. his pilgrimage:—‘On Mount Carmel is the cavern of Elias, where a large monastery once stood, as the remains of buildings attest; but it has been ruined by time and hostile incursions. Some years ago a hoary-headed monk, who was also a priest, came from Calabria, and established himself in this place, by the revelation of the Prophet Elias. He made a little inclosure in the ruins of the monastery, and constructed there a tower and a small church, and assembled about ten brothers, with whom he still inhabits that holy place*.’ Such appears to be the earliest authentic record of the foundation of the Carmelites. About the year 1209, Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, gave them a rule. It consisted of sixteen articles, which contain nothing original, and are merely sufficient to prove the ignorance, the abstinence, and the poverty of the original brothers. The institution was not, however, legitimately introduced into the grand monastic family till the year 1226, when it received the sanction of Honorius III. Twelve years afterwards it was raised from among the regular orders to the more valuable privileges and profits of mendicity; and we observe that the severe rule of its infancy was *interpreted* and mitigated soon afterwards by Innocent IV. Accordingly it became venerable and popular, and was embraced with the accustomed eagerness in every country in Europe.

A great number of individuals were still found scattered throughout the western Church, who cherished the name, though they might dispense with the severer *Hermits of St. Augustine*. duties, of hermits; and they professed a variety of rules by which their several independent societies were governed. Innocent IV. expressed his desire to unite them into one order; and it was executed by his successor. Alexander IV., the better to withdraw them from their seclusion, and engage them in the functions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy †, formed them into a single congregation, under one

* We cite the passage from Fleury, lib. lxxvi., sec. 55.

† Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. xix., cap. v., sec. 5.

rule and one general, and associated them by the same title of ' Hermits of St. Augustine.' We may observe, however, that as they were the most modern, so they were the least considerable of the mendicant institutions.

To these four orders the pontiffs granted the exclusive indulgence of travelling through all countries, of conversing with persons of all ranks, and instructing, wheresoever they sojourned, the young and the ignorant. This commission was presently extended to preaching in the churches, and administering the holy sacraments. And so great veneration did they excite by the sanctity of their appearance, the 'austerity of their life, and the authoritative humility of their manners, that the people rushed in multitudes to listen to their eloquence, and to crave their benediction. And thus the spirit of sacerdotal despotism, which had been chilled through the indecency or negligence of the secular clergy, and the luxurious languor of the regular establishments, was for a season revived and restored to an authority, in its extent more ample, and in its exercise far more unsparing, than it had possessed at any preceding period.

In their early years, the two great nurseries of the Dominicans were Paris and Bologna. In those cities, Jourdain, the General of the order, and successor of its founder, alternately passed the season of Lent; and thence he sent forth his emissaries through the south and the west. Among the first converts to the discipline of St. Dominic were many distinguished by rank and dignity, many eminent ecclesiastics, many learned doctors, both in law and theology, and many young students of noble parentage. Nor is it hard to believe those accounts, which praise the rigour of their moral excellence, and the general subjection of their carnal appetites to the control of the spirit. The very enthusiasm, which at first inflamed them for the purity and beauty of their institution, was inconsistent with hypocritical pretensions to piety; it tended, too, somewhat to prolong the exercise of those virtues whence it drew its origin. And thus, if their literary exertions were really stimulated by the highest motives—the glory of God, and the salvation of the faithful—they may well have surpassed the languid labours of the old ecclesiastics, which were so commonly directed to mere vulgar and temporal objects. Accordingly, as the Mendicants rose, the ancient orders and the secular clergy fell into disrepute and contempt; and the chairs and the pulpits, which they had so long filled, were, in a great measure, usurped by more zealous, more laborious, and more popular competitors.

But these conquests were not obtained or preserved without many violent and obstinate contests *. Both regulars and seculars defended their ancient privileges with an ardour which seemed to supply the want of

* The grand dispute in England between the Clergy and the Mendicants, in which the Archbishop of Armagh was so prominent, took place about 1357. The great complaint at that time was, that the latter had seduced all the young men at the University to confess to them, to enter their order, and to remain there. And the prelate mentions the remarkable fact, that, through the suspicions thus infused into families, the number of students at Oxford had been reduced during his time from thirty thousand to six thousand. It was made another matter of reproach on the mendicants, that they had bought up all the books, and collected in every convent a large and fine library. The field of contest was transferred to the pontifical court (then at Avignon); the mendicants were triumphant, and the Archbishop's mission appears to have had no result. And about the same time two considerable princes, Peter, Infant of Aragon, and Charles, Count of Alençon, became members respectively of the Franciscan and Dominican orders.

strength. Their disputes with each other were for the season laid aside; they united with equal earnestness against the invader of their common interests; and the rancour thus occasioned, and shared, in some degree, even by the most obscure individuals of both parties, was far from favourable either to the purity of religion, or to the honour of the Church—insomuch, that some Roman Catholic writers have expressed a reasonable doubt, whether the interests of their Church would not have been more effectually consulted by a thorough reformation of the two classes already consecrated to religion, than by the establishment of a new order. It is certainly true, that no cause has more scandalized the name of Christ, in every age of his faith, than the bitter dissensions of his ministers. Their very immoralities have scarcely been more poisonous in their influence on the people, than the spectacle of their jealousy and rancour. And thus, if the ancient zeal and piety could have been revived by ordinary regulations among the ecclesiastics of the thirteenth century—had it been possible to infuse into the decrepit the vigour of the young, into the pampered the virtue of the poor,—such had, indeed, been the safer method of regeneration. It appears, however, very questionable, whether the popes had power to accomplish so substantial a reformation in the Church, even had they been seriously bent on it. It is perfectly certain that they were not so disposed. The interests of papacy were now becoming widely different from the interests of the Church, and their policy (though they might not themselves be conscious of the distinction) was steadily directed to the former. With *that* view, the institution of the Mendicants was eminently useful, as it communicated a sort of ubiquity to the pontifical Chair. Moreover, the scandals which it occasioned were, in some measure, compensated by the energy to which the old establishments were reluctantly awakened; and which had been more honourable to themselves, and more useful to religion, had it been excited by a less equivocal motive.

One essential characteristic of the Mendicants was the want of any permanent residence; and thus their influence over the people, though at seasons vast and overruling, could not be deeply fixed, or very durable. Again, since they professed absolute poverty, they could scarcely exercise any fearless control over those, on whose favour and charity they were dependent for their daily subsistence: so that their popular authority was destitute of those substantial supports which their opponents derived from the possession of opulent establishments, and rested wholly on their talents and their virtues. As long as their zeal and their eloquence far surpassed those of the ancient ecclesiastics,—as long as the sanctity of their moral practice was beyond reproach or suspicion,—so long they deserved and maintained the superiority of their influence. But though the impression thus produced will generally last somewhat longer than the excellence which produces it, still the solid foundation of their power decayed with the decay of their original qualities; and the wealth which they at length substituted in the place of these, reduced them at best to the level of their rivals.

And no long time elapsed from their origin, before the reproach of corruption was commonly and justly cast upon them*. General complaints

* The evidence of Matthew Paris, an established Benedictine of St. Alban's, may be somewhat coloured by professional jealousy, but nevertheless it is substantially true. In his Henry III., anno 1246, he mentions, how, from being preachers, they became confessors, and usurped the other offices of the Ordinary. In the same place he publishes a celebrated Bull of Gregory IX. in their favour, and strongly describes the insolence which

arose respecting the multitude of pretexts which they invented for the extortion of money; respecting the vagabond habits, the idleness, and importunity of many among them. It was particularly asserted, that, having insinuated themselves into the confidence of families, they took under their special charge the management of wills, and constructed them to their own advantage. They became perpetual attendants on the death-bed of the rich. Moreover, they engaged with intriguing activity in the political transactions of the day, and were entrusted with the conduct of difficult negotiations. The cabinets of princes were not too lofty for their ambition, the secrets of domestic life were not beneath their avarice. Again—it offended the reason of many, that holy persons, professing profound humility and perfect poverty, should appear in the character of magistrates, having apparitors and familiars at their disposal, and all the treasures and all the tortures of the Inquisition. They thus became rich, indeed, and they became powerful: but there were those who did not fail to contrast the contempt of worldly glory, which illustrated the birth of their order, with the pomp which they afterwards assumed so willingly; and to remark, that through the abandonment of every possession, they possessed everything, and were more opulent in their poverty than the most opulent*. . . . Such reflections were obvious to the most illiterate; and they gradually diminished a popularity, which was ill compensated by riches. Howbeit, amid the decline in their reputation and the degeneracy of their principles, from the one grand rule of their ecclesiastical policy they never deviated,—they persevered, without any important interruption, in their faithful ministry to the Vatican. But from the time that they parted with their original characteristics, their agency became less useful; and the extravagance with which they sometimes exalted the pretensions of the See, began, in later ages, to excite some disgust among its more moderate and reasonable supporters.

they derived from it. ‘*Ecclesiarum rectores . . . procaciter alloquentes, indulta sibi talia privilegia in propatulo demonstrantes, erecta cervice ea exigentes recitari, &c.* . . . He then relates the manner in which they supplanted the clergy in the affections of the people. ‘*Esne professus? Etiam. A quo? A sacerdote meo. Et quis ille idiota? Nunquam theologiam audivit; nunquam in decretis vigilavit; nunquam unam questionem didicit enodare. Cæci sunt et duces cæcorum. Ad nos accedite, qui novimus lepram a lepra distinguere . . . Multi igitur, præcipue nobiles et nobilium uxores, spretis propriis sacerdotibus, prædicatoribus confitebantur . . . unde non mediocriter viluit ordinariorum dignitas.*’ . . . Matthew Paris then goes on to show the immorality thus introduced; since the people did not feel for the Mendicants any of that awe which their own priests had been accustomed to inspire, and therefore repeated their sins with less scruple. The same author (ad. ann. 1235) repeats the complaints of the insolence of the Mendicants, and of the extensive footing which they had already usurped upon the domains of the old establishments. In another place, (ann. 1247,) he describes them as the pope’s beadles and tax-gatherers. ‘*Utpote fratres minores et predicatores (ut credimus invitos) jam suos fecit Dominus Papa, non sine ordinis eorum læsione et scandalo, telonarios et bedellos.*’ . . . These passages were written within half a century from the foundation of the order. The evidence of the great Franciscan, Buonaventura, and of Thierrî d’Apolde, both writers of the same age, is also adduced by Fleury, to prove the early corruption of the Mendicants. Bzovius (ann. 1304, sec. vii.) publishes a long decree of Benedict XI., still further augmenting the privileges of the Mendicants, and exempting them from certain episcopal restraints.

* *Piètr. delle Vigne. (i. Epist. 37). Fleury, lib. lxxxii., sec. 7. The Capucines, a branch of reformed Franciscans, did not arise till the beginning of the sixteenth century. Their progress, which was contemporary with that of the Lutherans and the Jesuits, is also described as extremely rapid.*

SECTION VI.

The Establishment of Nuns.

THAT there existed, even in the Antenicene Church, virgins, who made profession of religious chastity, and dedicated themselves to the service of Christ, is clear from the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Eusebius*. But there is no sufficient reason to believe that they were formed into societies; still less that they constituted any order or congregation. They exercised individually their self-imposed duties and devotions; and found their practice to be consistent, like the Ascetæ, among whom they may properly be classed, with the ordinary occupations of society.

The origin of Communities of female recluses was probably coeval with that of monasteries, and the produce of the same soil. The glory of the institution is commonly ascribed to St. Syncletica, the descendant of a Macedonian family settled in Alexandria, and the contemporary of St. Anthony. It is at least certain, that many such establishments were founded in Egypt before the middle of the fourth century; and that they were propagated throughout Syria, Pontus, and Greece, by the same means and at the same time with those of the Holy Brothers, though not, as it would seem, in the same abundance. It appears, however, that they gradually penetrated into every province where the name of Christ was known; they were found among the Armenians, Mingrelians, Georgians, Maronites, and others; and finally formed an important and not incongruous appendage to the Oriental Church.

A noble Roman lady, named Marcella, is celebrated as the instrument chosen by Providence to introduce the pious institution into the West. In emulation of the models of Egypt, she assembled several virgins and widows in a community consecrated to holy purposes; and her example found so many imitators, that the Fathers of the next generation, St. Ambrose †, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, bear sufficient testimony to the prevalence of the institution in their time. It is true that, at least as late as the year 400, many devout virgins (*Virgines Devotæ*) still preserved their domestic relations and adhered to the more secular practice of the Antenicene Church; and it is possible that those devotees were never wholly extinct in any age. But the Associations for the same end gradually embraced most of those with whom religious zeal was the leading motive; and their sanctity was recommended to popular reverence, as

* Vit. Constant. lib. iv., Tertullian, lib. ad Uxorem. Cyprian (lib. i. epist. xi. ad Pomponianum, De Virginibus) reproaches in very severe language certain consecrated virgins, who had fallen under the suspicion of incontinence,—‘*Quid Christus Dominus et Judex noster, cum virginem suam sibi dicatam et sanctitati suæ destinatam jacere cum altero cernit, quàm indignatur et irascitur!*’ . . . Again: ‘*Quod si in fide se Christo dedicaverunt, pudicè et castè sine ulla fabula perseverent.*’ . . . Si autem perseverare nolunt vel non possunt, melius est nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant.’ . . . Again: (lib. v. epist. viii.) he speaks of ‘*Membra Christo dicata et in æternum continentiaæ honorem pudica virtute devota.*’ . . . See also his ‘*Tractatus de Disciplina et Habitu Virginum.*’ . . . These passages show, at the same time, that there were in that age virgins dedicated to religion, and that they were not bound by any irrevocable vow.

† Lib. i. de Virginibus ad Marcellinam. The testimony of St. Jerome, respecting Marcella, has been already cited (supra, p. 396.) St. Augustine (De Moribus Ecclesiarum, c. 33.) says, in speaking of the monastic establishments both at Milan and Rome:—‘*Jejunia prorsus incredibilia, non in viris tantum, sed etiam in fœminis; quibus item, multis viduis et virginibus simul habitantibus et lana ac tela victum quærantibus, præsertim singulæ gravissimæ probatissimæque non tantum in instituendis componendisque moribus, sed etiam instruendis mentibus peritæ et paratæ.*’ See Marsham’s Προσῳλαίου to Dugdale, and Hospinianus de Orig. Monach., lib. iii. c. xi. et seq.

it may also have been exalted and fortified, by the discipline and the vow which restrained them.

The Rules, to which the convents of Nuns* were subject, were formed for the most part upon those which bound the monks. Like the monks, they lived from common funds, and used a common dormitory, table, and wardrobe; the same religious services exercised their piety; habitual temperance and occasional fasting were enjoined with the same severity. Manual labour was no less rigidly enforced; but instead of the agricultural toils imposed upon their 'Brethren,' to them were committed the easier tasks of the needle or the distaff. By duties so numerous, by occupations admitting so great variety, they beguiled the tediousness of the day †, and the dullness of monastic seclusion.

It appears probable, as is warmly argued by Hospinian ‡, that in the very early ages the virgins, who were dedicated to the *Vow of Chastity*, religious purposes, could enter without any scandal into the state of marriage. But we should recollect that, at that time, the monastic condition, properly speaking, did not exist. Immediately after its institution, we find the authority of St. Basil loudly declared against such a departure from the more perfect purity; that patriarch of monasticism does not hesitate to pronounce the marriage of a nun to be incest, prostitution, and adultery (incestus, stupri scelus, et adulterium); and Ambrose and Augustine exacted the same sacred obedience to the irrevocable vow. By the

* The words Nonnus, Nonna, are said to be of Egyptian origin. The latter is used by St. Jerome, Epist. ad Eustochium Virginem. Benedict of Nursia (Regul. 63) gives it the interpretation of paternal reverence, and ordains, that 'Juniores monachi priores suos *nonnos* vocent; quod intelligitur paterna reverentia.' The terms Monialis and Sanctimonialis are usually derived from *Monos*. Hospin. Orig. Monach., lib. i. c. i.

† The two following passages from St. Jerome deserve to be cited, since they show as well what were the vanities, as what were the duties, of the earliest nuns:—'Vestis tua nec sit satis munda, nec sordida, nullaque diversitate notabilis; ne ad te obviam prætereuntium turba consistat et digito monstreris. . . Plures . . hoc ipso cupiunt placere quod placere contemnunt, et mirum in modum laus, dum vitatur, appetitur . . . Ne cogitatio facita subrepat, ut, quia in auratis vestibus placere desiisti, placere coneris in sordidis; et quando in conventum fratrum veneris vel sororum, humilis (al. humi) sedeas; scabello te causeris indignam; vocem ex industria, quasi confectam jejuniis, non teneas, et deficientis mutata gressum humeris innitaris alterius. Sunt quippe nonnullæ exterminantes (extenuantes?) facies, ut appareant hominibus jejunantes; quæ statim ut aliquem viderint ingemiscunt, demittunt supercilium, et aperta facie vix unum oculum liberant (al. librant) ad videndum. Vestis pulla, cingulum saccum et sordidis manibus pedibusque; venter solus, quia videri non potest, æstuat cibo. Aliæ virili habitu, veste mutata, erubescunt esse quod natæ sunt; *crinem amputant* et impudenter erigunt facies eunuchinas. Sunt quæ ciliciis vestiuntur et cucullis fabrefactis; ut ad infantiam redeant, imitantur noctuas et bubones. . . Hæc omnia argumenta sunt Diaboli.'—Hieron. (Epist. xviii.) ad Eustoch. Virginem.—Again, (Epist. to Demetrias, De Servanda Virginit.) 'Præter Psalmorum et Orationis ordinem, qui tibi hora tertia, sexta, nona, ad vesperem, media nocte, et mane semper est exercendus, statue quot horis Sanctam Scripturam ediscere debeas, quanto tempore legere, non ad laborem, sed ad delectationem ac instructionem animæ. Cunque hæc finieris spatia . . habeto lanam semper in manibus, vel staminis pollice fila deducito, vel ad torquenda subtegmina in alveolis fusa vertantur; aliarumque neta aut in globum collige, aut tenenda (nenda?) compone. Quæ texta sunt inspicere: quæ errata reprehendere: quæ facienda constitue. Si tantis operum varietatibus occupata fueris nunquam dies tibi longi erunt.' Similar instructions are delivered in Epist. 86, ad Eustochium Epitaph. Paulæ Matris. And St. Augustine (De Morib. Ecclesiæ., cap. 31.) mentions that the garments manufactured by the nuns were given to the monks in exchange for food. 'Lanificio corpus exercet et sustentant; vestesque ipsas fratribus tradunt, ab iis invicem quod victui opus est resumentes.' The *Tonsure* was not originally imposed, though it appears to have been an Egyptian custom.

‡ Lib. iii. c. xii.

Council of Chalcedon, nuns who married were made liable, together with their husbands, to the sentence of excommunication; yet in such manner, that penance might be imposed, if they reverently requested it, and communion restored in consequence of that penance, after a long interval proportioned to the offence. This canon was generally received in the West. But in the year 407, Innocent I. closed the outlet of penance, and left no loop-hole of forgiveness open to those who had violated their vow. Subsequent ages increased, rather than mitigated, this rigour; and imprisonment, and tortures, and death, were finally held out as the punishments of monastic incontinence. The resource of penance was still reserved by Innocent* for inconstant Novices—those who married, after having avowed the intention of chastity, but without having yet taken the veil.

The ceremony of consecration and the imposition of the veil was of origin earlier even than the time of St. Ambrose †; and it appears, that it might then be performed by a priest, no less *The Veil.* than by a bishop. The words ‡ pronounced on this occasion were prescribed by the Fourth Council of Carthage; but they varied, or were entirely changed, in subsequent times. The age at which the novice might be consecrated was equally variable, and seems to have been left, at least in early times, to the discretion of the prelate. An age as advanced as sixty years, appears at first to have been usual; but St. Ambrose gives reasons for permitting the veil to be sooner assumed; and the age of twenty-five was afterwards (generally, though by no means universally) established as the earliest, at which the recluse was permitted to place the indelible seal upon her resolution.

The first period, or, if we may so call it, the *Antiquity* of Monachism, was terminated in the Western Church by the epoch of St. Benedict; and it is generally recorded, *Benedictine Nuns.* that while that hermit was inventing his new institution for the brothers of his obedience, his sister Scholastica was raising the standard §, round which the holy virgins might collect with greater regularity and discipline. It would appear, however, that the rule of her disciples was rather given in restoration of the original observance, than on any new principle of religious seclusion. The alternations of industry and prayer; abstinence, silence, obedience, chastity were ordained, as in the primitive establishments; and the first Benedictine Nuns were in fact rather reformed nuns of St. Basil, than a distinct order. . . . Howbeit, they acquired reputation and flourished so rapidly, that in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, Rome contained (according to the assertion || of that Pope) three thousand ‘handmaids of God,’ (Ancillæ Dei,) who followed the Benedictine rule. And so boldly did they afterwards rise in rank and power, that about the year 813 it became

* Hospin. Orig. Monach. lib. iii. c. ult.

† We must not however be misled by the title of Tertullian's work, (De Virginibus Velandis,) to ascribe to that practice so high an antiquity. The object of that book is only to show, that all virgins, as well as matrons, ought, in their attendance on divine worship, to be veiled. It has no reference to any particular condition of life.

‡ They were these—‘Aspice, filia, et intueri; et obliviscere populum tuum et domum patris tui, ut concupiscat Rex decorum tuum.’

§ Mabillon (Pref. Hist. Benedict.) asserts this Scholastica to have been the founder of regular nunneries in the West; and calls her ‘Virginum Benedictinarum Ducem, Magistram et Antesignanam.’

|| Lib. vi. Epist. xxiii. See Hospinian, Orig. Monach. lib. iv. c. xvi. The ceremony of consecration, by the bishop, is here given at great length.

necessary to repress the pretended right of the Abbesses to consecrate and ordain, and perform other sacerdotal functions*.

The establishments of female recluses followed very closely the numerous diversities of the monastic scheme, and imitated the *Canonesses*. names of the male institutions, where they could not adopt their practice, or even their profession. An order of *Canonesses-Regular* was founded, or at least presented with a rule, by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 813. And we read, in later times, of a community of noble young ladies, who were associated under a very easy discipline, and unrestrained by any vow of celibacy, under the title of *Canonesses-Secular*. But these last pretenders to religious seclusion were, on more than one occasion, discountenanced by the authorities of the Church.

An imitation of the Military Orders might, at first sight, seem still more repugnant to the feelings and duties of holy *Nuns of the Hospital*. virgins. But, in respect at least to the oldest of those orders, it was in fact far otherwise. That community originated (as has already been mentioned) in an office of gratuitous humanity;—to entertain the stranger, and to tend the sick, were the earliest offices of the Knight of the Hospital. By him, indeed, those humbler tasks may afterwards have been forgotten in the character of the soldier of the Cross; but the ‘Nuns of the Hospital †’ adhered to the earliest and the noblest object of the institution. Their foundation was contemporary with that of the Chevaliers; and in after times, they extended their establishments, and perhaps their charities, into every part of Europe.

The calamities of the Crusades were followed and alleviated by another institution, in which charitable females immediately took a share, and of which the purpose was not less worthy of its religious profession. A multitude of Christian captives had been thrown by the vicissitudes of war into the power of the Saracens; and for their redemption, the order of the ‘Nuns of the Holy Trinity’ was established very early in the thirteenth century. It survived the occasion which gave it birth, and flourished widely, under the patronage of certain pious princesses ‡, especially in Spain.

The foundation of several nunneries divided with his other ecclesiastical duties the busy zeal of St. Dominic. And *Nuns of St. Dominic*. though we cannot discover that the essential characteristics of his order, preaching and mendicity, were in practice communicated to the holy sisters who bore his name, yet the name was sufficient to procure for them wealth and popularity; and they probably were not surpassed in either of those respects by any other order §. St. Catharine of Sienna, a vehement devotee, professed

* At the Council of Beaufield in Kent, abbesses subscribed their signatures, no less than Abbots and other Ecclesiastics. This is recorded to have been the first instance of such assumption of equality.

† A long account of these ‘Religieuses Hospitalières,’ together with the formalities of reception into the order, may be found in the *Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*, *Trois. Partie*, chap. xiv. We may remark that their ‘Habits de Cérémonie de Chœur,’ indicate wealth, if not vanity. The ‘Religieuse Chevalière de l’Ordre de St. Jaques de l’Epee’ was a Spanish invention of a much later age. This order seems to have originated at Salamanca.

‡ *Hist. Ordres Monast. partie II. chap. xlix.*

§ The historian ‘*Des Ordres Monastiques*,’ asserts, that when he wrote (about 1715), there were in Italy more than one hundred and thirty nunneries of that order, about forty-five in France, fifteen in Portugal, and forty in Germany, in spite of the devasta-

especially to reverence the virtues and imitate the discipline of St. Dominic; and she may properly be accounted among his "most genuine disciples, since she interposed to smooth the political difficulties of her country, and to influence, by her reason and authority, the most momentous concerns of the Church. Among the female Mendicants, the latest institution was that of the Carmelites. They appear to have been founded about 1452, by virtue of a bull of Nicholas V.; and nearly a century afterwards, they were reformed by the celebrated St. Theresa, a native of Castille.

We shall not trace the endless catalogue, nor enumerate the various names, under which the same or very similar institutions perpetually re-appeared. Among those of somewhat earlier times, that of St. Brigida, a Princess of Sweden, is most renowned. It was an establishment for the reception of both sexes—though separated in residence—under the superintendence of an Abbess; and its Rule * was confirmed by Urban V. about the year 1360. Though manual labour was strictly enjoined, the royal hand which founded the community appears, at the same time, to have blessed it with ample endowments. Of the more modern orders, there is also one which may seem to require our notice—that of the Ursulines. Its origin is ascribed † to Angela di *The Ursulines*, Brescia, about the year 1537, though the Saint from whom it received its name, Ursula Benincasa, a native of Naples, was born ten years afterwards. Its character was peculiar, and recalls our attention to the primitive form of ascetic devotion. The duties of those holy sisters were the purest within the circle of human benevolence—to minister to the sick, to relieve the poor, to console the miserable, to pray with the penitent. These charitable offices they undertook to execute without the bond of any community, without the obligation of any monastic vow, without any separation from society, any renouncement of their domestic duties and virtues. And so admirably were those offices, in millions of instances, performed, that, had all other female orders been really as useless and as vicious, as they are sometimes falsely described to be, the virtues of the Ursulines had alone been sufficient to redeem the monastic name.

But it is very far from true, that these other orders were either commonly dissolute or generally useless. Occasional scandals have engendered universal calumnies. To recite the mere names ‡ of those most

tions of the heretics. The order which bears the name of St. Catherine, was probably not founded by herself (though Hospinian asserts otherwise), and it is variously assigned to the year 1372 or 1455—a diversity which some attempt to reconcile. We shall have occasion to make further mention of this celebrated devotee in a following chapter.

* This Rule occupies eight folio pages in Hospinian, lib. vi. cap. 39. It professed to proceed from the immediate dictation of Christ.

† Hist. des Ordres Monast. Suite de la Trois. Partie, chap. xiv. et xx. The historian enumerates and describes thirteen congregations of Ursulines, established for the most part in France and in Italy.

‡ Such were the Religieuses Hospitalières de la Charité de Notre Dame, De Notre Dame du Refuge, De N. D. de la Misericorde, &c. Orphan asylums were numerous as 'the Congregations of St. Joseph.' Many were founded for the maintenance and education of poor girls; many for the sick; many for the penitent. In a description of the plague, in 1347, Fleury (Hist. Eccles. liv. xcvi. s. 45) bears the following accidental testimony to female charity:—'Plusieurs Prêtres timides abandonnoient leurs troupeaux et en laissoient les soins à des Religieux plus hardis. Les Religieuses servoient les malades sans crainte, avec leur charité et leur humanité ordinaire. Plusieurs entre elles moururent, mais on les renouelloit souvent.'

lately founded is sufficient to show that their professed objects were almost always excellent; and it would be as injurious to human nature, as it is contrary to historical evidence, to suppose that those objects were instantly abandoned, and made merely a cover for the opposite vices. In the more secular institutions of the other sex there was greater space for the operation of evil passions. In those polluted cloisters, the seeds of avarice were commonly nourished by the practice of profitable deceptions, and the prospect of opulent benefices. The holiest contemplations were interrupted by the voice of ambition inviting the most austere recluse to dignity and power—to abbasies, to prelacies; to the councils of kings, to that predominant apostolical eminence, whence kings and their councils were insulted and overthrown . . . But into the cell of the female Devotee, those passions at least can seldom have intruded, because they had no object there*. Without insisting upon any natural predisposition to piety and benevolence, we may be well assured that the precincts of the convent were very fruitful in the exercise of both; and whatsoever judgment we may finally form respecting the character of that influence, which monachism has exercised through so many ages on so many forms of society, we may pronounce without hesitation the general purity and usefulness of the Female Orders.

Voltaire, in his Chapter on the Religious Orders, after eulogizing the charities of the female institutions in the noblest spirit of philanthropy, has remarked that 'those who have separated themselves from the Church of Rome have but faintly imitated that generous virtue.' The taunt is undeserved. We did not lay aside our charities, when we dispensed with our vows; we did not languish in the practice, when we rejected the profession; the religious motive acts not less powerfully, because the *name* is less commonly put forward; and in as far at least as the tender sex is concerned, there is not a district in our Cities, nor a village in our Provinces, which does not profit by the unpretending, unavowed, enlightened benevolence of Protestant Ursulines.

We shall now conclude a chapter—already disproportionate to the dimensions of this work, but far too contracted for the immensity of the subject—by a few obvious and almost necessary observations.

Without recurring to the less definite shape which monachism assumed in the West during the fourth and fifth ages, we may observe, that the three distinctive characters which it afterwards adopted were well suited to the several periods in which they successively rose and flourished. First in origin were the Regular Benedictine † Cœnobites; and they

* Some remarks have been suggested to us on this passage, which we recommend to the reader's consideration—premising, however, that the position in the text only affirms the moral superiority of nuns to monks, on the ground that *some* of the passions on which the habits of the latter were formed, had no object to rouse them in the former.

I cannot help thinking (says an ingenious friend) that the argument implied in the words 'passions which had no object there,' is fallacious. Many passions, if not all, will *find* objects, natural or unnatural. The danger of wandering, in the absence of express revelation, from that knowledge of the will of God, which may be collected from induction, is as pernicious to morals, as the *a priori* reasoning is to science. An institution preventing women from becoming wives and mothers, was immoral (considering the natural evidence of their propensities) in the same sense in which the opposition to the philosophy of Galileo was unreasonable.

† We do not here intend to distinguish between monks and canons, because both were Cœnobites, and possessed the same general characteristics, widely removed from the principles both of the Military and the Mendicant Orders—still less between the Original and Reformed Benedictines.

reigned without any rivals over the consciences of the faithful for above six centuries.—Those were centuries of the deepest ignorance and superstition which the history of Europe exhibits. That Order imitated the Oriental enthusiasm in which the whole system originated; it likewise inculcated moral severity, and exercised, in a greater or less degree, both useful industry and virtuous benevolence. As it thus grew in reputation and temporal grandeur, it extended and multiplied its demands upon human credulity. The most extravagant spiritual claims were recommended by a great parade, and by some reality, of devotion. Spacious and imposing edifices, whence the chaunt of holy voices was heard unceasingly to proceed in solemn prayer, by night and by day—some practice of charitable offices—great superiority in manner and education—the possession, almost exclusive, of the learning of the age—these advantages prepared an uninstructed people to receive with blindness any form of superstition, which their ghostly directors might think proper to impose on them, and gave efficacy to deception and imposture. And thus it proved, that, when superstition had once taken root in the soil of ignorance, it was nourished through so many ages by a much less proportion of moral and religious excellence, and scarcely more of knowledge, than had been necessary to plant it there. The most inactive among the forms of monachism was found sufficient to hold the human mind, as long as it was uninformed and unexcited, in servile subjugation.

The next which rose were the Military Orders,—and of these it is sufficient to remark, that they formed no regular part of the church system, but were the casual consequence of the Crusades. They were instituted, to assail the external enemies of the faith; they were continued, to repel their invasions, and defend the outworks of Christendom; but they did not very long survive the circumstances which created and sustained them. Indeed, the profession of arms in the name of Christ was so palpable a mockery of the true spirit of his religion, that its permanence was scarcely consistent with the fundamental principles of Christian society. An extraordinary occurrence could alone have given it existence, but it could not possibly give it perpetuity.

As corruption increased within the Church, and ignorance diminished without it, heresy began to spread widely, and the voice of reason found many listeners. And then it was that a band of active and intelligent emissaries was required for the maintenance of the established ecclesiastical system. For this purpose the talents of the Dominicans were more especially serviceable. But since a large measure of superstition still infected the lower orders, and none were wholly free from it, the abstinent and ragged devotion of the Franciscans was also not without its use, in exciting veneration towards themselves, and towards the Church, whose missionaries they were. Besides, the original Mendicants denounced, with courage and vehemence, the vices and the violences of the great. Their close connexion with the papal, or Guelphic interests, placed them in opposition to the imperial domination, and thus made them, in their political mediations, the advocates of liberal and popular principles. But above all, they were careful to provide themselves with that powerful weapon, which, from the days of St. Augustine to those of the Crusades, had entirely rested, and which had been very partially employed afterwards. True eloquence, indeed, is not commonly attainable; but they possessed and perpetually exercised that fluency of passionate declamation, which produced on the people all the effects of eloquence. It had

even some advantages over the more chastised effusions of antiquity*. It derived its authority from the oracles of God; the moral obligations which it urged were more directly subservient to human happiness; and its particular application in the mouth of the Mendicants was very commonly to a benevolent object,—to negotiate treaties, to reconcile party animosities, to stay the calamities of public or private warfare. Accordingly, the records of the thirteenth and following centuries abound with proofs of its efficacy and its influence in political, no less than in ecclesiastical, transactions. It has moreover been mentioned, that the Mendicants availed themselves with great address of the peculiar learning† of that age, and acquired uncommon dexterity in the perversion of reason. Conversant, more than any others, with the metaphysical subtleties of the schools, they well knew how, at the same time, to indulge the sophistical and the superstitious spirit of the age, and, by indulging, to nourish both. Thus they combined, for the defence of papacy, the abuse of reason with the abuse of religion; and their genius and their industry, by pandering to the existing prejudices, prolonged the servitude and degradation of the human mind.

A Roman Catholic writer has observed, with a demonstration of pious gratitude, that the same God who raised up St. Athanasius against the Arians, and St. Augustine against the Pelagians, and St. Dominic and St. Francis against the Albigenses, deigned, in a later and still more perilous age, to call forth the spirit of Loyola against the Lutheran and Calvinistic apostates. And it may be, that at the moment when Luther was writing his book against monastic vows, the Spaniard was composing his ‘Spiritual Exercises’ for the restoration of other orders and the establishment of his own. It is only necessary for us to observe, that the defensive system of the Roman Church was completed by the institution of the Jesuits, though somewhat too late for its perfect preservation. And we may add, in pursuance of our other observations, that that order was as justly accommodated to the increasing intelligence of the sixteenth century, as were the Benedictines to the darkness of absolute ignorance, and the Mendicants to the twilight of reason. But each, in their turn of pernicious operation, though they enjoyed their appointed range and season of influence, were too feeble to prevent the revival, to arrest the growth, or to crush the maturity of truth and religious knowledge.

If we regard the monastic system in another point of view, we shall perceive it to consist in a continual succession of reformations. The foundation of every institution was laid, as it rose out of the corruption of its predecessor, in poverty, in the most rigid morality, in the duties of religion, of education, of charity. The practice first, and next the show, of these qualities, led, in

* A comparison in favour of the Mendicants is ingeniously drawn by Denina, lib. xii. cap. vi.

† Giannone even asserts, that the merit to which the Mendicants were chiefly indebted for the favour of the Popes, was their success in substituting the scholastic, for the dogmatic theology and the study of antiquity and history, so as to occupy the minds of the learned with abstract and useless questions and disputes, and so many *contrasti* and *raggiri*, that no one not conversant with that art could confront them with any hope of success. It was indeed by such a method of reasoning that the pretensions of Rome were best defended; and the Mendicants were bound to defend them, since all their exemptions, and much of their property, flowed *directly* from Rome; for the Pope not uncommonly gave them convents belonging to other Orders.

every instance, to wealth ; and wealth was surely followed, first, by the relaxation of discipline—next, by the contempt of decency. Then followed the necessity of reform ; and the same system was regenerated under another, or perhaps under the same name, and passed through the same deteriorating process to a second corruption. Again,—the Reformed Order was re-reformed and re-regenerated, and again it fell into decay and dissolution. The history of the monastic orders, when pursued into the details of the several establishments, presents to us an unvarying picture of vigour, prosperity, dissension, followed by new statutes, and a stricter rule. A system, of which the foundations were not placed either in Scripture or in reason, was necessarily liable to perpetual change ; nor was it capable of any other condition of existence, than one of continual decay and reproduction.

If we reflect for an instant on the outlines of Western Monachism, we observe, that the Rule of Benedict of Nursia had already fallen into great degradation, when it was revived by Benedict of Aniane. The system then flourished with extraordinary vigour ; but for so short a period, that when, about the year 900, the Reformed Order of Cluni was established, its founders deserved the glory of restoring the ancient discipline ; and that event is justly considered as marking an important epoch in monastic history. Again, within two other centuries, we observe the younger and more rigid Cistercians censuring the secular pride and luxurious relaxation of their rivals. In the next age, it was proposed to heal the disorders, or at least to supply the deficiencies, of the old system, by the super-addition of the Mendicants, models of primitive and apostolical austerity*. But even the very slight notice, which we have been able to bestow on the history of the Franciscans, has proved how very early they fell into disorders, succeeded, though not repaired, by reformation. Even the institution of St. Dominic was very far from securing the purity of his children ; indeed, it was at no distant period from their foundation, that a part of them assumed the distinctive appellation of Reformed Dominicans. (*Dominicani Riformati.*) . . . By this process of continual change and restoration, the monastic system maintained an influence, varying extremely in degree, but never wholly suspended, over the nations of the West for eleven hundred years. That it did so, may well surprise us, if we consider only the principles of its first foundation, and the monstrous and avowed abuses, which at various periods infected it. But on the other hand, it was sustained by an infusion of much real piety and of many unquestioned virtues ; and it was prolonged from time to time by a series of judicious and seasonable alterations, such as are able to give permanence even to a feeble and mischievous establishment, and without which there is no security even for the wisest and the most excellent.

Still this last cause had alone been insufficient. It is not possible, that any policy of Church government could have upheld the system so long and so triumphantly, if it had not possessed something not only plausible in its principle, and respectable in its profession, but also practical and profitable in its influence on society. It would be ungrateful

* This was, indeed, to seek safety in the opposite extreme, and by the *entire* renunciation of all temporalities to exceed the severity of St. Benedict ; but the disease at that time demanded a violent remedy. The choice for such an Order lay between bodily labour and mendicity—the latter was preferred, as being, in name, more humiliating, and also more consistent with intellectual attainments, and the grand spiritual offices of instructing the vulgar, converting heretics, &c.

and unjust to disparage the benefits which it has really conferred on former ages, and of which the consequences may have reached our own.

We may comprehend all the useful merits, which have ever been claimed for monachism, with any shadow of reason, under four heads. (1.) The earliest monks lived by the labour of their hands; and the large tracts of waste land, with which their houses were endowed, were brought into cultivation by their personal exertions. Even in the eighth and ninth centuries, when they became for the most part clerks, their estates continued to bear marks of more careful superintendence; their serfs and dependents were more numerous and more prosperous; cities grew up under their economy; provinces were fertilized, forests and marshes were peopled under their administration. Nor is there any reason to question, what is generally admitted, that the vassals of the monasteries were raised at least some degrees nearer to domestic comfort and civilization, than those of the adjacent baronies.

(2.) The earliest monasteries were very commonly consecrated to the discharge of important moral and social, as well as religious, duties. That of hospitality, or the entertainment of travellers and pilgrims, was certainly practised with great fidelity; and in ages and countries in which inns and caravanseras* were yet unknown, and even the personal safety of the stranger was ill secured by law, it was usefully and benevolently instituted, that his reception and protection should, in some manner, be associated with the offices of religion. The worldly authority of religion is never more profitably employed, than in supplying the defects of police, of government, and civilization. And thus it proved, that, during the five or six centuries of confusion and barbarism, which followed the subversion of the Western Empire, the monastic system became a powerful instrument in correcting the vices of society, and alleviating their pressure on the lower orders.

The earliest donations, with which the Church was enriched, were for the most part the genuine unconditional fruits of superstition. But in somewhat later times, when it was discovered that the property of the Church was liable not only to spoliation by laymen, but to abuse by churchmen, the profusion of the pious admitted the admixture of human motives, and was less than formerly directed to the support of the clergy, more to that of the poor and miserable. Accordingly, among the ecclesiastical records of the eighth and ninth centuries, no less than of those which followed, we find many monuments †, which prove the general application of a part (and in some few cases the greater part) of the revenues of certain monasteries to the use of the sick, the poor and the

* Muratori shows that the use of inns, as places of *reception* for strangers, was as late as the eleventh or twelfth century. He throws great light on the nature of the earliest Christian establishments for that purpose, in Dissertations 37 and 56.

† Among those produced by Muratori, are some bearing the dates 759, 812, 790, 718, 721, 757, 764, 847, 825, &c. A charter given to the monks of Modena, in 996, contains these words:—‘Et domum Hospitalem habeant, ubi *secundum morem* hospites de decimis laborum suorum recipiant.’ Some assert, that, before the middle of the eighth century, there was no monastery in the west which had not an Hospital attached to it; and we have remarked that in later ages, *that* was, in at least one instance, the very foundation on which a new order was established. We might add that such was the origin of the Ordre du Saint Esprit at Montpellier; and we observe that in 1198, Innocent III. rebuilt an Hospital, which had been founded at Rome, in 715, by a Saxon king for the use of Saxon pilgrims.

traveller. A particular building* appropriated to these purposes was attached to many monasteries, and was an essential part of the establishment. Thus, these religious institutions became the channel, through which the benevolence of the wealthy was communicated to the lower classes. And though the charity, which seemed to acquire sanctity by passing through that medium, may sometimes have been diminished or perverted, there can be no doubt that much of it reached its destination, even in the worst ages of the church. In seasons of general strife and anarchy, the contributions of the pious found their best hope of security and usefulness in monastic hands; and if the sacred deposit was sometimes violated by the treacherous avarice of those to whom it was confided, a much greater portion was unquestionably applied to its intended purpose, the alleviation of disease and misery.

In the Eastern Church, the introduction of every variety † of charitable establishment immediately followed the reception of the Gospel. It was the work of Christian principles and of Christian men; and was closely, though not inseparably, connected with the monastic institution. Two of the greatest patrons of that system, St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, were likewise the founders of hospitals (Nosocomia): places of entertainment for strangers (Xenodochia) were early attached to several Churches, and deacons appointed to discharge their duties. But the monasteries of the East were at no period so enriched by charitable deposits, as those of the Latin Church: for the monks in those countries never obtained influence so despotic over a more enlightened people; and a more settled form of civil government secured the wealthy against the rapine, to which they were continually liable under the feudal anarchy.

But it was not merely in respect to their temporal necessities that the people, and especially the lower orders, were benefited by those establishments. Many blessings were at the same time conferred by their religious character; many afflictions were consoled, many hopes suggested, many sins prevented, by the exertions of pious monks. Those brothers, though exalted as a community, were not individually removed above the condition of the peasants, and they had commonly the same origin; so that the intercourse was close and searching, and its advantages frequently reciprocal. There are many spiritual wounds, which are most effectually probed and healed by a pastor, whose condition, whose associations and understanding, are not much elevated above those of the penitent. A more perfect confidence, a deeper sympathy, is then excited, than when the parties are widely separated in rank or intellect. This advantage the monks in general possessed over the secular clergy in the Roman Church; and to this we may partly attribute the superiority of their influence. That this influence was often abused, we know too well; nor can there be any doubt that the intercourse which led to it has been sometimes injurious. But during the better ages of monachism, it is unquestionable that the blessings of that religious connexion between the monks and the poor were greatly predominant.

* Some of these, called *Matriculæ*, seem to have corresponded very nearly with our poor-houses. The *Domus Hospitalis* was nearly synonymous: a Church was usually founded with them. We have an instance of one of these built by Ansaldus at Lucca, in 784, on the condition 'that every week, twelve poor and strangers should be admitted to the table of the Church.' There are abundant records of such establishments; but some of them were, in process of time, seized and appropriated by the lay-rector. See Muratori, *Dissert.* 37.

† This is proved by the mere use of the terms *Xenodochia*, *Gerontocomia*, *Nosocomia*, *Orphanotrophia*, *Brephotrophia*, *Ptochotrophia*, so familiar to the writers of those ages.

It is the boast of St. Bernard that those who had embraced the monastic condition lived with greater purity than other men; that they fell less frequently and rose more quickly; that they walked with greater prudence; were more constantly refreshed with the spiritual dew of heaven; rested with less danger; died with greater hope. And far as the monastic practice has generally fallen below its profession, we doubt not, that in the earlier ages, and especially in the infancy of their several institutions, their inmates surpassed all other classes of society, not excepting the secular clergy, in the exercise of moral and religious offices. Devoted to the relief of the poor, and the service of the sick and the stranger, they were so placed, that even the imperfect discharge of their charitable duties conferred no scanty benefits on an uncivilized generation. Among the millions who have entered religious houses, under the most solemn vows of virtue and piety, there must have been multitudes whose mere innocence made at least some amends to society for their seclusion from its care and its temptations; there were certainly many, whose acquirements and indisputable excellence threw out a light and example to their contemporaries; and some there were, and not a few, whose eminent qualities were directed, as steadily as the spirit of their age allowed them, to the honour and improvement of their Church—to alleviate private affliction, and mitigate the general barbarism.

(3.) From the earliest period, in the Eastern as well as in the Roman Church, the duties of education were entrusted to the monks. In process of time they became, in the latter Church, nearly confined to them, and they continued so at least as late as the eleventh century. Monastic schools were established by St. Benedict; they were inseparably attached to his institutions, and spread, with the progress of his order, over the kingdoms of the West; and they were open to children of the earliest age*. It would seem that, in the eighth century, the cathedral or episcopal academies† were first established; and these afterwards became the most distinguished for the rank and eminence of their scholars. They were conducted, under the superintendence of the bishop, by the canons of the cathedral. And here we need only repeat a former observation, that, if the office of instruction was confined to the clergy, so also were its benefits, for many ages, to those intended for the ministry. So that the advantages which those establishments really conferred on the body of society were neither immediate nor certain; while the power of the clergy, being unduly exaggerated by the exclusive possession of learning, was thereby placed upon a principle absolutely at variance with the highest earthly interests of man.

(4.) This subject naturally leads us to our last consideration—the extent and character of the literature, whether sacred or profane, which was protected and nourished in the monastic establishments. On the first matter, Roman Catholic writers do not hesitate to ascribe the very

* This was peculiar to the order of St. Benedict. Hist. Litt. de la France, Siècle xii. p. 11. See also Mabillon, *Études Monastiques*, p. 1. ch. xi. The same writer (ch. xv.) enumerates several among the early Christian heroes,—Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome, &c.—who studied for a greater or less time in monasteries. St. Basil, in the first instance, established a school in his monastery for the reading of holy (as distinguished from profane) histories, and appointed rewards for superior merit. ‘*Nunquam de manu et oculis recedat liber*,’ says St. Jerome; and it is from the same monastic student that we have received that much contemned precept, ‘*ne ad scribendum cito prosilias*.’ *Multo tempore prius disce quod doceas.*’

† See Mosh, vol. ii. p. 55.

preservation of the pure doctrine of the Church to the refuge which it found within those fortresses—though it may seem doubtful, whether that doctrine might not have been preserved with equal purity, through ages too ignorant for controversy or cavil, by the fidelity of the secular clergy. At any rate, this praise can scarcely be granted to the monks without some qualification. For if it be true that, during the Arian controversy, they were the most zealous defenders of the Nicene faith, it is not less certain, that the principles of Origen, and the mystical * interpretation of Scripture gained great footing among them, and that not merely in the East; nor should the support which they persevered in affording to the cause of the Images, during that long and angry controversy, be forgotten in any estimate which we may endeavour to form of their pretensions to doctrinal or ecclesiastical purity. It is indeed unquestionable, that the externals of religion, so valuable to the Latin church, its offices †, and ceremonies, were enriched and dignified by the monks and canons. They acquired an imposing splendour from the number engaged in their performance, and the resources of their several communities. But passing over these equivocal merits, we may mention one great and truly incalculable service which those establishments conferred on future ages, though they neglected to derive much advantage from it themselves. They preserved, through dangerous and turbulent periods, ancient copies of the inspired writings, and of the most valuable commentaries made on them in the earliest times. And those were among the most profitable moments of monastic leisure, which were employed in multiplying the sacred manuscripts ‡.

Though religious houses were intended to be the depositaries of virtue and piety §, not of letters, yet letters were, to a certain extent, encouraged there, as subsidiary to the grand object of the institution. It is shown, indeed, by the learned author || of the ‘*Monastic Studies*,’ that the earliest monks entirely renounced profane literature, and confined their diligence to theological works and contemplations: the authority and example of St. Jerome confirmed that preference. But in later times, and especially when

* This is said to have been, in the first instance, occasioned by the substitution of mental prayer for manual labour. From the excesses of mysticism proceeded the errors of the Beghards and Beguines, and other enthusiasts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; they strove after absolute perfection, and they fell into fanaticism.

† Fleury, *Discours. depuis 800. . 1100.* Muratori, *Dissertat.* 56. The monks gained great advantages by the introduction of chaunts into the service; and this was imitated, in the ninth century, by the cathedral clergy. Some rivalry ensued between these ecclesiastics, and thus, ‘*cœpit frequentius agi et augustius procedere divina Res.*’ Some ‘*modulation of prayers and praises*,’ they had indeed used from the earliest ages; but not with that plenitude and majesty, which the chorus of monks and canons afterwards introduced. The organ appears to have come into use about the year 826.

‡ The great increase of MSS. during the eleventh century, is to be ascribed to this monastic leisure, and could scarcely be effected otherwise. And this was the first step, after the devastation of the four preceding ages, towards the revival of ancient, and the creation of modern, learning. In the twelfth age we find St. Bernard inculcating the duties of writing and copying as the best substitute for labour.

§ The words of St. Peter, ‘*We have left all to follow Thee*,’ are those, as St. Bernard observed, which have founded cloisters and peopled deserts.

|| Mabillon (*Etudes Monastiques*, p. 1.) proves the prevalence of literary industry, in the monastic life, by direct historical evidence; by the multitude of learned ecclesiastics who emerged from them; by their libraries; by direct reference to the rule of St. Benedict. To the neglect of study he attributes the decline of the several Orders, and observes, that reform was commonly attended by its restoration; that academies or colleges were invariably connected with the Benedictine establishments; and that both Popes and Councils perpetually inculcated the duty of study.

the practice of manual labour fell into disuse, the limits of their studious industry were enlarged, and they gradually embraced some department of profane science, as well as of classical lore. The compilation of Decretals led to the study of canon law; the discovery of the Digest directed attention to civil legislation. The art of medicine presented a spacious field, which was made attractive, first, perhaps, by its salutary and charitable uses, afterwards by the gain* which followed it. The monastic establishments furnished the leisure and the best existing instruments for all those pursuits; and, after the eighth or ninth age, they were distinguished by some efforts after knowledge, not fruitless of beneficial effects and even of useful discoveries.

Again, many of the most precious monuments of profane antiquity owe their preservation to the sanctity of the monasteries, or to the zeal of their defenders. All these might have perished, as many, notwithstanding, did perish, had there not existed, during the long and barbarous anarchy of the Western Empire, certain communities, associated in the name of religion for peaceful, if not pious, purposes; whose interests were opposed to the progress of disorder and rapine, and whose holy profession secured them some respect from a lawless, but superstitious, people. The diligence which was employed in transcribing those valuable models, while it promoted their circulation, could scarcely fail to infuse some taste or energy into the dullest mind; and it certainly appears, that during the eighth and ninth, and especially the eleventh ages, most † of the characters, who acquired any ecclesiastical celebrity, proceeded from the discipline of the cloister.

Having thus intended to give a general view of the advantages which the monastic system has conferred on society, we cannot fail to observe, that they are for the most part confined to ages of ignorance or turbulence; that they were almost proportionate to the debasement of the people, and to the weakness or wickedness of the civil government. The former of those evils was somewhat alleviated, the latter was partially obviated, by the monastic institutions. Herein is comprehended the sum and substance of their utility. In a civilized nation, under a just and enlightened rule, it is their necessary effect to obstruct industry and retard improvement. But, on the other hand, if we consider them in reference to the times in which they rose and began to flourish,—if we compare the habits, the morals, the intelligence of the monks with those of their secular contemporaries,—shall we not immediately admit, that in bad ages they were probably the best men; that they were the most useful members of a disjointed community; that their vicious principles were less vicious than the general principles of society; that they were in advance of the civilization of their day? If so—and to us it appears indisputable—let us be cautious how we cast unqualified censure upon a body of religious persons, who formed, for the space of five or six centuries, the most respectable portion of the Christian world.

* A council held at Rheims, under Innocent II. in 1131, published a canon, prohibiting monks and canons-regular to study civil law or medicine; and the injunction was repeated by the Lateran Council in 1139. These occupations were on this occasion expressly ascribed to avarice. And we may remark, that the prohibition was confined to the monks—the secular clergy, in the entire ignorance of the laity, were permitted to practise both law and physic.

† Bede, Alcuin, Willibrod, &c. were monks; and most of the Popes and Cardinals of the eleventh century rose from the ranks of the regular clergy. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xi. Siècle.

At the same time, we ought not to forget, that, even in those times to which their utility was confined, it was continually obstructed both by the original defects of *Superstitious tendency*. their system, and its consequent corruptions.

Almost from their first establishment, in the East no less than in the West, we find them the faithful defenders, if not parents, of superstitious abuse. The adoration of saints, the miraculous qualities of relics, and the homage due to them, and, above all, the sanctity and worship of images, have been inculcated with peculiar zeal by the monks of every order, in every age of the church. Again, as they ever have been the patrons of religious abuse, so have they inflexibly opposed any *general* attempt at church reform. Reforms, indeed, in their particular establishments have been incessant. Such, again, as touched the discipline of the secular clergy have sometimes found support in the jealousy of the regular orders. But any exertion, tending to the restoration of pure Christianity, has ever found its fiercest opponents in the cloister; and through such opposition many unscriptural practices have been perpetuated both in the Eastern and Western Churches. Of course it is not intended to ascribe to them all the corruptions of religion; indeed, we have already traced the origin of many of these to a period preceding the creation of monachism. The 'vices of the clergy' are acknowledged in ecclesiastical records long before the prevalence of monastic influence; and it seems probable even that the traffic in indulgences finally so scandalous to the Mendicants, was begun by the bishops*. But all existing abuses were carefully nourished and fostered by the hands of monks; and the execution of miracles and other popular impostures was conducted with peculiar ingenuity and success by the inmates of the monastery †. And we may add, that the lucrative system of Purgatory was then most zealously supported, as indeed the wealth which flowed from it was distributed for the most part among those establishments.

In early ages the monks were the subjects, and, as it were, the army of the bishops; they maintained *their* rights, they fought their battles, and profited by their protection. In the East this mutual relation long subsisted; and as the original monasteries were expressly subjected, by the Council of Chalcedon, to the bishop of the diocese, and as many were indebted for their foundation to episcopal munificence and piety, the claims were just, and the connexion natural. But in the Roman Church it was violated almost by the first movements of papal ambition. In the year 601, Gregory the Great ‡ (himself for some time the inmate of a monastery) held a Council, in which were passed many regulations favourable to what the monks considered their independence. They were permitted to choose their own abbot; and the *Exemptions* bishop was precluded not only from all interference in

* See Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 420. We may remark, that the same author sometimes distinguishes the regular canons as more exempt from the vices which he so indiscriminately objects to the other monastic orders.

† The Carthusians are stigmatized by monastic writers for inferiority in that power, if not for the entire destitution of it. The consequence is, that, having performed few or no miracles, they boast very few names in the calendar of the saints. See Hospinian, lib. v. cap. vii.

‡ Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. iv., cap. xii. Mosheim, seemingly overlooking this circumstance, is disposed to attribute the growing alliance of the popes and monks in the eleventh century to the oppression and rapacity of princes and bishops. (Cent. xi. p. 2, chap. ii.) Doubtless there were instances of this; but the principle of the alliance was of much earlier origin.

their temporalities, and all exercise of jurisdiction over them, but even from the celebration of the divine offices in their churches. From this event (if from any single event) we may probably date the undue aggrandizement of the monastic order, and its increasing influence on civil as well as ecclesiastical politics. But in independence it only so far gained, as to exchange a near for a distant master—a petty tyrant, it might be, for an imperious but partial despot. One evil effect of this change was presently felt,—the removal of the bishop's immediate superintendence facilitated the progress of abuse and licentiousness*. The eighth and ninth ages were, in truth, the most triumphant era of monasticism †. Whatsoever learning then existed was confined, or nearly so, to the convents; and not only did nobles and kings contest with each other the honour of endowing them, but there were many who took refuge there in their own persons from the miseries and dangers of a turbulent world. By such secession they conferred the security which they courted; and additional sanctity seemed to surround the buildings which were dignified by the retreat of great, perhaps even of good, men.

Absolute exemptions from episcopal authority were for some time rare. The first instance was probably that of Monte Cassino, which might be excused by its vicinity to Rome. But the example, though sparingly imitated, was by no means lost on following times; and after the pontificate of Gregory VII., the abbots began universally to claim the immediate protection of St. Peter; and his Vicar was seldom slow to accord it. In process of time, entire congregations of monasteries (the Clunian, for instance, and the Cistercian) were included in a single exemption; so afterwards were the Mendicant Orders; and finally the whole monastic body acknowledged no other dependence than on the Pope ‡ alone. The abuse was at length pushed so far, that even a private clerk might obtain—of course by purchase—exemption from the control of his bishop. Undoubtedly, during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Holy See derived great power from the sort of separate hierarchy thus established; and for the two following ages, when ambition became less its ruling spirit, and avarice more so, such exemptions became the means of abundantly gratifying the favourite passion. But in the excess to which they were then carried, they shook the foundation of papal power, by inflaming the jealousy and disunion of the regular and secular clergy; and thus they mainly tended to promote, in due season, the rise of the Reformation, and to facilitate its progress.

At the same time, if the Popes were long supported and aggrandized through their close connexion with the monastic Orders, so were they very sedulous to return the favour, and to enrich those Orders, sometimes at the

Monastic Wealth. Purgatory, Indulgences, &c.

* One of Charlemagne's Capitularies prohibited abbots and abbesses from keeping fools, buffoons, and jugglers, for their amusement. But this implied no particular censure on the monastic orders, since we observe the same prohibition to be extended to bishops.

† Giannone, lib. v. cap. vi. The same have also been considered as the grand periods of episcopal authority. Both may be true. For the monasteries, though in some cases, and to a certain extent, independent of the bishops, were not yet placed in rivalry with them; but they probably made common cause, whenever the general interests of the Church were concerned.

‡ The papal right to grant these exemptions does not seem to have been disputed. Yet it rested on no better foundation than a confused notion, confirmed and augmented by the Decretals, that there were *no* limits to that authority. We should observe, that even in the East there were also instances of the direct dependence of monasteries on the Patriarch; but they were rare, and probably in faint imitation of the practice of the West.

expense of the secular clergy, but more usually by contributions from the laity. In earlier ages, the profusion of kings and nobles abundantly satiated the avarice of every department of the church; but when this spirit gradually expired, and new Orders were still everywhere starting up, professing poverty, and clamorous for wealth, it became necessary to open new resources for their nourishment. These were easily discovered in the fruitfulness of superstition. Purgatory presently assumed a more definite shape; and it was no difficult office for the priests, who created it, to conduct its administration and economy. Their power over the concerns of that state was believed on the same authority, which had established its existence. This grand invention, with the devices of masses, indulgences, &c., which flowed from it, extended its influence from the highest even to the lowest classes of the people; so that through these means every condition of society became tributary to the church. The monks enjoyed a very great share in the profits of this imposture. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, the reputation to which they had already risen was so much augmented by the foundation and name of Cluni, that some are disposed to date their triumph over the secular clergy from this period*—it is certain that the attention of churchmen was from this time more anxiously directed to their temporalities † than heretofore. . . . After the institution of the Mendicants, the lucrative ‡ departments of the profession were chiefly committed to their superintendence; and it was especially through their heedless abuse of favours, as heedlessly lavished on them by a succession of necessitous Popes, and most so through the public and confessed venality of indulgences, that the deformities of the papal system became generally acknowledged and execrated. These were the scandals which, more than any of its pretensions and impostures, awakened the indignation of mankind. And thus it came to pass, in the fulness of time, that out of the bosom of that very order which had been most instrumental in supporting papal power, and corrupting the very corruptions of religion, the voice of Providence was pleased to call forth the great restorer of his holy church. While the Benedictines were reposing in their luxurious edifices—while the Mendicants were openly prostituting for gold the offices and pretended solaces of religion, the progress of knowledge and the increase of corruption prepared the field of triumph for the Saxon reformer.

* It is probable that they far surpassed the secular clergy of this time in austerity and even in real piety of life, which was not, indeed, any very difficult triumph. It is certain that they now began to apply not only to study, but to business, which the seculars almost equally neglected. Hence the succession of five monks, who, during the eleventh age, governed the Church for fifty years; and to whom Mosheim, in his unqualified hatred for everything monastic, attributes almost all its sins.

† Giannone (Stor. Nap., lib. vii., cap. v.) remarks, that censures and excommunications—those spiritual weapons which hitherto had been usually employed for the correction of sin—were from this period chiefly directed against persons who plundered or alienated the property of the Church.

‡ It is worthy of remark that the French, in pursuance of their constant determination to preserve themselves from pure papacy, strongly discouraged the acquisition of property in France by the Mendicants, fairly objecting to them their unequivocal vow of poverty.

CHAPTER XX.

History of the Popes, from the Death of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII.

The ardour of the Popes for Crusades—its motives and policy—Honorius III.—Frederic's vow to take the cross, and procrastination—Gregory IX.—his Coronation—he excommunicates the Emperor—who thus departs for Palestine—Gregory impedes his success, and invades his dominions—their subsequent disputes—Innocent IV.—his previous friendship with Frederic—Council of Lyons—various charges urged against Frederic—Innocent deposes Frederic and appoints his successor, on his own papal authority—Civil war in Germany—in Italy—death of Frederic—his character and conduct—his rigorous Decree against Heretics—Observations—Other reasons alleged to justify his deposition—this dispute compared with that between Gregory VII. and Henry—Taxes levied by the Pope on the Clergy—Crusade against the Emperor—Exaltation of Innocent—his visit to Italy and intrigues—his death—his qualities as a statesman—as a churchman—expression of the Sultan of Egypt—Alexander IV.—Urban IV.—Clement IV.—Introduction of Charles d'Anjou to the throne of Naples—Gregory X.—his piety, and other merits—Second Council of Lyons—Vain preparations for another Crusade—Death of Gregory—Objects of Nicholas II.—Martin IV.—Senator of Rome—Nicholas IV. diligent against Heresy—Pietro di Morone or Celestine V.—circumstances of his elevation—his previous life and habits—his singular incapacity—disaffection among the higher Clergy—his discontent and meditations—his resignation—Boniface VIII.—his excessive ambition and insolence—on the decline of the papal power—his temporal pretensions—Sardinia, Corsica, Scotland, Hungary—Recognition of Albert King of the Romans—and act of his submission—Philip the Fair—The Gallican Church—origin of its liberties—Differences between Boniface and Philip—Bull *Clericis Laicos*—its substance and subsequent interpretation—Affairs of the Bishop of Parmiers—Bull *Ausculta Fili*—burnt by Philip—Conduct of the French Nobles—of the Clergy—of Boniface—Bull *Unam Sanctam*—other violent proceedings—Moderation of Philip—further insolence of the Pope—Philip's appeal to a General Council—William of Nogaret—Personal assault on Boniface—his behaviour and the circumstances of his death.

THE Church of Rome had now so habitually stained herself with blood, as to be callous to the common feelings of nature, and insensible to the miseries of mankind. For more than a century she had employed her power in promoting the destruction of human life, by the most senseless expeditions: and as the ruinousness and vanity of the Crusades became more manifest, she seemed to redouble her exertions to renew and perpetuate them; for she thrived by contributions levied for this purpose, and by the property which was thus thrown under ecclesiastical protection; and she gathered strength through the weakness of monarchs, and the superstition of their subjects. Again, after Innocent had succeeded in an additional outrage upon humanity and reason, by converting the machine, which had been intended against the enemies of Christ, into an engine of domestic persecution and torture, it became more than ever the interest of the pope to keep alive a spirit, which might so easily be made to deviate into arbitrary channels. And thus the zeal for Crusades, which inflamed the breast of Innocent, passed without any diminution into those of his successors. Moreover, it is well known how earnestly the holy See supported the interests of Frederic II. against Otho IV., as long as the former was the weaker party, and how zealously it began to raise enemies against him, as soon as he became powerful; while the industry, with which it renewed and prolonged the contests between the Guelphs and the Ghibelines—contests which lacerated the vitals of Italy—furnishes melancholy proof, that its interests were even at this time associated with every principle that is subversive of peace and baneful to society; and that it pursued those interests with callous, persevering, uncompromising obduracy.

Innocent III. was succeeded by Honorius III., a native of Rome, who

for four years had been governor of Palermo under Frederic II.; but the remembrance of that connexion was easily thrown off, as soon as he rose from the condition of a subject to *Honorius III.* that of a rival. Frederic had made a solemn vow to Innocent, to engage without loss of time in a new crusade; and on his coronation at Rome, in 1220, he renewed that promise with still greater solemnity to Honorius. In the year following, instead of proceeding on his expedition, he appears to have appointed, on his own authority, to some vacant see; in virtue, as he maintained, of his royal right; in violation, as the pope asserted, of the liberties of the church. During the time consumed in this dispute, Damietta fell into the power of the Mahometans. In the year 1223, at a council held at Terentino in Campania, the Emperor renewed his oath to depart, and that within the space of two years; and to give earnest of his sincerity, he espoused the daughter of John of Brienne, King of Jerusalem. In the year following, that he might atone to the church for his continued delay, and evince to her the sincerity of his affection, he published some savage constitutions against heretics, which we shall presently notice. At the same time, in a long letter to the Pope, he complained of the general indifference to the cause of the Crusades, which then unfortunately prevailed throughout Europe*. Some disputes with the Lombards formed the next excuse for his delay; and in 1227 Honorius died, still pressing the departure of the monarch, and still pressing it in vain.

Gregory IX., who was nephew of Innocent III., was immediately raised to the pontifical chair, with loud and unanimous acclamation. On the day of his coronation he proceeded *Accession of Gregory IX* to St. Peter's, accompanied by several prelates, and assumed the pallium according to custom; and after having said mass he marched to the palace of the Lateran, covered with gold and jewels. On Easter Day, he celebrated mass solemnly at Sta. Maria Maggiore, and returned with a crown on his head. On Monday, having said mass at St. Peter's, he returned wearing two crowns, mounted on a horse richly caparisoned, and surrounded by Cardinals clothed in purple, and a numerous clergy †. The streets were spread with tapestry, inlaid with gold and silver, the noblest productions of Egypt, and the most brilliant colours of India, and perfumed with various aromatic odours. The people chaunted aloud *Kyrie eleison*, and their songs of joy were accompanied by the sound of trumpets. The judges and the officers shone in gilded habits and caps of silk. The Greeks and the Jews celebrated the praises of the Pope, each in his own language; a countless multitude marched before him carrying palms and flowers; and the sena-

* See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. l. 78, sect. 65, where a part of the letter is quoted. The actual restitution of the territories of the Countess Matilda to the Roman See, is by some ascribed to this Pontificate. Raynaldus (ann. 1221, Num. 29) asserts, that the imperial diploma existed in the Liber Censuum of the Vatican library—apud Pagi. Vit. Honor. iii. Sect. xxxi.

† This description is very faintly copied from a life of Gregory IX. cited by Odoricus Raynaldus; the following is a specimen: *Divinis missarum officiis reverenter expletis duplici diademate coronatus sub fulgoris specie in Cherubini transfiguratur aspectum, inter purpuratam venerabilium Cardinalium, Clericorum et Prælatorum comitativam innumeram, insignibus papalibus præcedentibus, equo in phaleris pretiosis evectus, per almæ Urbis miranda mœnia Pater Urbis et Orbis deducitur admirandus. Hinc cantica concrepant, etc. etc.* See Pagi, Vit. Gregor. ix., s. iii. Fleury l. 79. s. 31. There seems no reason to believe, that these demonstrations of joy or ebullitions of adulation exceeded the customary parade of the thirteenth century.

tors and prefect of Rome were on foot at his side, holding his bridle—and thus was he conducted to the palace of the Lateran.

The first and immediate act of a pontificate so gorgeously undertaken, was to urge the renewal of the Crusades, both by persuasion and menace, at the various courts of Europe. The forces of Frederic were already collected at Otranto, and, if we are to believe some writers *, the Emperor did actually embark, and proceed on his destination as far as the narrow sea between the Morea and Crete, when a dangerous indisposition obliged him to return. It is at least certain, that he once more deferred the moment of his final departure. The Pope was infuriated; he treated the story of illness as an empty pretence, and without waiting or asking for excuse or explanation, instantly excommunicated the Emperor. This took place on the 29th of September, within six months from his elevation to the See; and the sword of discord, which was drawn on that day, had no secure or lasting interval of rest, until the deposition, or rather the death of Frederic.

The Emperor wrote several papers in his justification, and among them a letter to Henry III. of England, containing much severe and just reproach against the Roman Church. 'The Roman Church (such was the substance of his upbraiding) so burns with avarice that, as the ecclesiastical revenues do not content it, it is not ashamed to despoil sovereign Princes and make them tributary. You have a very touching example in your father King John; you have that also of the Count of Toulouse, and so many other princes whose kingdoms it holds under interdict, until it has reduced them to similar servitude. I speak not of the simonies, the unheard-of exactions, which it exercises over the clergy, the manifest or cloaked usuries with which it infects the whole world. In the mean time, these insatiable leeches use honied discourses, saying that the Court of Rome is the Church, our mother and nurse, while it is our stepmother and the source of every evil. It is known by its fruits. It sends on every side legates with power to punish, to suspend, to excommunicate; not to diffuse the word of God, but to amass money, and reap that which they have not sown †. And so they pillage churches, monasteries and other places of religion, which our fathers have founded for the support of pilgrims and the poor. And now these Romans, without nobility and without valour, inflated by nothing but their literature, aspire to kingdoms and empires. The Church was founded on poverty and simplicity, and no one can give it other foundation than that which Jesus Christ has fixed.' At the same time the Emperor continued to prepare for immediate departure, in spite of the sentence which hung over him. The Pope assembled a numerous Council, and thundered forth a second excommu-

* See Giannone, l. xvi. c. 6. Sigonio seguitò la fede di Matteo Paris, il quale (ad ann. 1227, p. 286) scrisse: 'Animo nimis consternati in iisdem navibus quibus venerant plusquam 40 armatorum millia sunt reversi.' But this passage more probably relates to the numerous pilgrims, who had actually sailed to the Holy Land for the purpose of meeting Frederic, and who immediately returned on not finding him there. Fleury makes no mention of his having put to sea at all on this occasion; but Bzovius asserts—'per triduum in mare provectus cursum convertit ac se neque maris jactationem neque incommodam valetudinem pati posse asseruit.' Ann. Eccles. ad ann. 1227.

† In 1229, Gregory IX. levied an exaction of tenths in England with so much severity, that even the standing crops were anticipated, and the bishops obliged to sell their property, or borrow money at a high interest, in order to answer the demand. Erat Papa tot et tantis involutus debitis, ut unde bellicam, quam susceperat, expeditionem sustineret, penitus ignorabat. Matthæ Paris, anno citato. Mention is made of the continual, though secret, maledictions with which the Pope was pursued.

nication ; and in the spring following, without making any humiliation, or obtaining any repeal of the anathema under which he lay, Frederic set sail for the Holy Land.

If there had been a shadow of sincerity in Gregory's professed enthusiasm for the liberation of Palestine,—if he had loved the name and birth-place of Christ with half the ardour with which he clung to his own papal and personal dignity, he would not have pursued the departed Emperor with his perverse malevolence, he would not have prostituted the ecclesiastical censures, to thwart his projects and blast his hopes. Yet he did so: his mendicant emissaries were despatched to the Patriarch and the military orders of Jerusalem, informing them of the sentence under which Frederic was placed, and forbidding them to act, or to communicate with him. At the same time, provoked, as some assert*, by a previous aggression from Frederic's lieutenant, he invaded with all his forces the Apulian dominions of the Emperor. Under these adverse circumstances, Frederic made a hasty, but not inglorious †, treaty with the Saracens, and instantly returned to the defence of his own kingdom—a measure which became the more necessary, since the Pope had issued a third excommunication, releasing his subjects from their oath of allegiance ‡. We do not profess, in this peaceful narrative, to describe the details of military adventures, or to trace the perplexed and faithless politics of Italy. We must be contented to add, that some successes of the Emperor led to a hollow and fruitless reconciliation; that this again broke out (in the year 1238) into open war, which lasted till the death of the Pope, three years afterwards. The period of nominal peace had been disturbed by the constant complaints and recriminations § of both parties. The perusal of those papers is sufficient to convince us, that if both had some, the Pope had the greater, share of blame; and while the style, which the prelate assumes, is that of an offended and injured protector and patron, the language of the Emperor, though never abject, frequently descends to the borders of querulousness and humility.

The cause of Frederic gained nothing by the death of Gregory, since he was succeeded by Innocent IV. || This extraordinary person (Sinibaldo Fieschi, a Genoese) had been distinguished as cardinal by his attachment to the person, if not to the cause, of the emperor; and on his election to the pontificate, the people of Italy indulged the fond and natural expectation, that the dissensions which blighted their happiness would at length be composed. Not so Frederic; for he was familiar with the soul of Innocent, and had read his insolent and implacable character. To his friends, who proffered their congratulations, he replied, that there was cause for sorrow rather than joy, since he had exchanged a cardinal, who was

Frederic II. in Palestine.

Innocent IV.

* Fleury, l. 79, s. 43. Giannone, l. 16, c. 6.

† The possession of the City and of the Holy Sepulchre was secured to the Christians, while the Temple (now the Mosque of Omar) which had already been desecrated to the Mahometan worship, was left in the possession of the Saracens: a fair arrangement, which was misrepresented by the Pope and most ecclesiastical writers, and restored to history by Gibbon and Sismondi. Rep. Ital. chap. 15.

‡ The plea which he gave was 'because no one should observe fidelity to a man who is opposed to God and his Saints, and tramples upon his commandments.' A new maxim (as Fleury simply observes), and one which seems to authorize revolt.

§ These disputes are related at great length by Fleury, liv. 81, sect. 32, &c.

|| On June 24, 1243, Celestine IV., in fact, intervened, but died on the sixteenth day after his election.

his dearest friend, for a pope, who would be his bitterest enemy*. And so, indeed, it proved. On the occasion of an early and amicable conference, Innocent refused to withdraw his predecessor's excommunication, until Frederic should restore all that he was charged with having plundered from the Church. The meeting had no result; and Innocent presently repaired to France, and summoned a very numerous council at Lyons.

As soon as the members were assembled † (in 1245) Innocent, taking his throne, with Baldwin, emperor of the East, on his right hand, began the proceedings, by conferring the use of the *red bonnet* on his cardinals ‡—to the end that they might never forget, in the use of that colour, that their blood was at all times due to the service of the Church. At the same time he adorned them with other emblems of dignity, in imitation of regal pomp and state, and in scorn (as it was thought) of a favourite expression of Frederic, that a Christian prelate ought to emulate the meekness and poverty of the disciples of Christ. He then opened his discourse respecting the defence of the Holy Land, and of other states at that time endangered by the Tartar invasion §, and concluded with some general reproaches on the character and conduct of Frederic,—that he had persecuted the pontiffs and other ministers of the Church of God; exiled and plundered the bishops; imprisoned the clergy, and even put many to a cruel death, with other similar charges. The same were repeated on the next day of meeting, and supported and exaggerated by the suspicious testimony of two partial and intemperate prelates. On both occasions they were boldly repelled by the emperor's ambassador, Taddeo di Suessa. After the delay of a fortnight, occasioned by an unfounded expectation of Frederic's appearance in person, the council assembled for the third time; and then, after premising some constitutions respecting the Holy Land, Innocent, 'to the astonishment and horror of all who heard him,' pronounced the final and fatal sentence against Frederic. He declared that prince deprived of the imperial crown, with all its honours and privileges, and of all his other states; he released his subjects from their oath; he even forbade their further obedience, on pain of excommunication, and commanded the electors to the empire to choose a successor. He presently recommended

* See Giannone, *Stor. di Nap.*, lib. xvii., c. 3, and various authorities collected by Sismondi, *Rep. Ital.*, ch. xvi.

† See Giannone, lib. xvii., cap. 3. Sismondi, *Rep. Ital.*, ch. xvi.

‡ *Bzov. Ann. Eccles.*, ad ann. 1245. Giannone, *loc. cit.* Pagi. vit., Inn. IV. sec. xxxi. investigates the question whether this dignity was conferred at that time, or two years later.

§ Besides the affair of Frederic, to which our account in the text is nearly confined, the first General Council of Lyons professed three grand objects. (1.) To assist the Latin emperor of Constantinople against the Greeks. (2.) To aid the emperor of Germany against the Tartars. (3.) To rescue the Holy Land from the Saracens. For the attainment of the *first* of these objects, the Pope ordained a contribution of half the revenues of all benefices on which the incumbents *were not actually resident*, (a wholesome and admirable distinction,) placing a still higher impost on the largest; also of a tenth of the revenues of the Church of Rome. For the *second*, he exhorted the inhabitants to dig ditches, and build castles. For the *third*, he commanded the priests, and others in the Christian army, to offer up continual prayers, moving the Crusaders to repentance and virtue. Besides which he promised a twentieth part of the revenues of benefices for three years, and a tenth of those of the Pope and his cardinals. He likewise encouraged all who had the care of souls to influence the faithful to make donations by testament and otherwise. The decree touching the levies of money displeased many prelates, who openly opposed it, declaring that the Court of Rome now perpetually despoiled them under that pretext.

to that dignity Henry, Landgrave of Thuringia. For the kingdom of Sicily, he took upon himself, 'with the counsel of the cardinals, his brethren,' to provide a sovereign.

Frederic was at Turin when he received the news of this proceeding. He turned to the barons, who surrounded him, and, with deep indignation, addressed them. 'The pontiff *Deposition of Frederic.* has deprived me of the imperial crown—let us see if it be so.' He then ordered the crown to be brought to him, and placed it on his head, saying, 'that neither pope nor council had the power to take it from him.' Most of the princes of Europe were, indeed, of the same opinion, and continued to acknowledge him to the end of his life. And we may remark, that the usurpation of Innocent was in one respect marked with peculiar audacity,—he did not even plead the approbation of the Holy Council, but contented himself with proclaiming that the sentence had been pronounced *in its presence* *.

Nevertheless, his edict found willing obedience from the superstition or the turbulence of the German barons. Henry was supported by numerous partizans, and waged a prosperous warfare against Conrad, the son of Frederic; and on his early death, William, Count of Holland, was substituted by the Pope as a candidate for the throne. Innocent's genius and activity suggested to him the most refined arts to insure success, and his principles permitted him to adopt the most iniquitous. He even departed so far from the observance of humanity, and the most sacred feelings of nature, as to employ his intrigues to seduce Conrad from the service of his father, into rebellious and parricidal allegiance to the Church. That virtuous prince, rejecting, with firmness, the impious proposition, replied, that he would defend the side he had chosen to the last breath of life †; and neither the Pope nor the Church gained even a temporary advantage by an attempt which covers them with eternal infamy.

The same industrious hostility which had kindled rebellion among the German princes, was exerted with no less effect among the contentious states of Italy. The Guelphic interests were everywhere strengthened by the energy of Innocent; and the utmost efforts of Frederic were insufficient to restore tranquillity to Italy, or even to obtain any important triumphs over his Italian enemies. He died in Apulia, in the year 1250; and though he had never formally renounced the title of Emperor, his deposition was virtually accomplished by the edict of Innocent, since the rest of his life was spent in uninterrupted confusion and alarm, in the midst of battle, and sedition, and treason, without any enjoyment of the repose of royalty, and with a very limited possession either of its dignity or authority. The character of Frederic has been vilified by Guelphic writers, and probably too highly exalted by the opposite faction. In the conduct of affairs purely temporal, he is celebrated for justice, magnificence, generosity, as well as for the patronage of arts and literature. Familiar with the use of many languages, and himself an author, he exhibited that disposition to cultivate science, and nourish every branch of knowledge, which is so seldom associated with great vices. In regard to his long and complicated contentions with the Church, it is unquestionably

*His death
and character.*

* 'Sacro præsentè Concilio.' Bzovius (Ann. Eccles., ad ann. 1445) gives the precious document entire, prefaced, of course, with unqualified eulogy. Pagi, however, (Vit. Inn. IV., sec. xx.), argues, that the approbation of the Council was implied in its proceedings, if not actually expressed in the title of the sentence.

† Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. xvii., ch. 4.

true that he violated, without any known necessity, certain solemn obligations respecting the time of commencing his Crusade. His reluctance to engage at all in such sanguinary and fruitless enterprises may be acknowledged and justified; but his repeated breach of faith gave some reason to the Holy See for suspecting his subsequent promises. It is also true that he exiled some bishops, and imprisoned others, and even proceeded to greater extremities against some individuals of the inferior orders of the clergy; and also that he levied contributions and imposts on all classes of his ecclesiastical subjects*. But those who felt his rigour may probably have deserved it by moral or political misconduct; and it was just and legal † that the clergy should contribute some proportion to the support of the state. It may seem strange that, while his adversaries heap upon him the bitterest charges of impiety and blasphemy ‡, his friends persist in asserting the unalterable fidelity and affection which he bore to his mother church, the protectress of his infancy; that he was ever eager to advocate her cause, and promote her interests. In support of this singular pretension, it is advanced, that he was the inflexible and implacable extirpator of heresy. This fact, though urged by his admirers, is not disputed by his enemies. It is faithfully recorded, that at an early period (in 1224) he published three constitutions, which aggravated the guilt and punishments of heresy even beyond those of treason, and placed the temporal authorities at the disposal of the ecclesiastical inquisitors §. ‘Those (he ordained) who have been arrested for heresy, and who, being moved by the fear of death, are desirous to return to the Church, shall be condemned to the penance of perpetual imprisonment. The judges shall be bound to seize the heretics discarded by the inquisitors of the holy See, or by others zealous for the Catholic faith, and to confine them closely until their execution, according to the sentence of the Church . . . We also condemn to death those who, having abjured to save their life, shall return into error. We deprive heretics, and all who abet them, of all benefit of appeal; and it is our will that heresy be entirely banished from the whole extent of our empire. And as the crime which assails God is greater than that of treason, we ordain that the children of heretics, to the second generation, be deprived of all temporal benefits, and all public offices, unless they come forward and denounce their parents. ||’

Such were the measures by which an independent, and powerful, and

* Hence (says Giannone) probably arose the report, that he had commonly proclaimed his intention of reducing the clergy to primitive poverty; ‘so that Matthew Paris, who, before Frederic’s deposition, had always adhered to his party, as soon as he understood that such were his common expressions, as he was himself abbot of Monte Albano (St. Alban’s), in England, and wealthy and well beneficed, was displeased with such a proposition, and so began to change his style, and to write against him, in a manner different from his former.’ *Stor. di Nap.*, lib. xvii., c. 4.

† Giannone proves that such had been the invariable custom, at least in the southern provinces of the empire of Frederic.

‡ One of these is the celebrated expression respecting the Three Impostors, then commonly attributed to Frederic, though solemnly and publicly denied by him. Another is a tale, recorded by certain monks, that, when they requested him to spare their crop of wheat, Frederic commanded his soldiers ‘to desist, and to respect those ears of corn, since some day the grains which they contained might become so many Christs.’ Giannone, *loc. cit.*, on authority of Simon Hanh, *Hist. Germ. in Frederico II.*

§ Several authors assert that, in virtue of a promise made to Innocent III., he established a permanent Inquisition in Sicily in the year 1213. *Stor. di Nap. loc. cit.* This, however, is scarcely probable, for the Inquisition was not at that time permanently established even at Toulouse.

|| Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. lxxviii., sec. lxxv.

(for those days) an enlightened monarch, evinced his affection for the Church of Rome! Such were the favours by which he courted her friendship, and sought to merit her gratitude! by feeding her fiercest passion — by sanctioning the most fatal of all her evil principles. It is true that Frederic may thus have established some claims on the sympathy of the furious zealots of his time; but his indulgence to those churchmen was no deed of friendship to the Church. To protect and foster the vices of a system, is to prevent its permanence, and poison its prosperity; and if ever, during his long reign, he appeared as the real friend of Rome, it was the time when he least professed that name—at the time when he exposed her abuses, and proclaimed her shame, and called upon her to repent and amend. And assuredly, when he lent his obsequious sword to swell the catalogue of her crimes, he was already preparing for his latter years the tempest which disturbed and tormented them; nor did it happen without the spirit of God, that his calamities were inflicted by that same hand, whose darkest atrocities had been approved and directed by himself.

It is strange, too, that among the four reasons by which the Pope justified his sentence of deposition, it was one, that Frederic had rendered himself *guilty of heresy*, by his contempt of pontifical censures, and his unholy alliance with the Saracens. Thus, then, did that prince, according to the strict letter of his own constitutions, become liable, on his condemnation by the Church, to the monstrous penalties contained in them.

Another *, perhaps a more plausible reason, was this,—that he had been deficient in that fidelity, which he owed to the Pope, as his vassal for the kingdom of Sicily; for that claim, however absurd in origin and principle, had been previously asserted and acknowledged. But, in truth, when we compare the character and causes of this second conflict between the Church and the Empire with those which marked the contest of Henry with Gregory VII. and his successors, we find it much more difficult to discover what was the specific and tangible ground of quarrel. In the former instance there existed one grand and definite object, for which both parties perseveringly struggled; in the latter, many vague complaints and indeterminate offences were advanced and retorted; but no single great principle was avowedly contested, nor was any one additional right or privilege acquired or confirmed to the Church by its final triumph. Only the power and influence of Rome were made more manifest; and other nations were taught to tremble at the omnipotence of the double sword.

This leads us to remark another distinction—that, in the contest with Henry, it was, in reality, the *Church* of Rome which rose in opposition to the empire—the spiritual, or, at least, the ecclesiastical, interests of the See were those most consulted and most prominent in the debate. In that with Frederic, it was rather from the *Court* of Rome, that the spirit and motives of policy proceeded. In the former case, the material sword was introduced as secondary and subsidiary to the spiritual; but in the latter, if the contrary was not actually the case †, at least the two weapons were

* See Sismondi, Rep. Ital., ch. xvi.

† In the year 1251, Christianus, (or Conrad,) Archbishop of Mentz, was actually deposed by Innocent, for reluctance to use arms in the defence of the Church. ‘He said, that the works of war did not become the sacerdotal character; but that he was ever willing to use the sword of the spirit, which was the word of God. The Scriptures had

so dexterously substituted and interchanged for each other—the one was so continually presented under the holy semblance of the other—as to show the proficiency which the See had latterly made in the art of deluding the human race.

Again—the avarice or the necessities of Rome compelled her, during these disputes, to a measure which, however expedient at the moment, was finally very injurious to her—that of levying taxes rigidly and generally upon the clergy. It was not in England only (though there most successfully*) that Gregory IX. exacted from all ranks of ecclesiastics the tenth of their moveables immediately on his breach with the emperor; and every one recollects with what repugnance his second requisition (in 1240) was admitted by our clerical forefathers. From the moment that the Pope was found so infatuated as to publish a *Crusade* † against a Catholic emperor, and to feed his own temporal ambition by despoiling his faithful Catholic clergy, the minds of all reasonable laymen were startled and revolted by the former outrage, while the hearts of the clergy, being touched by the injustice of the latter, began gradually to close against so rapacious a protector.

When Innocent received the news of the death of Frederic, his exultation broke forth without restraint or moderation; *Conduct of Innocent.* —‘Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be in festivity; for the thunder and the tempest with which a powerful God has so long threatened your heads, are changed by the death of that man into refreshing breezes and fertilizing dews ‡.’

commanded him to put his sword in the sheath.’ Of this offence (and no other charge is mentioned) he was accused by the king and certain of the laity before the Pope, and was immediately degraded from his See. Pagi, Innoc. IV., sec. xlvi.

* The pages of Matthew Paris abound with instances of pontifical rapacity and insolence. See *ad annos* 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1250, 1252, &c. . . Sometimes a legate à latere was the instrument; sometimes the Mendicants acted as tax-gatherers; and even Ireland did not escape their visitations. In 1247, the complaints both of the French and English clergy assumed a formidable shape for that age. The lasting effect was, that the former devotion to Rome was turned into ‘execrable odium et maledictiones occultas.’ For all both saw and felt that the Pope was insatiable in his extortions, to their great loss and impoverishment. And there were many who began to question whether he had really received from heaven the power of St. Peter to bind and to loose, seeing how very unlike he was to that apostle. ‘Resolutum est igitur os iniqua loquentium, &c.’ . . . and this as well in France as in England.

† The same indulgences were promised to those who armed against the emperor as against the sultan; and the apostolic preachers, under Innocent at least, even pointed out the former as the easier and broader road to salvation. Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xvi. Fleury, Hist. Eccl., lib. lxxxiii., sec. xxxiii. The nobility of France, and the Queen Blanche, were highly offended by this measure of Innocent, during the Crusade of St. Louis. ‘The Pope (they complained) is preaching a new Crusade against Christians for the extension of his own dominions, and forgets the king, our master, who is suffering so much for the faith.’ ‘Let the Pope (the queen replied) keep those who go into his service; and let them depart, never to return.’ The nobles also reprimanded the Mendicants who had preached this Crusade. ‘We build for you churches and houses: we receive, nourish, and entertain you. What good does the Pope for you? He fatigues and torments you; he makes you his tax-gatherers, and renders you hateful to your benefactors.’ They excused themselves on the plea of the obedience due to him. . . . Here we discover the elements of the Gallican liberties.

‡ In a similar spirit of Christian forgiveness, the same Pope is related to have expressed his exultation at the death of Grosstete, bishop of Lincoln. ‘I rejoice; and let every true son of the Church rejoice with me—that my great enemy is removed.’ . . . Assuredly that admirable prelate had gone very far in disaffection, not hesitating to denounce Innocent, almost with his dying breath, as Antichrist; ‘For by what other name are we to designate that power, which labours to destroy the souls that Christ came to save?’

It was thus that he addressed the clergy of Sicily, while, at the same time, he prepared to reduce that province, together with the kingdom of Naples, under his own immediate government, and attach it in perpetuity to the dominions of the Church. In pursuance of this project, he quitted Lyons, his constant residence * during the uncertainties of the war, and visited, in a sort of triumphal procession, the Guelphic cities of Italy. He was everywhere received with an enthusiasm which he had not merited by any regard for any interests except his own; and he is even supposed somewhat to have chilled the misplaced gratitude of his allies by the unexpected assertion of some spiritual pretensions over themselves. In Sicily, and the south of Italy, he succeeded in creating a powerful party; but it was overthrown by the arms of Conrad and Manfred, the sons of Frederic. Foiled by force, the Pope had recourse to intrigue; and he began to treat successively with the kings of England and France, with a view to bestow the crown of the Sicilies on a branch either of the one family or the other. In the meantime, the death of Conrad revived in him the expiring hope of uniting it to his own. Ambition resumed her sway; and he broke off the imperfect negotiations. The kingdom of Naples was again thronged with his emissaries; seditions were in every quarter excited in his favour; and even Manfred himself, in the belief that resistance would be vain, advanced to the frontiers to offer his submission, and deigned to lead by the bridle the horse of the pontiff as he crossed the Garigliano.

This event, which seemed to secure to the Court of Rome the throne of Naples and Sicily, and thus to extend its dominions beyond any limits which it had at any time reached, or, till lately, aspired to, took place in the summer of 1254. The duration of this unnatural prosperity was even shorter than could have been predicted by the most penetrating statesman; for before the conclusion of the very same year, Manfred had again possessed himself of the keys of the kingdom. But Innocent did not live to witness this second reverse;—he had already expired † at Naples, in mature old age, and in the confident persuasion that he had achieved the dearest object of his ambition, and that he died the most powerful prince who had ever filled the throne of St. Peter.

During a pontificate of eleven years and five months, he had displayed

* On the departure of the Pope from Lyons, the Cardinal Hugo made a valedictory address to all the population of both sexes; and it contained the following sentence:—*'Amici, magnam fecimus, postquam in hanc Urbem venimus, utilitatem et eleemosynam. Quando enim primo huc venimus, tria vel quattuor prostibula invenimus. Sed nunc recedentes unum solum relinquimus. Verum ipsum durat continuatum ab orientali parte civitatis usque ad occidentalem.'* This is related as fact by Matthew Paris. Ad ann. 1251.

† Soon after Innocent's death, (of which the exact day, it is proper to remark, is disputed—Pagi, Inn. IV., sec. lxxv.) a cardinal had the following vision. He saw a noble matron, on whose brow the word *Ecclesia* was written, present her petition at the Judgment-seat, saying, *Justissime Judex, justè judica*. She then brought forward these charges against Innocent IV. (1.) At the foundation of the Church, Thou didst give it liberties proceeding from Thyself; but he has made it the vilest of slaves, (*ancillam vilissimam*). (2.) It was founded to benefit the souls of the miserable;—he has made it a table of money-gatherers. (3.) It was founded in Faith, Justice, and Truth;—but he has staggered Faith, destroyed Justice, and clouded Truth. *Justum ergo judicium redde mihi*. Then the Lord said to him, Go and receive thy reward according to thy merits. And thus he was carried away. The cardinal then woke, through the terror of this sentence, and shouted so loud, as to excite the suspicion of insanity. *Ista visio* (continues Matthew Paris) (*nescitur si fantastica*) *multos perterruit; et utinam cum effectu castigans emendavit*. That it was generally propagated, and perhaps believed at the time, is sufficient to prove to us (if we needed indirect proof) what was the sort of reputation which Innocent IV. possessed among his contemporaries.

all the qualities which consummate an artful politician, and which disgrace a bishop and a Christian. As a statesman, he designed daringly, he negotiated skilfully, he intrigued successfully; he perfectly comprehended the means at his disposal, and adapted them so closely to his purposes, that his reign presented a series of those triumphs* which are usually designated glorious. As a churchman, he bade defiance to the best principles of his religion; he set at nought the common feelings of humanity. The spiritual guide to eternal life, he had no fixed motive of action, except vulgar temporal ambition. 'The servant of the servants of God,' he rejected with scorn the humiliation of Frederic †, and spurned a suppliant emperor, who had been his friend. And lastly, when the infant son of Conrad was presented to his tutelary protection by a dying father, the prayer was haughtily refused; and 'the father of all Christians, and the protector of all orphans,' hastened to usurp the hereditary rights of a Christian child and orphan. These circumstances duly considered, with every allowance for times and prejudices, seem, indeed, almost to justify the expression of the sultan of Egypt, in his answer to a letter of Innocent—the taunt of a Mussulman addressed to Christ's vicar upon earth;—'We have received your epistle, and listened to your envoy: he has spoken to us of Jesus Christ—whom we know better than you know, and whom we honour more than you honour him ‡.'

Alexander IV. succeeded to the chair, to the passions, and to the projects of Innocent; and it was the leading object of his *Alexander IV.* reign of six years to maintain or recover the temporal possession of the kingdom of Manfred. But he possessed neither the firmness of character nor the various talents necessary for success. The machine, which had not always moved obediently even to the hand of Innocent, seemed to lose, in his feebler grasp, all the elasticity of its action; and it became evident, before the end of his pontificate, that the sceptre of Naples and Sicily was not destined to a bishop of Rome. At the same time, Alexander was celebrated for the exercise of some of those virtues, which were not found in his predecessor—for earnestness of piety, or, at least, for assiduity in prayer, and the strict observance of Church regulations §. The favours which he bestowed upon the Mendicant orders will prove his zeal, indeed, rather than the wisdom of his policy. But the Crusade which he preached, from whatsoever motive, against Eccelino, the tyrant, was almost justified

* We should mention, however, that the fall of Frederic is not wholly attributable to Innocent's influence. A very strong republican and anti-imperial spirit previously prevailed in many, especially the northern, cities of Italy, which the Pope could not have created, though he very well knew how to avail himself of it. Another remark we may here make—that Innocent was much more successful in fomenting seditions, and making parties in foreign states, than in securing the subordination of his own capital. There were few cities in Italy where he had less influence than at Rome; which may account for his continual absence from it. See Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xviii. Matthew Paris, Hist. Angliæ, ann. 1254.

† Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xvii.

‡ De quo Christo plus scimus quam vos sciatis, et magnificamus eum plusquam vos magnificatis. Bzov., Ann. Eccles., ad ann. 1264. Matthew Paris, Hist. ad ann. eundem. The letter is a very sensible composition, and deals very directly with the subjects on which it treats.

§ Alexander IV. is thus characterised by Matthew Paris;—Satis benignus et bene religiosus; assiduus in orationibus, in abstinentia strenuus, sed sibilis adulantium seducibilis et pravis avarorum suggestionibus inclinivus. Pagi is very much offended by the qualification of the praise.

by the crimes of that miscreant; for though a war proclaimed 'in the name of God' is, in most instances, only wickedness cloaked by blasphemy, yet we may view it with some indulgence, when it is directed against the convicted enemy of mankind.

For the seven following years (from 1261 to 1268) the chair was occupied by two Frenchmen, Urban IV. and Clement IV., who have obtained an eminent place in civil as well as ecclesiastical history, by the introduction of Charles of Anjou to the throne of Naples. Whether from personal hostility to the actual occupant of that throne, or from ecclesiastical rancour against the son of Frederic, or from a political determination to cut off all connexion between the south of Italy and the empire, or from all these causes united, the holy See, by whomsoever administered, did not remit or relax its exertions for the expulsion of Manfred. The negotiations with the court of France, which Innocent IV. had commenced and interrupted, were renewed and concluded by Urban IV.; and during the following reign of Clement, the Crusade against a legitimate and virtuous monarch was completed with the most sanguinary success. The brother of St. Louis supported his usurpation by the same merciless sword which had achieved it; and the historians of Italy still recount, with tears of indignation, the more than usual horrors of the French invasion.

But, however strong this Pope's nationality may have been, it did not cause him to forget his papal interests. The conditions which he exacted from Charles, on investing him with the crown of Naples, contained most of the claims then in dispute between kings and popes, such as the unqualified appointment to vacant sees, the exclusive care of the temporalities during vacancy, and even the abolition of all pretensions rising from the regalia*.

On the death of Clement, the See was vacant, through the disunion of the cardinals, for nearly three years. At length, in 1273, an Italian, a native of Piacenza, was elected, and assumed the name of Gregory X.—'a person (says Fleury †) of little learning, but of great experience in secular affairs, and more given to the distribution of alms, than the amassing of riches.' He was in the Holy Land at the time of his appointment; and as he returned with a keen and recent impression of its sufferings, and with an enthusiasm freshly kindled by that spectacle, the first act of his pontificate was directed to the revival of the crusading ardour; and the same continued to the end of his life to be the favourite object of his exertions. He was successful, because he was sincere. Those, who cared not for his reasoning, listened to his disinterested supplications; those who were not inflamed by his enthusiasm, still respected and loved it. It was no longer against a Christian sectarian, or a Catholic Emperor and his

* See Giannone, Stor. di Nap., lib. xix., cap. v. In a Bull, dated in 1266, he declared that the disposition of all benefices rightfully belonged to the Pope. The claims of the princes were supported by a decree of the Council of Lyons. See Dupin, Siècle xiii., sec. x. That author observes generally that commendams of benefices, and the distinction between simple benefices and those with cure of souls, were the introduction of this age; and that the jurisdiction, privileges, and immunities of the clergy, were thus extended 'as far as possible. Pluralities were strictly prohibited, and commonly enjoyed. On the other hand, ecclesiastics were compelled to contribute, not only to the real or pretended necessities of the church, but frequently, under one pretext or other, to the exigencies of the state. Hence their murmurs and discontent. The possession and enjoyment was the habit and the right—the contribution was novel and vexatious.

† Hist. Eccl., lib. lxxxvi. sec. xvii.

persecuted race, that the monarchs of Europe were called upon to arm; it was no longer for the peculiar aggrandizement of the Court or Church of Rome, that the father of Christians summoned them to battle; they had already learnt to distinguish between the interests of the Vatican and the honour of Christ; and the magic which a spiritual Pope had so long exercised over the human mind, lost much of its fascination and power, as soon as he degenerated into a temporal prince.

But Gregory X. had higher and less ambiguous claims on the gratitude of Christendom than any zeal for the deliverance of Palestine could possibly give him. He laboured to compose the dissensions of his distracted country; to heal the wounds which had been so wantonly inflicted by the selfish ambition of his predecessors. He interposed, impartially, and therefore not vainly, to reconcile the opposite factions of Guelphs and Ghibelines*; and exhibited to them the new and venerable spectacle of a pacific Pope. He interposed too in the affairs of the empire; but it was again for the purpose of terminating a division which threatened the peace of Germany; and he proved the sincerity of his intention by confirming the election of Rodolph, who had secured and deserved the affections of his people. Another project, on which he was bent with like earnestness, had the same respectable character,—the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches; and in this difficult affair he also obtained a complete (though very transient) success, by the concessions of the Emperor Michael, and the temporary or nominal submission of his Church.

It was at the second Council of Lyons, that the deputies of the East presented their faithless homage to the Roman pontiff. But that prelate had two other, and, perhaps, dearer objects, in the summoning of that vast assembly †. The one was to complete the preparations for this long-projected Crusade; the other was the worthier of his wisdom, and even of his piety—to reform the obnoxious abuses of his Church. In the course of the six sessions of the Council, thirty-one constitutions were enacted for the better administration of the Church, and they did honour at least to the intentions of those who promulgated them. Some eight or ten of these related to the election of bishops; several others to cures and benefices, to the discipline or temporalities of the Church. Another (the 21st) was levelled against the unlimited

* Leonardus Aretinus (Histor. Florent. lib. iii. p. 48, edit. Argent, 1610) bears ample testimony to the sanctity and pacific character of Gregory, and details the circumstances of his attempt to reconcile parties at Florence. The following is given as part of his address to the citizens:—*Quæ est igitur hæc tam præpotens causa? Quod Guelphus est (inquit) aut Gibellinus—nomina ne ipsis quidem qui illa proferunt nota!—Ea nimirum causa est cur cives necantur, domus incenduntur, evertitur patria, sititur proximi sanguis. Oh puerilem stultitiam! oh amentiam non ferendam! Gibellinus est—at Christianus, at civis, at proximus, at consanguineus. Ergo hæc tot et tam valida conjunctionis nomina Gibellinis succumbent? Et id unum atque inane nomen (nam quid significet nemo intelligit) plus valebit ad odium, quam ista omnia tam præclara et tam solida et expressa ad caritatem, &c.* These sentiments (the historian adds) were grateful to the multitude, but displeased the aristocracy. The Pope was then obliged to lay the city under an interdict; and his admirable intentions involved him in an obstinate contest with the nobles. But any doubts which might still remain respecting his sanctity were removed (as Leonardus gravely asserts) by the numerous miracles performed at his tomb.

† Five hundred bishops, seventy mitred abbots, and a thousand inferior clergy and theologians composed this Council, assembled in 1274. The legates of Michael the Greek Emperor, and of the King of the Tartars were present. Also the ambassadors of France, Germany, England, Sicily, &c., and one Prince, James of Arragon. Pagi, Greg. x., s. xxv.

growth of Mendicant orders; disbanding all, which had not formally received the papal confirmation, and discouraging the foundation of others. But that among the acts of this assembly, which was at the time the most celebrated, and perhaps in effect the most permanent, was the law which regulated the method of papal election, by severe restraints imposed upon the conclave*. It was then enacted, that the cardinals should be lodged in one chamber, without any separation of wall or curtain, or any issue—that the chamber should be so closed on every side, as to leave no possibility of entrance or exit. ‘No one shall approach them or address them privately, unless with the consent of all present, and on the business of the election. The conclave (properly the name of the chamber) shall have one window, through which necessary food may be admitted, without there being space for the human body to enter. And if (which God forbid) in three days after their entrance they shall not yet have come to a decision, for the fifteen following days they shall be contented with a single dish, as well for dinner as for supper. But after these fifteen days they shall have no other nourishment than bread, wine and water, until the election shall be made. During the election, they shall receive nothing from the apostolical chamber, nor any other revenues of the Roman Church.’

The expedition to Palestine gave promise of the most favourable issue. The Emperor Rodolph had engaged to conduct it; Philip the Hardy, King of France, Edward *Intended Crusade, and* of England, James of Arragon, and Charles of *Death of Gregory.* Sicily, had pledged their faith to attend it: supplies had been secured by the universal imposition of a tax on Ecclesiastical property; and the following year was devoted to the necessary preparations. At the end of that year †, before one galley had departed, or perhaps one soldier embarked, the Pope himself fell sick and died. From that moment (says Sismondi) the kings into whom he had inspired his enthusiasm, renounced their chivalrous projects; the Greeks returned to their schisms, and the Catholics, divided afresh, turned against each other those arms which they had consecrated to the deliverance of Palestine.

The short reigns of Innocent V., Adrian V. and John XXI., were not distinguished by any memorable event. Nicholas III., a Roman of the family of the Ursini, succeeded in *Nicholas III.* 1277, and devoted himself with great prudence and success, not so much to enlarge the temporal edifice of his church, as to secure the foundations on which it stood. For that purpose he resumed some negotiations, commenced by Gregory X. at Lyons, with Rodolph, King of the Romans, and brought them to so fortunate a termination, that that prince finally satisfied all the donations of preceding Emperors, and recognized the cities of the ecclesiastical states, as being absolutely independent of himself, and owing their entire allegiance to the Pope. Nicholas had another object of jealousy in the increasing power of Charles, King of Sicily, and he had the address ‡ to engage that prince

* Pagi, Vit. Greg. X. sect. xli. Fleury, liv. lxxxvi., sect. xlv. It was quite obvious that, as men and cardinals are constituted, these regulations could not be enforced rigorously. But with some modifications they subsist even to this moment.

† In January, 1276.

‡ The art with which he played off the Emperor and King of Sicily against each other, until he obtained all that he required from both, was worthy of the most refined ages of papal diplomacy. See Sismondi, Rep. Ital, chap. xxii. ann. 1277, 1278.

to resign two very important dignities, which he had probably acquired through the subservience of Clement IV. One was the office of Imperial Vicar-general in Tuscany; the other was that of Senator of Rome. We have already had occasion to mention the inefficacy of the Pope's civil authority in his own capital; and this had lately been subjected even to additional insult by the frequent appointment of foreigners to the highest offices. Pope Nicholas published a constitution to prevent the recurrence of this evil, and to limit the time of possession to one year.

It is worth remarking, that, in defence of his temporal sovereignty, as well over the states, as over the city, of Rome, he appealed to the immoveable foundations on which he conceived them to rest. In favour of the first, he pleaded the donations of Lewis the Meek, and the confirmations of Otho I. and St. Henry*; in favour of the second, the 'Donation of Constantine;' and he maintained, that the temporal power of the Pope and his Cardinals was absolutely necessary for the free exercise of their spiritual functions. He reigned only two years and nine months: he is commonly described as possessing many good qualities; and we read of no other serious charge against him, than that he heaped upon his greedy relatives and connexions the most splendid benefices of the church, with unmerited and shameless profusion.

The King of Sicily was successful in procuring the election of a Frenchman, Martin IV., who is chiefly remarkable in history *Martin IV.* for his entire subservience to the interests of his patron.

In violation of both the clauses of the constitution of Nicholas, he accepted the office of Senator, and held it for life. As this was the first instance of such condescension on the part of St. Peter's successors, it has not escaped the notice of the historian. And if indeed the claims on the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which they had asserted for above two centuries, had been well founded, it would have been a strange and unprecedented degradation for a sovereign prince to exercise a simple magistracy in his own city†. But Martin was probably less disposed to examine the remote and general question of right, than to avail himself of the substantial power thus firmly vested in his own person.

He enjoyed his dignity for a very short time, though sufficient to make him witness of the 'Sicilian Vespers,' and the misfortunes of his countrymen. He was buried in the Church of St. Lawrence, and many sick were healed at his tomb, in the presence of vast numbers of the clergy and laity,—according to the evidence of a contemporary author, who affirms that those miracles still lasted while he was writing, which was six weeks after the decease of the pontiff‡. The mention of these impostures is so common, even in the pages of the most enlightened Catholic historians, that we are not justified in passing them over in entire silence. In fact, they formed so essential a part of the Roman Catholic system, that we should do injustice to its whole character, if we were not occasionally to notice them.

* Fleury, liv. lxxxvii., sect. xv. and xvi.

† Sismondi (chap. xxii.) asserts that he immediately transferred his dignity to Charles, following Jordanus, apud Raynaldum, and other authorities. The words of the appointment sufficiently express the extent of the power conferred. 'Nobiles viri . . . Electores ordinati . . . domino Martino Papæ IV. unanimiter et concorditer transulerunt et plenarie commiserunt regimen senatus Urbis, ejusque territorii et districtus toto tempore vitæ suæ: et dederunt sibi plenam et liberam potestatem regendi toto tempore Urbem . . . per se, vel per alium, vel per alios, et eligendi senatorem, vel senatores,' &c. &c.

‡ Fleury, liv. lxxxviii., sect. xvi. Both Martin and his predecessor were extremely attached to the Franciscan Order.

Martin was succeeded by a noble Roman, Honorius IV.; and he by another native of the Roman states, Nicholas IV., who was elected in 1288. The claims of this Pope on historical notice, are confined to some diligent but almost hopeless exertions to excite the princes of Europe to another Crusade; and to some as zealous and as fruitless efforts for the extirpation of heresy. In 1288, he stimulated his Mendicant emissaries to peculiar diligence both in Italy and Provence, and put in practice a somewhat singular method for securing the orthodoxy of his people*. He obliged the converted heretic to be bound in a pecuniary recognizance against relapse, and to find sufficient securities for payment. Avarice was scarcely become even yet the ruling passion of the Vatican; but since the sway of Innocent III., it had been rapidly gaining ground; and the edict of Nicholas gives fearful indications of its progress. In the year following, an ordinance was published at Venice, for the purpose of facilitating the operations of the Inquisition; and it was approved and confirmed by the pontiff.

† Nicholas died soon afterwards; and the history of his successor is distinguished by so many strange circumstances from the ordinary annals of papal biography, that it may afford relief as well as advantage to unfold its particulars. Through the disunion of the cardinals, the See had already been vacant for seven-and-twenty months, and no progress seemed yet to have been made towards the decision. They were still assembled in conclave, and still without any prospect of immediate accommodation, when, on some day in the beginning of July, 1294, one of their number was prevented from attending the deliberation by the sudden and violent death of his brother. By this casual occurrence, the thoughts of the venerable society were directed to man's mortality; and their reflexions assumed a serious and solemn character. *Election of Pietro di Morone, or Celestine V.* At length, returning to the subject before them, the bishop of Tusculum asked with vehemence, 'Why then delay we so long to give a head to the Church? whence this division among us?' To which Cardinal Latino added, 'It has been revealed to a holy man, that unless we hasten to the election of a Pope, in less than four months the anger of God will burst upon us.' Hereupon, Benedict Gaetano, (the same who was afterwards Boniface VIII.) sarcastically smiled and said, 'It is brother Pietro di Morone, to whom that revelation has been vouchsafed?' Latino answered, 'The same; he has written to me that, when engaged in his nocturnal devotions before the altar, he had received the command of God to communicate this warning.' Then the cardinals began to discourse of what they knew concerning that holy man. One dwelt on the austerity of his life, another on his virtues, another on his miracles: presently some one proposed *him* as a candidate for the See; and a discussion immediately arose on that question.

The debate was of very short duration, for reason had given place to passionate emotion, and passion was mistaken for inspiration. Cardinal Latino first gave his suffrage for Pietro di Morone: his example was eagerly followed by his colleagues, and the sudden and ardent unanimity of the conclave was attributed to the immediate impulse of the divinity †.

* The idea was not original. Instructions to the same effect were given to the Minorites by Alexander IV. in 1258. It was then provided, that the money so raised should be employed in the prosecution of heretics.

† A suspicious historian would perhaps except Benedict Gaetano from the charge of superstitious enthusiasm. Possibly even then he proposed to profit by the weaknesses of

Its choice had fallen upon a weak and aged recluse, whose life had been devoted to the most rigorous observances of superstition, and whose inveterate habits of solitary meditation disqualified him for the commonest offices of society. His very name was derived from the mountain top where his existence had passed away. The cave in which he dwelt had been the refuge of a dragon, who obsequiously resigned it to his human successor; and we are seriously assured, that his infancy had been the object of that miraculous agency, which he so profusely exercised in his later years; and that even at his entrance into this polluted world, he was protected by the semblance, or the reality, of the monastic habit*.

The deputies proceeded to announce to him the astounding change in his fortune. They arrived at the city of Sulmone, and having received permission to present themselves, ascended with toil and sweat the narrow and rugged path, which led through a desolate wilderness to the cell they sought. The cell was closed against them, and they were compelled to make their communication through a small grated window. Through the interstices they beheld a pale old man, attenuated with fasting and macerations, with a beard disshevelled and eyes inflamed with tears, trembling with the agitation into which the awful announcement had thrown him. The Archbishop of Lyons then assured him of the enthusiasm which had united the Cardinals in his favour; and pressed him, by accepting the dignity, to compose the troubles of the Church. Pietro answered, 'I must consult God—go and pray likewise.' He then prostrated himself on the earth, and after remaining some time in supplication, he rose and said, 'I accept the pontificate, I consent to the election—I dare not resist the will of God, I will not be wanting to the Church in her necessity.' No sooner was the result of this interview bruited abroad, than the sides of Mt. Morone were frequented by assiduous visitants, whom piety, or interest, or curiosity conducted to the cavern of the hermit-pope. Churchmen and laymen of every rank hastened to pay homage to his virtues or his dignity; and his earliest levee was adorned by the presence of two kings †.

It was immediately discovered that the qualifications of Celestine V. (Pietro assumed that name) fell far short even of the ordinary limits of monastic capacity. He was entirely ignorant of all science and all literature; even the Latin language was nearly strange to him; against the comprehension of worldly matters his eyes were closed by perpetual seclusion, and his blindness was confirmed by old age; his simplicity tempted and rewarded deception, and he was guilty of the most extraordinary errors in the discharge of his easiest duties. Besides this, he brought with him from his cell and his convent (for he had been the founder of a new Order

Pietro; but he could scarcely have considered them as the object of God's especial interposition; or have believed that an old man, who had not hitherto filled any office in society, had been selected by the especial favour of Providence to occupy the highest.

* All these fables are sedulously and solemnly related by Bzovius. *Manebat matri fixum quod nascenti olim filio contigerat, ac tanquam magnum aliquod divinumque portendebat. Ex utero siquidem materno exierit circumamictus indumento quodam, quod nihil ab his quibus religiosi homines vestiuntur, differebat. Ad ann. 1294.*

† Charles le Boiteux of Sicily, and his son Charles Martel, titular Prince of Hungary. The Pope elect descended to Aquila to assume his pontificals, on an ass, and the two princes held the bridle.

Intumidus vilem Murro conscendit asellum,
Regum fræna manu dextra lævaque regente
Pontificis. . .

Might there not in this act be some of that 'Humility which apes the Divinity?'

of Monks, distinguished for their illiterate vulgarity) a disaffection towards the higher ranks of the secular clergy, which was not, perhaps, without reason; and a contempt for their luxuries and abhorrence for their vices, which formed the holiest feature in his character. It was probably this disposition, which endeared him to the laity, as well as to many among the regular clergy; and no doubt it was the alienation from his own official counsellors, which subjected him too obsequiously to the influence of the king of Sicily. For under this influence he was assuredly acting, when, without any foresight of the inevitable consequences of the measure, he added to the college of Cardinals seven natives of France.

These were circumstances sufficient to excite the dissatisfaction of that body, and their suspicions respecting the nature of the spirit which had decided their choice. They professed apprehensions, which were not wholly unreasonable, lest, by some new imprudence, the Pope should compromise or concede the inviolable rights of the Church.—They disliked the frugal severity of his Court; they complained with justice, that he preferred an obscure residence in the kingdom of Naples to the Holy and Imperial City; and the bitterness of their displeasure was completed, when he revived, in all its rigour, the obnoxious constitution of Gregory X. respecting the manner of papal election.

In the mean time, Celestine had discovered his own disqualifications and his inability to correct them. Amidst the incessant toil of occupations which he disliked and dignities which he despised, he sighed for the tranquillity of his former solitude; and then, that his pious meditations might not wholly be discontinued, he caused a cell to be constructed in the centre of his palace, whither he frequently retired to prayer. On such occasions, he sometimes gave vent to his deep disquietude. ‘I am told that I possess all power over souls in this world—why is it then that I cannot assure myself of the safety of mine own? that I cannot rid myself of all these anxieties, and impart to my own breast that repose, which I can dispense so easily to others? Does God require from me that which is impossible; or has he only raised me in order to cast me down more terribly? I observe the Cardinals divided; and I hear from every side complaints against me. Is it not better to burst my chains, and resign the holy See to some one who can rule it in peace?—if only I could be permitted to quit this place and return to my solitude!’

Several of the Cardinals having observed that disposition, were sedulous to encourage it. It was entirely in accordance with their general wishes, with that most especially of *His Resignation*. Benedict Gaetano; since he designed himself for the successor. Those, on the other hand, who profited by Celestine’s simplicity, or revered his piety, or admired his popular austerities, dissuaded him from so unprecedented a project. But the good man was sincere and inflexible*; and after tasting for only five months of the bitterness of power, he pronounced his solemn resignation† of the pontificate.

* Bzovius describes his ardour for abdication, by the strong expression, ‘that no one ever accepted office so eagerly as he resigned it.’ That writer (if we could forget the miraculous absurdities which overload his narrative) has described this curious episode in papal history more fairly than Mosheim; for the latter overlooks the old hermit’s absolute incapacity, in a partial eagerness to attribute the discontent of his clergy to the consciousness of their own vices, and the fear of a rigorous reformation—though that may unquestionably have been one of their motives.

† ‘I, Celestine V., moved by sufficient causes—by humility, by the desire of a better

Thus far his vows were accomplished without any obstruction. But he last aspirations of his prayer were not accorded, nor was it given him again to breathe the peaceful breezes of Mt. Morone. The shadow of his dignity continued to haunt him after he had cast away the substance; the man who had possessed the chair of St. Peter, and abdicated it, could not possibly descend to insignificance or rise to independence. The merit of resigning a throne was insufficient to atone for the imprudence of accepting it; and Celestine was condemned for the remainder of his days to strict confinement by the jealousy of Boniface*.

As the pontificate of Boniface VIII. is the hinge on which the subsequent history of papacy almost entirely turns, we must follow its particulars with more than usual attention.

Whatsoever flexibility or show of moderation Benedict Gaetano may have exhibited before his advancement, he threw off all disguise and all restraint as soon as he had attained the object of his ambition. His pride seemed to acknowledge no limit, and no considerations of religion, or policy, or decency could repress his violence. In 1298, Albert of Austria caused himself to be saluted king of the Romans; and having slain his competitor in battle, made the usual overture to the Pope for confirmation. But this favour Boniface was so far from according, that he placed the crown † upon his own head, and seizing a sword, exclaimed, 'It is I who am Cæsar, it is I who am Emperor; it is I who will defend the rights of the empire!' There is a solemn and affecting function in the Roman Church, (celebrated on the first day of Lent,) in which ashes are thrown on the heads of the proud and great, to remind them of their insignificance and mortality. While the Pope was performing this ceremony, one Spinola, Archbishop of Genoa, a political adversary, presented himself in his turn to receive the lesson of humiliation. Boniface beheld him, and dashing the ashes in his face, said to him, 'Ghibeline! remember that thou art dust, and that with thy brother Ghibelines, thou wilt return to dust ‡.' As the kingdoms of Europe were then situated, not only in political reference to papal usurpation and pre-eminence, but also in respect to the revival of learning, the progress of civilization, the change of principles, and the decay even of some inveterate prejudices, there only wanted an intemperate defender, such as

life, by respect for my conscience, by the feebleness of my body, by my deficiency in knowledge, by the evil disposition of the people; and to the end that I may be restored to the repose and consolation of my past life—resign the papacy freely and voluntarily, and renounce that office and that dignity, &c. . . .'

Such was the form of his resignation, as given by Fleury (l. 89, s. 34) on the authority of Wadingus, 1294, n. 6. As his power to resign was by some held doubtful, the Cardinals suggested to him first to publish a general Constitution, authorizing a Pope to abdicate his office. He did so.

* Soon after his resignation, he escaped from some attendants whom Boniface had placed over him, with the view of returning to his ancient cell; but finding himself pursued, he turned towards the eastern coast, in the hope of finding a refuge in Greece. He was speedily overtaken; but in the mean time he had materially swelled the catalogue of his miracles, and established that sort of reputation by which he merited his canonization.

† We may here observe that, in consistency with his principles, Boniface VIII. introduced the use of the *double* crown. It appears from the images of the Popes, as well as from historical evidence, that from St. Sylvester to Boniface VIII., they were contented with a single crown. From Boniface to Urban V., they doubled the symbol of royalty, as its substance was really falling from under them. From Urban downwards, throughout the decline and overthrow of their authority, they have fondly clung to the majesty of the triple crown.

‡ These anecdotes are related by Sismondi (Rep. Ital. chap. xxiv.) without suspicion, on the authority of Pipini and Muratori.

Boniface, to decide the wavering balance, and precipitate before its time the baseless despotism of Rome.

Those historians are, notwithstanding, in error, who date the decline of the papal supremacy from the reign of Innocent III. On the contrary, the system had not then quite attained the fulness of its force; it had not then achieved its greatest triumph, which, without question, was the deposition of Frederic II. And if it is true, that, from Innocent IV. to Boniface VIII., no additional ground was gained, that no fresh claims were asserted, even that some former claims were less effectually enforced; it is certain, on the other hand, that not one iota of the papal pretensions had been resigned; and that they had met for the most part with ready, or at least undisputed, acquiescence. But in the meantime, the understanding of mankind had been no longer stationary; knowledge and genius and reason had revived and taken courage, and were advancing to the assertion of their eternal rights; and in the eye of the philosopher, it was a circumstance of evil omen to the projects of Boniface, that they were urged by the contemporary of Dante. Nevertheless, whether insensible to the weakness of his own cause, or to the progress of the principles opposed to it, or imagining by violence to supply the want of strength, he resolved to push the temporal pretensions of the See to their most extravagant limits*.

His first measures wore, indeed, a specious appearance, since he presented himself as the advocate of peace. He endeavoured to reconcile Charles of Sicily and James of Arragon; and more than once obtruded his mediation upon the Kings of England and France: these attempts seem to have had no other fruit, than a considerable contribution levied upon the English clergy. He then turned his attention in other directions. In 1297, he gave the kingdom of Sardinia and Corsica in fief to James of Arragon and his posterity, on certain conditions of aid and subsidy to Rome. In 1300 he laid claim to the kingdom of Scotland, and directed Edward I. to withdraw his soldiers from that country; and in the correspondence thus occasioned between those two great usurpers, each party might have found it easier to invalidate the claims of the other, than to establish his own—this burst of empty arrogance passed of course without effect. He pretended to the disposal of the crown of Hungary, and gave it to a grandson of Charles le Boiteux; and when some of the nobles (in 1302) ventured to support a rival prince, he addressed his legate there established in the following terms:—‘The Roman pontiff established by God over kings and their kingdoms, sovereign chief of the hierarchy in the church militant, and holding the first rank above all mortals, sitteth in tranquillity in the throne of judgment and scattereth away all evil with his eyes † . . . You have yet to learn that St. Stephen, the first Christian King of Hungary, offered and gave that kingdom

His temporal pretensions.

* Ruggiero di Loria having conquered Gerba, and some other islands, till then nearly unknown, near the coast of Africa, was contented to receive them in fief and on condition of tribute, from Boniface, who vouchsafed him a Bull of Investiture, in 1295. (*Insulas objacentes Africæ, Gerbam nimirum et Cherchinas, quas Loria barbaris eripuerat, jure fiduciario, sedis Apostolicæ liberalitate Bonifacius ei possidendas attribuit. Raynaldus. Ann. 1295, s. xxxvi.*) It was on the ground of this precedent, that two centuries afterwards, Alexander VI. assumed the right to dispose of all undiscovered tracts, continental or insular; and to concede the whole extent of terra incognita to Ferdinand and Isabella, by drawing a line on the map from pole to pole. Giannone, lib. xix. cap. 5.

† Prov. xx. 8.

to the Roman Church, not willing to assume the crown on his own authority, but rather to receive it from the vicar of Jesus Christ; since he knew, that no man taketh this honour on himself, but he that is called of God*.' In 1303 Boniface found it expedient to acknowledge as king of the Romans the same Albert whom he had formerly reviled: this concession was attended by a recognition of his own authority, by that prince, to the following effect. 'I acknowledge that the Roman empire has been transferred by the holy See, from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne; that the right to elect a king of the Romans, destined to be emperor, has been accorded by the holy see to certain princes ecclesiastical and secular; and that the kings and emperors receive from the holy see the power of the sword.' He concluded that act of subservience by an unconditional promise of military aid, if it should be required by the Pope. His sincerity was never put to trial, and when we consider for how long a period, and with what general success, the dependence of the empire had been asserted by the Popes, and recollect the peculiar foundation on which that claim rested, we shall scarcely wonder at its unequivocal acknowledgment by Albert. From these facts, we may at least observe the assiduity, with which Boniface pressed his temporal pretensions in every quarter of Europe. We shall now proceed to the principal theatre of his exertions, and watch the accumulation of the tempest which followed them.

The throne of France was then occupied by Philip the Fair—a man as arrogant, as jealous, as violent as Boniface, and perhaps even surpassing him in audacity. The clergy of France, though very faithfully attached to the Catholic Church and respecting the Pope as its head, had on various occasions, from the earliest period of papal usurpation, displayed an independent spirit of which we find no trace in other countries—yet not such as to give the slightest indications of schism, or even to prevent the holy see from making some successful inroads. The first † mention that we find of the liberties of the Gallican (as distinguished from the Roman) Church, is in the year 1229, and on an occasion of which it has no reason to be proud. A very rigorous Ordonnance was then published in the king's name for the extinction of Heresy—enjoining the immediate punishment of offenders, commanding the strictest search to be made for them, and offering a reward on conviction—and the end of this was—'to establish the liberties and immunities of the Gallican Church.'—But the act from which those liberties really date their origin, is the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis, published in 1269, on his departure against the Saracens. Its constitutions will be recorded in the next chapter. Their leading object was to protect episcopal election and preferment to benefices, the privileges granted to monasteries and ecclesiastical persons, and the property of the church generally, from the intrusions and exactions of Rome. Thus this matter rested till the reign of Boniface VIII. The fixed and distinct principle on which the Gallican liberties were finally placed (the inferiority of the Pope to a General Council) was not yet established, not perhaps even broached; but enough had been done to prove to a moderate Pope, that neither the king nor the clergy of France were prepared to acknowledge an implicit obedience.

The first difference between Boniface and Philip was merely sufficient to discover the disposition, and inflame the animosity of both. The

* Heb. v. 4.

† Fleury, liv. lxxix. sect. L.

Pope had learnt, that the kings both of France and England had levied contributions on their clerical, as well as their lay, subjects for purposes of state. In consequence, he published, in 1296, his celebrated Bull, beginning *Clericis Laicos*, of which the substance was this: 'Antiquity relates to us the inveterate hostility* of the laity to the clergy, and the experience of the present age confirms it manifestly—since, without consideration that they have no power over ecclesiastical persons or property, they load with impositions both prelates and clergy, regular and secular; and also, to our deep affliction, prelates and other ecclesiastics are found, who, from their greater dread of temporal than eternal majesty, acquiesce in this abuse.' He then proceeds to pronounce sentence of excommunication against all who shall hereafter exact such impositions, whether kings, princes, or magistrates, and against all who shall pay them.

*Bull Clericis
Laicos.*

Very soon afterwards, Philip published, in retort, an edict, forbidding the export of money, jewels, and other articles specified, out of his dominions. 'The Pope, who was thereby deprived of his ecclesiastical contributions, presently put forth a long reply and remonstrance, in which he explained his preceding Bull to mean, that the consent of the Pope is necessary for the levying of the aforesaid contributions; that, in circumstances of great national exigency, even that might be dispensed with; and that the prohibition did not extend to donations strictly voluntary †. At the same time he enlarged on the liberty of the Church—the ark of Noah—the spouse of Jesus Christ—to which He had given power over all the body of the faithful, and over every individual member of it. By these general expressions he intended to insinuate, not only that princes had no power over the Church, but that the Church possessed unlimited control over princes. The rejoinder on the part of the king had more reason in its theology, and more piety in its reason. It professed a holy fear of God, and respectful reverence for the ministers of the Church; but, in the full consciousness of justice, it repelled with disdain the senseless menaces of man. In the following year, the Pope had the prudence to address to the archbishop of Rheims such an interpretation of the Bull as left to Philip no reasonable ground of complaint; and French historians, with great probability, attribute the rare moderation of Boniface to his necessities or his avarice ‡.

*Disputes between Boni-
face and Philip.*

The truce thus tacitly established between the parties was of very short duration. Indeed, where were so many undefined and disputable rights, it was not possible that peace could long subsist between two rivals equally disposed to encroachment and usurpation. In the year 1301, Philip arrested (and seemingly with justice) Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, a creature of the Pope, on the charge of sedition and treasonable language, and caused him to be confined until the sentence of degradation should be passed on him, previous to the infliction of legal punishment. At the same time he wrote a respectful letter to Boniface, praying him to

* On this sentence, Fleury, the most candid of Catholics, very simply remarks, 'That aversion of laymen for the clergy, which the Pope mentions, ascended not to a very high antiquity; since for the five or six first ages, the clergy secured the respect and affections of all men, by their charitable and disinterested conduct.' (liv. lxxxix. s. xliii.) No clergy, which shapes its conduct by any other principle, ever will secure, or ever ought to secure, either affection or respect.

† Pagi, Vit. Bonif. VIII., sect. xxviii.

‡ To the same cause we may probably ascribe the proclamation of the first Jubilee, in the year 1300, by Boniface,—an institution to which we shall recur in a future chapter.

deprive the culprit of his clerical privileges, or at least to take measures for his conviction. But Boniface, having learnt that a bishop had been placed in confinement, addressed his answer (which he sent by a special legate) to that point only; and denying that laymen had received any power over the clergy, he enjoined the king to dismiss the prisoner freely to the pontifical presence, with full restitution of all his property, at the same time reminding him that he had himself incurred canonical punishment for having rashly laid his hand on the person of a bishop. On the same day, or very soon afterwards, he published a Bull, addressed also to Philip, in which, after exhorting his son to listen * with docility to his instructions, he proceeded in the following terms:—‘God has set me over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant †, in his name, and by his doctrine. Let no one persuade you, then, that you have no superior, or that you are not subject to the chief of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He that holds that opinion is senseless, and he that obstinately maintains it is an infidel, separate from the flock of the good Shepherd.’ . . . He then continued, still out of his affection ‡ for Philip, to charge him with many general violations of the ecclesiastical privileges, or, as they were then more commonly called, Liberties; and concluded by informing him, that he had summoned all the superior clergy of France to an assembly at Rome, on the 1st of the November following (1302), in order to deliberate on the remedies for such abuses.

Philip was astonished by this measure, but not so confounded as to deviate either into timidity or rashness. He convoked a full and early assembly or parliament of his nobles and clergy. In the meantime, he burnt the Bull of the Pope as publicly as possible, and caused that act to be proclaimed with trumpets throughout the whole of Paris. In his subsequent address to his parliament, he mentioned the proceedings of Boniface, disclaimed with scorn any temporal allegiance to him, retorted the charges of corruption and mal-administration, declared his readiness to risk any loss or suffering in defence of the common interests, and referred the decision of the question to the assembly. The barons and lay members pronounced their opinions loudly and unhesitatingly in favour of the king. With them the question was, in a great degree, national. They were jealous of the honour of the crown, and eager to protect it from any foreign insult. And though a calmer judgment would, perhaps, have taught them, that such a restraint upon the monarchy might, in its effects, be beneficial to all classes of the people, they sacrificed every consideration of policy to the passion of the moment. The situation of the clergy was exceedingly difficult, since they had two duties to reconcile, which, even in ordinary times, were not always in strict ac-

* *Ausculat, fli*—the two first words of this Bull—have affixed to it its historical name. It was published in December, 1301, and was preceded only two days by another constitution of Boniface, called *Salvator Mundi*, by which he suspended all favours and privileges which had been accorded by his predecessors to the kings of France, and to all their subjects, whether lay or clerical, who abetted Philip. Pagi, *Bonif. VIII.*, sec. lvii.

† *Jerem. i. 10.* The words are addressed to Jeremiah, in respect to his prophetic mission; but they had been perverted to the support of the papal pretensions long before the time of Boniface. See, for instance, the letter of Honorius III., written in 1225, to Louis of France. The ‘plenitude of power which the Holy See has received from God’ is there placed chiefly on that foundation.

‡ Another reason, by which he justified his interference, was his own responsibility to God for the soul of King Philip.

cordance, and which were then in direct opposition. Their first attempt was to explain and justify the *intentions* of the Pope; but that was repelled with general contempt and indignation. Then they expressed a dutiful anxiety to assist the king, and maintain the liberties of the kingdom; but at the same time they pleaded the obedience due from them to the Pope, and prayed for permission to attend his summons to Rome. This permission was clamorously refused by the king and his barons.

The clergy then addressed a letter to the Pope, in which they expressed an apprehension lest the violent and universal hostility*, not of the king and his barons only, but of the body of the laity, should lead to an entire rupture between France and Rome, and even between the clergy and the people; and they prayed that he would release them from the summons to Rome. At the same time the barons also wrote—not, indeed, to the Pope, but to the College of Cardinals—in severe censure of the new and senseless pretensions of Boniface, on whom personally they cast the entire blame of the difference. In reply, the cardinals disavowed, on the part of Boniface, any assertion that the king of France held his temporalities of the Pope; while, in defence of his ghostly authority, they maintained, ‘that no man in his senses can doubt, that the Pope, as chief of the spiritual hierarchy, can dispense with the sin of every man living.’ In his reply to the dutiful supplication of the prelates, the Pope rebuked them for their want of courage and attachment, enforced on them the indisputable subjection of things temporal to things spiritual, and persisted in commanding their attendance at Rome.

The great majority disregarded the summons; but some few were found who considered their first obedience as due to their ecclesiastical sovereign. These proceeded *Bull Unam Sanctam*. to Rome; and, in spite of their small number, Boniface availed himself of the name of this Council to publish the Decretal, commonly known as the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. The propositions asserted in this celebrated constitution are, first, the Unity of the Holy Catholic Church, without which there is no salvation; wherein is one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Hence it follows, that of this one and only Church there is one body and one head, (not two heads, which would be monstrous,) namely, Christ, and Christ’s vicar, St. Peter, and the successor of St. Peter. The second position is, that in the power of this Chief are two swords, the one spiritual, and the other material; but that the former of these is to be used by the Church, the latter for the Church; the former is in the hand of the priest, the latter in the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. It is next asserted, that one of these swords must be subject to the other sword, otherwise we must suppose two opposite principles, which would be Manichæan and heretical. Thence it is an easy inference, that the spiritual is that which has rule over the other, while itself is liable to no other judgment or authority than that of God. The general conclusion is contained in one short sentence,—‘Wherefore we declare, define, and pronounce, that it is absolutely essential to the salvation of every human being, that he be subject unto the Roman pontiff†.’

* ‘The laity absolutely fly from our society, and repel us from their conferences and councils, as if we were guilty of treason against them. They despise ecclesiastic censures, from whatsoever quarter they may come, and are preparing and taking precautions to render them useless.’ Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, liv. xc., sec. ix.

† The texts on which these propositions were chiefly founded are John x. 16; Romans xiii. 1; Jeremiah i. 10; 1 Corinthians ii. 15.

But Boniface did not content himself with mere assertions. On the very same day he also published a Bull of excommunication against all persons, of whatsoever rank, even kings or emperors, who should interfere in any way to prevent or impede those, who might desire to present themselves before the Roman See. This edict was, of course, understood to be directly levelled against Philip. Soon afterwards he sent a legate into France, the bearer of twelve articles, which boldly expressed such papal pretensions, as were in opposition to those of the king; and concluded with a menace of temporal as well as spiritual proceedings. The claims contained in these articles have been already mentioned, and do not require enumeration. But what may raise our surprise is, that the answer of Philip was extremely moderate; that he condescended to explain away much that seemed objectionable in his conduct; that he promised to remedy any abuses which his officers might have committed, and expressed his strong desire for concord with the Roman Church.

His moderation may have been affected, and his explanations frivolous, and the abuses in question he may not have seriously intended to alleviate. But at least it is true that he had never sought the enmity of Rome; and had Boniface availed himself of that occasion to close the breach, when he might have closed it with profit and dignity, his last days might have been passed in lofty tranquillity; he would have been respected and feared, even by those who hated him; and posterity would still have admired the courage and the policy which had contended against the most powerful prince in Europe, in no very blind or superstitious age, without disadvantage or dishonour. But the Pope did not perceive this crisis in his destiny. He proceeded in his former course—he proclaimed his dissatisfaction at the answers of the king, and repeated and redoubled his menaces.

Philip had then recourse to that public measure which so deeply influenced the future history of papacy—the convocation of a General Council, to pronounce on the proceedings of the Pope. But while he was engaged in preparations for this great contest, and for the establishment of a principle to which his clergy were not yet prepared to listen*, a latent and much shorter path was opened to the termination of his perplexities.

William of Nogaret, a celebrated French civilian, in conjunction with certain Romans of the Colonna family, who had fled for refuge to Paris from the oppression of Boniface, passed secretly into Italy, and tampered successfully with the personal attendants of the Pope. The usual residence of the latter was Anagni, a city some forty or fifty miles to the south-east of Rome, and his birth-place. There, in the year 1303, he had composed another Bull, in which he maintained, ‘that, as vicar of Jesus Christ, he had the power to govern kings with a rod of iron, and to dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel †;’ and he had destined the 8th of September, the anniversary of the nativity of the Virgin, for its promulgation. A rude interruption disturbed his dreams of omnipotence, and discovered the secret of his real weakness. On the very day preceding the intended publication of the Bull, Nogaret, with Sciarra Colonna, and some other nobles, escorted by about three hundred horsemen, and a larger number of partizans on foot, bearing the banners of France, rushed into Anagni, with shouts of

* Not only did the bishops and the whole clergy decline any active part in the proceedings against the Pope, but they refused any share in them, and only consented to the convocation of the council through the necessity of seeking some remedy for the disorders of the Church.

† Psalms ii, 9.

'Success to the king of France!—Death to Pope Boniface!' After a feeble resistance, they became masters of the pontifical palace. The cardinals dispersed and fled—through treachery, as some assert, or, more probably, through mere timidity. The greater part of the Pope's personal attendants fled also.

Boniface, when he perceived that he was surprised and abandoned, prepared himself with uncommon resolution for the last outrage. 'Since I am betrayed (he cried) as Jesus Christ was betrayed, I will at least die like a Pope.' He then clothed himself in his official vestments, and placed the crown of Constantine on his head, and grasped the keys and the cross in his hands, and seated himself in the pontifical chair. He was now eighty-six years of age. And when Sciarra Colonna, who first penetrated into his presence, beheld the venerable form and dignified composure of his enemy, his purpose, which doubtless was sanguinary, seemed suddenly to have deserted him, and his revenge did not proceed beyond verbal insult*. Nogaret followed. He approached the Pope with some respect, but at the same time imperiously informed him, that he must prepare to be present at the council forthwith to be assembled on the subject of his misconduct, and to submit to its decision. The Pope addressed him—'William of Nogaret, descended from a race of heretics, it is from thee, and such as thee, that I can patiently endure indignity.' The ancestors of Nogaret had atoned for their errors in the flames. But the expression of the pontiff was not prompted by any offence he felt at that barbarity; not by any consciousness of the iniquity of his own oppression †, or any sense of the justice of the retribution; it proceeded simply from the sectarian hatred which swelled his own breast, which he felt to be implacable, and which he believed to be mutual.

While their leaders were thus employed, the body of the conspirators dispersed themselves throughout the splendid apartments in eager pursuit of plunder. Any deliberate plan which might have been formed against the person of the Pope, was disappointed by their avarice. During the day of the attack, and that which followed, the French appear to have been wholly occupied in the ransack. But in the meantime the people of Anagni were recovered from their panic; and perhaps they were more easily awakened to the shame of deserting their Pope and their citizen, when they discovered the weakness of the aggressors, and the snare into which their license had led them. They took up arms, assaulted the French, and having expelled or massacred them, restored to the pontiff his freedom and authority.

But they were unable to restore his insulted honour and the spirit which had been broken by indignity. Infuriated by the disgrace of his captivity, he hurried from Anagni to Rome, burning *His Death.* for revenge. But the violence of his passion presently over-

* Some modern French historians assert that Boniface was severely wounded by the assailants—a story which is idly repeated by Mosheim, and re-echoed even by Gibbon. It is the *unanimous* affirmation of contemporary writers, that no hand was raised against him. See Sismondi, chap. xxiv. The words of S. Antoninus (part 3., tit. xx., cap. 8. sec. xxi.) are express. 'Domino autem disponente, ob dignitatem Apostolicæ Sedis, nemo, ex inimicis ejus ausus fuit mittere in eum manus; sed indutum sacris vestibus dimiserunt sub honesta custodia, et ipsi insistebant prædæ, &c.' See Pagi, Bonif. VIII., sec. lxx.

† Boniface VIII. was a very faithful patron of the Inquisition; and if his name is not distinguished in the list of persecuting popes, it is rather from the want of opportunity, than of inclination. Persecution being now systematized by the regular machinery of the Inquisition, there were fewer occasions for individual distinction. See Whately on 'The Errors of Romanism,' ch. v., sec. iii., vi., p. 241—244.

powered his reason, and his death immediately followed. He was attended by an antient servant, who exhorted him to confide himself in his calamity to the Consoler of the afflicted. But Boniface made no reply. His eyes were haggard, his mouth white with foam, and he gnashed his teeth in silence. He passed the day without nourishment, the night without repose; and when he found that his strength began to fail, and that his end was not far distant, he removed all his attendants, that there might be no witness to his final feebleness and his parting struggle. After some interval, his domestics burst into the room, and beheld his body stretched on the bed, stiff and cold. The staff which he carried bore the mark of his teeth, and was covered with foam; his white locks were stained with blood; and his head was so closely wrapped in the counterpane, that he was believed to have anticipated his impending death by violence and suffocation*.

This took place on the 10th of October; and precisely on the same day, after an interval of three hundred and three years, his body was dug up, and transferred to another place of sepulture. Spondanus †, the Catholic historian, was at Rome at the moment. He relates the circumstances, and mentions the eagerness with which the whole city rushed to the spectacle. His body was found, covered with the pontifical vestments, still fresh and uncorrupted. His hands, which his enemies had asserted to have been bitten away in his rage, were so free from decay and mutilation, with every finger entire, that even the veins and nerves appeared to be swelling with flesh and life.

After the death of Boniface the French interest presently prevailed in the College; and in the year 1305 the archbishop of Bourdeaux, a native of France, was elected to the chair. He took the title of Clement V., and presently transferred the papal residence from Rome to Avignon.

CHAPTER XXI.

(I.) *On Lewis IX. of France*—His public motives—contrasted with those of Constantine and Charlemagne—His virtues, piety, and charity—Particulars of his civil legislation—His superstition—The original Crown of Thorns—its removal to Paris—its reception by the king. His death—His miracles and canonization—The Bull of Boniface VIII.—(II.) *On the Inquisition*.—Whether St. Lewis contributed to its establishment—Origin of the Inquisition—Office of St. Dominic and his contemporaries—Erection of a separate tribunal at Toulouse—by Gregory IX.—The authority then vested in the Mendicants—Its unpopularity in France—Co-operation of St. Lewis—Conduct of Frederic II.—Of Innocent IV.—Limits to the prevalence of the Inquisition.—(III.) *On the Gallican Liberties*.—Remonstrance of the Prelates of France respecting excommunications. Firmness of Lewis—His visit to the Cistercian chapter. The supplication of the monks, and the reply of the King—Early spirit and sense of independence in the French clergy—The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Lewis—Its principle—The six articles which constitute it—Consequences of the policy of Innocent III.—(IV.) *On the Crusades*. Remarks on the character and circumstances of the first Crusade—Exertions of St. Bernard for the second Crusade—its fatal result—Excuse of that abbot—Causes of the fall of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—Third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh

* Sismondi, Rep. Ital., end of chap. xxiv. 'Concerning which Boniface (says Matthew of Westminster) a certain versifier wrote as follows:—

Ingreditur Vulpes, regnat Leo, sed Canis exit;
Re tandem vera si sic fuit, ecce Chimæra!—

Flores Histor. ad ann. 1303.

Others give the same in the form of a prophesy, delivered by Morone during his imprisonment. Ascendisti ut Vulpes, regnabis ut Leo, et mericris ut Canis. Antiq. Eccles. Britann. ad ann. 1295.

† Spondanus continued the History of Baronius from the year 1197, in which it concludes, to 1646. See also Bzovius on this same occurrence,—Ann. 1303.

Crusades—The eighth and ninth. St. Lewis—Termination of the Crusades, and final loss of Palestine—General remarks—(1.) On the *Origin* and first motives of religious pilgrimage—Treatment of first pilgrims by the Saracens—Pilgrimage during the 10th and 11th centuries—Conquest of Palestine by the Turks—Practice of private feuds and warfare in Europe—prevalent in the 10th century—The superstitious spirit of the same age—associated with the military—General predisposition in favour of a Crusade—Failure of Sylvester II. and Gregory VII.—(2.) On the *Objects* of the Crusades—what they were—what they were not—The object of the first distinguished from that of following Crusades—Conduct and policy of the sovereigns of Europe—Of the Vatican—Gradual change in its objects.—(3.) On the *Results* of the Crusades—Advantages produced by them—Few and partial—on government—on commerce—on general civilization—Evils occasioned—Religious wars—Immoral influence—Corruption of church discipline—Canonical penance—Introduction of the Plenary Indulgence—its abuses—The Jubilee—Interests of the clergy. *Note (A)*. On the collections of papal decretals—That of Gratian—the Liber Sextus—Clementines, &c.—*Note (B)*. On the University of Paris—The Four Faculties—Foundation of the Sorbonne.—*Note (C)*. On certain Theological Writers—Rise and progress of the Scholastic System of Theology—Peter the Lombard—His ‘Book of the Sentences’—St. Thomas Aquinas—His history and productions—St. Bonaventure—the character of his theology—The Realists and Nominalists—or Thomists and Scotists.—The Immaculate Conception.

It is seldom that the stream of ecclesiastical history receives any important contribution from the biography of kings. Our more peaceful course is indeed perpetually troubled by the eddies of secular polity, and most so in the most superstitious ages. The names of Constantine and Charlemagne have, it is also true, deserved an eminent rank among the heroes of the church. But if we pass over the legendary tales of the monarch-monks of the darkest days, we shall scarcely discover any other powerful prince whose policy was formed either on an ardent sense of religion, or an attachment to ecclesiastical interests, until we arrive at the reign of Lewis IX. And here we must at once distinguish the principles of that prince from those either of Constantine or of Charlemagne. By whatsoever motives of genuine piety those two sovereigns may really have been influenced, it is certain that their ecclesiastical institutions were chiefly regulated for political ends. It was their object—an object worthy of their royal rank and virtues—to improve the moral and religious condition of their subjects through the instrumentality of Christ’s ministers; and at the same time to raise the dignity and character of those, whose sacred office, when they are not the worst of men, is calculated to make them the best. But the actions of Lewis were not guided by any such considerations. They proceeded from that which it was the purpose of the others’ policy to create—an absorbing Christian piety, with its train of concomitant excellencies. On this subject there is no difference among historians, except in as far as some are more disposed to ridicule the superstitious excesses into which he fell, through the practice of his age, than to do justice to the lofty motives whence his virtues proceeded.

SECTION I.

On Lewis IX.

Lewis IX. was born about the year 1215, and came to the throne at a very early age. He was educated by a mother named Blanche, who was eminent for her devotion to God and the church; and we should here remark, that he drew his first breath, and received his earliest notions of ecclesiastical polity, among the groans of the suffering Albigeois. The sanctity of his private life was not sullied by any stain, nor was it clouded by any austerity. ‘Never, since I was born,’ (says Joinville,) ‘did I hear him speak ill of any one.’ He loved his subjects; and had his lot been cast in happier days, he would have loved mankind. But the principles of his church so contracted those of his religion, that his benevolence could never expand itself into philanthropy.

He was devout in private prayer, as well as a constant attendant on the offices of the church. On the one hand, his submission to the admonitions, and even to the personal corrections, of his confessor is diligently recorded; and on the other, his adoration of the Holy Cross * is recounted with no less admiration. He would descend from his seat, and advancing in a homely garment, with his head, neck, and feet bare, and his children behind him, bend with such profound humility before the emblems of his salvation, that the spectators were moved to tears of affection and piety. He appears, too, from the same accounts, to have washed the feet of monks and of mendicants, by a very common exercise of self-abasement. And we may overlook this foolish affectation in that substantial excellence, which distributed his charitable benefactions without thrift or partiality, through every class of those who needed them. The foundation of many churches and monasteries secured at the same time the gratitude and fidelity of his spiritual subjects.

Hume has ascribed to Lewis IX., together with 'the mean and abject superstition of a monk, the magnanimity of a hero, the integrity of a patriot, the humanity of a philosopher'—That insatiable zeal for crusades, which neither his reason, which was powerful, nor his humanity, nor his philosophy, nor all united, were even in later life sufficient to allay, afforded at the same time the most pernicious proofs of his superstition and his heroism. But his patriotism was more honourably displayed in the internal regulation of his kingdom; in the removal of abuses, in the advancement of civilization; and in this office, (as his domestic biographer observes,) he so combined the secular with the spiritual interests of his subjects, that he seemed to discharge by the same acts the double office of priest and king †. He detested the practice of usury; and to that motive we may perhaps attribute his hatred for the Jews, who exercised the trade exclusively. Still we must doubt the wisdom, while we censure the cruelty, of the edict, by which he expelled them from the country. He enacted a very severe (according to our notions, a barbarous ‡) law against blasphemy. While we praise his bold, though seemingly ineffectual, attempts to restrain the moral profligacy of his nobles, we shall scarcely less applaud the vigour, with which he exerted against that body the power of royalty, in a cause almost equally sacred: It was a leading object of his policy, to protect the lower classes of his subjects against the brutal § oppression of the aristocracy; and to unite the interests of the crown and the people against that privileged order, which was equally hostile to the independence of both. Justice he commonly admi-

* See the book 'De Vita et Actibus Ludovici,' &c. by his chaplain, William (Carnotensis) of Chartres; and his 'Vita, Conversatio et Miracula,' by F. Gaufridus his confessor. One object of the latter is to point out the exact correspondence of the character of Lewis with that of Josiah. The particular description and changes of his coarse raiment; the days of his fasting, of his abstinence from meat, or from fruit and fish, or from every kind of fish except one, or from every thing except bread and water, and such like details of his devotional observances, are related by both writers; especially by the confessor, and in his 17th chapter. The king's eleemosynary liberality forms the worthier subject of that which follows. Both his biographers were Dominicans.

† 'Quod etiam quodammodo regale sacerdotium, aut sacerdotale regimen videretur pariter exercere.'—Gulielm. Carnotensis.

‡ He caused the lips (or, as some say, the forehead) of those convicted, to be seared with a hot iron.

§ Having learnt, on one occasion, that a nobleman had hanged three children for the offence of hunting rabbits, Lewis condemned him to capital punishment. But the rest of the nobility united with so much determination to preserve the life of their fellow-tyrant and the prerogatives of their order, that the king was obliged to commute the punishment for deprivation of property.

nistered in person*, and tempered it with his natural clemency. At the same time he endeavoured to purify its sources by permanent alterations, and to secure at least for future ages the blessings, which he might despair effectually to impart to his own. Accordingly, he struck at the root of the evil, and made it the grand object of his efforts, to substitute trial by evidence for the 'judgments of God;' and most especially for the most sanguinary among them, the decision by duel. His ordinances on those subjects were obeyed within the boundaries of his own domains: but he had not the power to enforce them universally. The Barons, who were severally the legislators in their own estates, adhered to the venerable establishments of former days; and a more general diffusion of knowledge was required, before the plainest reason, aided even by royal authority, could prevail against the inveterate sanctity of instituted absurdities.

It was the same with those humane endeavours to arrest the practice of private warfare, in which he anticipated the course of civilization by more than two centuries†. But when he despaired of effecting this object at once, he attempted at least to mitigate the mischief by a judicious prohibition—that neither party should commence hostilities till forty days after the offence had been offered‡. Thus was he compelled to temporize with a great national evil, of which he felt at the same time the whole extent, as well as his own incapacity to correct it. From these instances we may observe, that the civil legislation of St. Louis was generally founded on wise policy, and that it always sprang from benevolent motives. We shall presently notice some of his ecclesiastical enactments; but, at the same time, it must be admitted, that the charge of 'abject superstition' alleged against him by the philosophical historian is not less just, than the merits also ascribed to him; nor will it here be out of place to recount one celebrated incident in support of this imputation.

The History of the Church comprises the records of superstition, which in those corrupt ages was indeed so interwoven with piety, that it is rare to find them separate. The character of St. Lewis particularly exemplified their combination; it may be perpetually detected in his warlike enterprises; but there is not one among his spiritual adventures which better illustrates himself and his age than the following:—The original Crown of Thorns had been long preserved at Constantinople as the most precious and venerable among the relics of Christ; yet such were at this time the necessities of the government, that the holy treasure was consigned in pawn to the government of Venice. It was delivered over to

*Reception of the
Crown of Thorns.*

* 'I have often seen the saint,' (says Joinville,) 'after he had heard mass, in summer, come out to the Forest of Vincennes, and seat himself at the foot of an oak, and make us sit all round him. And those who had any business came and spoke to him without any officer giving them hinderance.—And sometimes he would come to the Garden of Paris, and have carpets spread for us to sit near him; and then he administered justice to his people, as he did at Vincennes.'—*Histoire du Roy St. Louis*, p. 23. Edit. Paris, 1617. This history, which is the life of an admirable king and Christian, by a candid, loyal, unaffected soldier, is a beautiful specimen of inartificial biography. But, unhappily, the most beneficial, and, therefore, the noblest acts of the monarch, are not those which have most attracted the attention of the soldier. The details of his campaigns, and many anecdotes of his private life, are related with minuteness and seeming accuracy; but his great legislative enactments are slightly, or not at all noticed.

† The right of private feud cannot be considered as abolished, until nearly the end of the 15th century. In collecting a large and, for those days, a valuable library, and in encouraging the progress of knowledge among his subjects, St. Louis opened the only certain path to their civilization.

‡ Some attribute this regulation to Philippe Auguste.

the commissioners of the Republic, who immediately set sail, in a wintry and inclement season, full of religious confidence, and were preserved (as it was thought) through a perilous voyage by the holiness of their charge. The pledge, which the Greeks were too poor or too wise to redeem, was eagerly purchased by St. Lewis, and the relic, after a few months at Venice of repose and adoration, continued its pilgrimage to the west. During the course of an overland journey it was again distinguished by the favour of the elements; and though the rain fell abundantly during the nights, not a drop descended by day to interrupt its progress. At length when it arrived at Troyes in Champagne, the event was notified to the king at Paris, and he instantly set off to welcome it, accompanied by the Queen Blanche his mother, by his brothers, by some prelates, and other nobles.

The royal company met their holy acquisition in the neighbourhood of Sens, and after they had uncovered the case and beheld the object, and moistened it with pious tears, they assembled the clergy of the diocese and formed a solemn procession towards the city. As they approached the gates, the king and his eldest brother, the Count d'Artois, received the venerated burden on their shoulders; and in this manner, with naked feet, and no other covering than a shirt *, they carried it, in the midst of the adoring crowd, into the cathedral. . . . Thence it proceeded to Paris, and there its arrival was hailed with a repetition of the same degrading solemnities. The whole clergy and the whole people were in motion, and again the two illustrious brothers, barefoot and naked as before, supported and deposited it in the destined sanctuary. An annual festival was instituted to commemorate an event of such national importance—the introduction of this new palladium. But its value was soon afterwards diminished by the importation of a formidable rival for the popular adoration. It was not long before the royal enthusiast succeeded in procuring some substantial fragments of the real Cross; and this acquisition again furnished him with another pretext to multiply to his lively subjects the occasions of religious festivity.

In the year 1270, St. Lewis died before Tunis, while in the prosecution of his second crusade. His last words were said to have been these†—‘ Lord, I will enter into thine house; I will worship in thy holy temple, and give glory to thy name. Into thy hands I commend my spirit.’ From the beginning of his life to its latest breath the same principle predominated, the same religious fervour (however it may sometimes have been perverted) influenced all his actions; and, perhaps, in the interminable catalogue of her Saints, the Church of Rome cannot number a name more worthy of that celestial dignity than Lewis IX. But the merit to which that pious monarch was chiefly indebted for his heavenly office, was not that to which he had ever particularly pretended. His eminent virtues, his religious life and death, even his services to the Catholic Church, might seem to have entitled him to that high reward. But those claims had been wholly insufficient, had it not also been conclusively attested that he had performed many manifest and astonishing miracles.

The canonization of Lewis IX. took place twenty-seven years after his death, and almost the whole of that time was employed in collecting

* Vita et Convers. S. Ludovici, &c., per F. Gaufridum. Aug. 11, 1239, was the day consecrated by this exploit.

† So says William of Chartres, and Boniface VIII. in his Bull of Canonization, confirms it.

the necessary documents *. The rapid succession of the Popes was the cause which retarded it; and it may seem as if in mockery of his holy character, that the performance *and Canonization* of this office did at last devolve upon Boniface VIII.

It was Boniface who preached the panegyric sermon, and enlarged on those various virtues which had no counterpart in his own bosom. It was the genius of arrogance which paid homage to the spirit of humility, and exalted it even to the thrones of heaven. 'Let the hosts of heaven rejoice at the arrival of so noble and glorious an inhabitant—an approved and eminent husbandman of the Christian faith is added to their multitudes. Let the glorious nobility of the celestial citizens sound the jubilee of joy, for an honoured stranger is adscribed to their ranks. Let the venerable assembly of the Saints arise with gladness and exultation to receive a compeer who well deserves such dignity. Arise, thou innumerable council of faith; zealots of the faith arise, and sing the hymn of praise in concert with the Church which is your own. . . . He offered offence to no one, to no one violence or injury. He carefully observed the boundaries of justice, without deserting the path of equity. He punished with the sword the daring and lawless enterprises of the wicked. An ardent lover of peace and concord—an anxious promoter of unity—hostile to scandals and dissensions †, &c. &c. We may remark that this last topic, in the mouth of Boniface VIII., was at best an equivocal eulogy. A zeal for 'unity,' and an abhorrence of 'scandals and dissensions,' is a praise which, when proceeding from pontifical lips, conveys the necessary suspicion of intolerance. Louis has been accused of that crime—the ruling iniquity of his age—and we shall now examine on what facts that charge is really founded.

SECTION II.

On the Inquisition.

It is asserted, and with truth, that the Inquisition was permanently established in France during the reign of St. Louis; that he never ceased to manifest great partiality for the Dominicans and Franciscans ‡, and all invested with the inquisitorial office; and that it was even at the particular solicitation of the king §, that Alexander IV. confirmed, in 1255, the

* In the first of the two sermons delivered by Boniface on that occasion, he expressly asserts, that after the fullest examination into the evidence for the miracles, he has ascertained that sixty-three miracles were assuredly performed, besides others which God evidently vouchsafed to him—(sexaginta tria, inter cætera quæ Dominus evidenter ostendit, certitudinaliter facta cognovimus.) Respecting the tedious duration of the investigation Boniface remarks, in the same discourse, with great simplicity—'Et ita per tot et totiens examinatum est, rubricatum et discussum negotium, quod de hoc plus facta est descriptura, quam unus asinus posset portare.'

† It is difficult to conceive a more turgid and tautologous composition than this celebrated bull. The merits which Louis really possessed are enumerated without taste or feeling; and the author of the panegyric seems to have been wholly incapable of estimating the character which he pretended to eulogize.

‡ It appears that he intended to educate two of his sons in monasteries, and that by his Testament he assigned one to Dominican, the other to Franciscan tuition.—Gaufridus, *Vita et Conversat.* chap. 14.

§ See Limborch, *Hist. Inquisit. lib. i. cap. 16.* The annalist Raynaldus has expressed his pious regret, that the admirable institution of the Saint was feebly supported, and even entirely overthrown by his degenerate successors! We should observe that the domains of the Count of Poitiers and Toulouse, who was then Alphonso, brother of the king, were excepted from the jurisdiction of the prior, as being already subject to a special commis-

institution of that tribunal, and appointed the Prior of the Dominican Convent at Paris to be Inquisitor-general in France. That we may be able to estimate the real weight of these assertions, and (what is more important than the reputation of any individual) that we may understand on what ground that frightful structure was erected, we must trace as shortly as possible the causes which led to its foundation.

The itinerant emissaries of Innocent III., among whom Dominic is the name most celebrated, first obtained the title of Inquisitors—that is to say, they were invested by the Pope with authority to discover, to convert, or to arraign before the ecclesiastical courts all guilty or suspected of heresy. But this was the limit of their commission. They did not constitute an independent tribunal, nor were they clothed with any judicial power. The process was still carried on, according to the practice then prevailing, before the bishop of the diocese, and the secular arm was invited, when necessary, to enforce his sentence. But this form of proceeding was not found sufficiently rapid to satisfy the eagerness of the Pope and his missionaries. The work of extirpation was sometimes retarded by the compunctions of a merciful prelate, sometimes by the reluctance of the civil authorities to execute a barbarous or unpopular sentence*. And to remove these impediments to the course of destruction, there was no resource, except to institute in the infected provinces, with the direct co-operation of the ruling powers, a separate tribunal for causes of heresy. This object was not immediately accomplished. In the meantime the Dominicans and Franciscans were spreading their numbers and influence in every country. And as they were the faithful myrmidons of the Roman See, and more devoted in their allegiance than either the secular or the regular clergy, thus arose an additional reason for investing them with a distinct jurisdiction. By the council held at Toulouse in 1229, (of which the decrees have been noticed in a former chapter,) a canon was published which united ‘one priest with three laymen,’ in a sort of council of inquisition. It is this regulation which is reasonably considered as the foundation of the *Court of Inquisition* †.

To Pope Gregory IX. be ascribed the honour of this success! Still the court thus established continued to be a court of bishops. Its *object* was indeed exclusively such as the most zealous pontiff could have desired; but it was composed of materials neither wholly destitute of human feeling, nor blindly subservient to the papal will. A further change was, therefore, necessary; and, accordingly, about three years afterwards, Gregory found means to transfer the authority in the new court to the Dominican order. It was thus that the Inquisition, properly so called—that is, a court for the trial of heretics, erected by papal authority, and administered

sion on matters of faith.—Fleury, liv. lxxxiv. § lxxxv. The act of St. Louis was to establish that generally throughout his kingdom, which had hitherto been confined to the most infected province.

* It should be remarked on the other hand, that it was sometimes (especially in the beginning of the persecutions) precipitated by the agency of popular fury, excited by the preachers *against* the heretics. Their favourite text is said to have been (Psalm xciv. v. 16.) ‘Who will rise up for me against the evil-doers? Who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?’ Many of them were eloquent—the people were superstitious—the preachers were fanatics. In fact, when the ecclesiastical censures were despised, and the secular power refused its aid, popular madness was their only remaining instrument.

† By the Council of Narbonne, held two years before, it was enacted, ‘that the bishops should establish in each parish synodal witnesses to inquire into heresy, and other notorious crimes, and to make their report.’ These were truly established inquisitors;—still their office was to report, not to judge.

by papal dependents—was indeed instituted. . . . Some popular commotions * followed its first proceedings;—the persons of the judges were exposed to insult, and the whole body was, for a short time, expelled from the city. But the spirit of Rome was yet too powerful,—the fugitives were presently restored. And though the inquisitorial system never reached in France those refinements in barbarity which some other countries have endured—though it obtained, in truth, no very permanent footing among a humane and generous people—it continued to subsist there for several years; and if there was any sceptre under which it can be said to have flourished, it was assuredly the sceptre of St. Louis. Still we must not forget that it was established in his boyhood; so that the guilt of *that* † act is unjustly cast upon him. He perpetuated the evil which he found; and in the religious code of those days, the ‘unity of the Church’ was so carefully identified with the glory of Christ, that an ardent desire for the one might easily degenerate into a misguided zeal for the other: and thus, without intending to exculpate the royal persecutor, we are bound to distinguish between the crime of those who created that ecclesiastical system, and of him who blindly supported it;—of the churchmen ‡ who artfully confounded the essence of religion with the maintenance of their own power, and of the pious laymen, who adopted with reverence the undisputed and consecrated maxims.

The brutal edicts § of Frederic II., published about 1144, and not exceeded by the most barbarous emanations of the Vatican, were not palliated by any motive of misdirected piety: *Progress of the Inquisition.* yet were they much more effectual than the encouragement of Louis in arming the fury of the Dominicans, at least within the limits of his empire. But the intolerant zeal of Frederic neither softened the hostility of Innocent IV., nor preserved himself from the anathemas of the Church ||. After his triumph, Innocent pursued and exceeded the footsteps of his predecessors. He established the Tribunal ¶ of the Inquisition in the north of Italy, and in that form which

* Besides the indignation excited by the object of this institution, there was a general objection among laymen to the establishment of *any* new ecclesiastical tribunal, to which all classes were alike amenable. And this was not diminished when, to the original offences of heresy, those of Judaism, Mahometanism, sodomy, sacrilege, and even polygamy, were added. But we have not observed that this wide extension of the objects of that court was ever made in France.

† We must notice the injustice which has hastily been offered to the character of Louis IX. by Mosheim. That writer having asserted (on the authority of the Benedictine compilers of the history of Languedoc) that Louis published a barbarous edict against heretics, in the year 1229, proceeds thus:—‘A great part of the sanctity of good King Louis consisted in his furious and implacable aversion to heretics.’ . . . Now, that this aversion formed, at any age, a prominent part of his character, will be asserted by no one who has studied the *whole* of his life. But in respect to this particular edict, was Mosheim ignorant that it was published under the regency of Queen Blanche, when the Prince was not yet fifteen years old?

‡ In 1239, one hundred and eighty heretics were burnt in Champagne, in the same flames, and in the presence of eighteen bishops. ‘It is a holocaust agreeable to God!’ exclaimed a monk who witnessed the execution. . . . Was it to be expected that a woman and a child should rise up against an ecclesiastical practice, which was sanctioned by the concurrent zeal of monks, of prelates, of popes, and of councils?

§ Four of them are cited by Limborch, *Hist. of Inquisit.*, lib. i. cap. 12.

|| He was accused of having favoured and fostered heresies. His edicts *may* have had that tendency; but he was assuredly innocent of the intention.

¶ Giannone (lib. xix., chap. v. sec. iv.) seems to ascribe the *establishment* of the court virtually administered by the Mendicants, to Innocent IV., and with truth, so far as Italy was concerned. Two circumstances (he remarks) were opposed to it. (1.) The judicial rights of the episcopal courts. (2.) The executive rights of the secular magistrates. The

made it most effectually the engine of the Vatican. It is true, that in this court the bishop was nominally appointed as coadjutor to the papal inquisitor; but all substantial judicial authority was placed in the hands of the latter*. The civil magistrate was likewise admitted to a seat among the members of the court; but in reality his power was ministerial only. The whole effective power, both judicial and executive, was vested in the Dominicans and Franciscans. . . . From Italy, the pestilence rapidly spread to the island of Sardinia, to Syria, and to Servia †. On the other hand into Spain, the field of its most destructive ravages, it was introduced so late as the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella—a reign more renowned, more panegyrised, than any other in the history of that country. But from Spain even the despotism of Charles V. was insufficient to communicate it to the rest of his subjects; the natural humanity of the Germans perseveringly repelled that pestilence; and the inhabitants of Naples on one side, and of the Low Countries on the other, resisted and rejected it with equal constancy.

We shall not enter more deeply into the records of the Inquisition, nor particularize the combinations of its machinery, and the exquisite harmony of its movements, because it did not reach that fatal perfection until a time posterior to the conclusion of this History ‡. It is with no trifling satisfaction that we dispense with this labour; for the details of ingenious barbarity, though they may awaken a transient attention, convey little that is instructive to a reasonable mind; and the feelings of horror and indignation which they excite, do they not sometimes miss their true object, and exceed their just limits?—do they not sometimes rise into a detestation too general and too unqualified against the Church which permitted such iniquities?—do they not sometimes close our charities against fellow-Christians and fellow-Catholics, who perhaps abominate, as intensely as we do, the crimes of their ancestors? To expose the deviations from the precepts of the Gospel and the principles of philanthropy, into which the Church of Rome, in different ages, has fallen, is a painful task so commonly obtruded upon the historian, that he may well be spared the gratuitous denunciation of those which do not lie within the boundaries prescribed to his work.

first was obviated by the *nominal* association of bishops in the inquisitorial office. The second, by permitting the magistrate to have his minister in the court, though at the appointment of the grand inquisitor. There was much art in this concession; for thus, while the ecclesiastics really held the whole power, the secular authorities, by being united with them in name, were associated in hatred. They were tools,—they were mistaken for accomplices.

* We learn from Bzovius at a later period, (ann. 1302, sect. x.) that Boniface VIII. transferred the inquisitorial office from the Franciscans to the Dominicans, publishing at the same time some severe constitutions against heretics. There is one feature in them which we have not remarked in the earliest edicts. Not only were their defensors, receptatores, &c., included in the penalties, but also their *fili et nepotes*—children and grandchildren. The bishop of the diocese was *permitted* to act in concert with the inquisitors; and the investigation was ordered to proceed ‘*simpliciter et de plano, absque advocatorum et judiciorum strepitu et figura!*’ The accusers were allowed to give evidence secretly, if there should seem to be any danger to them from the publication of their names.

† Limborch, lib. i., cap. xvi. The ‘*Liber Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tholosanæ*,’ published at the end of his work, is of great value, not only as it faithfully represents the spirit of the ruling party in the Church at that time, (there were no doubt many *individuals* of greater moderation and humanity), but also as the best storehouse of the opinions with which the heretics were charged, and for which they suffered.

‡ It was indeed introduced into Spain under Pope Sixtus IV., before the close of the fifteenth century; but its first efforts, which were directed against the Jews, were merely characterized by savage barbarity.

SECTION III.

On the Gallican Liberties.

A difference which took place between St. Louis and his clergy, in the year 1263, throws some light both on his own character, and on the ecclesiastical history of the age. The bishops were desirous to make to the king a remonstrance from their whole body; and when they were admitted into his presence, the bishop of Auxerre spoke in their name as follows:—‘Sire, all these prelates here assembled desire me to say, that you are permitting the Christian religion to fall to ruins, and to crumble in your hands.’ On which the good king* made the sign of the Cross, and said, ‘Now tell me, bishop, how that is, and for what reason?’ ‘Sire,’ continued the bishop, ‘the evil is, that no regard is any longer paid to excommunication. In these days, a man would rather die under the sentence, than obtain absolution by making the necessary satisfaction to the Church. Wherefore, Sire, all these here present request, with one voice, that, for the honour of God, and in the discharge of your own duty †, it may please you to command all your bailiffs, provosts, and other administrators of justice, as follows:—that, if any one be found in your kingdom who shall have lain under a sentence of excommunication for a year and a day continuous, he be compelled, by seizure of his goods, to reconcile himself to the Church.’ The holy man (le saint homme) answered, that he would issue such order in respect to those who should be *proved* guilty of injustice either to the Church, or to their neighbour. The bishop pressed, in reply, the exclusive privileges of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but the king firmly refused the secular aid, unless the nature of the offence, and the justice of the censure, should be such as required its interference. This was the endeavour of a wise prince to distinguish the boundaries of ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction, and to restrain the former within its just limits; and it shows at least, that, on matters which were still left open to the exercise of reason, Louis, how much soever he might love the religion, was not at all disposed to be overreached or overawed by its ministers.

We may relate another anecdote of the same monarch, which will suggest one or two instructive reflections to the intelligent reader. St. Louis had promised to be present at a chapter-general of the Cistercian order, to be held in the year 1244 with unusual solemnity. Innocent IV. received information of his intention; and as the contest with Frederic involved him at that moment in some difficulties, he took measures to profit by the pious disposition of the king of France. The monarch arrived, attended by his mother, his brothers, and some nobles; and all the abbots and the monks of the community, consisting of five hundred, went forth in procession to meet and welcome the royal visitor. Immediately, while he was seated in the chapter, surrounded by his court, the abbots and the monks fell on their knees before him, with their hands in the attitude of

* Joinville, who tells the story, was present. Prem. Partie Vie de St. Louis, p. 24.

† ‘Pour Dieu, et pour ce qu’ainsi le devez faire.’ We should observe that the demand on the part of the prelates was not new, and that it had even been granted by the predecessor of Louis. The first canon of the Council of Narbonne, held in 1227, mentions, as the law then in force, that whoever remained under the sentence, after three admonitions, should pay a fine of nine livres and a denier; but that whoever remained so for a whole year, should suffer the confiscation of all his property. Fleury, liv, lxxix. sec. xxxii.

prayer, and their eyes suffused with tears—for such had been the instructions of Innocent. Their prayer was this:—‘That, according to the ancient custom and liberty of France, he would protect their father and pastor, the holy pontiff, against the insults of the emperor; that he would receive him, if necessary, into the bosom of his kingdom, as Alexander had formerly been received, while flying before the Emperor Frederic, and Thomas of Canterbury, in his persecution by Henry of England.’ . . . St. Louis descended from his seat, and placed himself in like manner upon his knees before the holy suppliants. But his reply was dictated by the calmest prudence and policy—that he would defend the Church, as his honour required, from the insults of the emperor; and no less willingly would he receive the exiled Pope into his kingdom, if his barons should so counsel him; but that a king of France could on no occasion dispense with the counsels of his nobles*.’ . . . It was no secret from the king, nor, perhaps, even from his monastic petitioners, that the barons of France would never consent to open their rich domains, as a refuge for the rapacious court of Innocent IV.

If St. Louis, on the one hand, protected the liberties of his lay-subjects from the usurpations of the clergy, he was no less vigilant, on the other, in shielding all parties from the increasing exactions of Rome. Even from very early ages the Church of France had exhibited on some important occasions marks both of independence and good sense, above the level of other nations. The oriental absurdity of the Stylites was rejected by that more rational people. The rising authority of St. Leo was unable to silence the refractory bishops of France. The use of images was for some time discountenanced in that country. The Augustinian doctrine of predestination found, perhaps, its warmest adversaries among the divines of France. But most especially in the contest of Hincmar with Pope Nicholas, and some other occurrences of the ninth century, do we detect the spirit of a clergy not prepared to pay implicit obedience to the *foreign* autocrat of the Church. Nevertheless, no formal declaration of resistance—no national attempt to emancipate the Gallican Church from any of its fetters, or give it security by a separate constitution against further aggressions—had hitherto been made by any king of France.

It was the last among the legislative acts of St. Louis to publish those institutions which formed the basis of the boasted ‘Liberties of the Gallican Church.’ Just before his departure for Tunis, he issued his Pragmatic Sanction. It was founded on the necessity of distinguishing temporal from spiritual authority, and became, in after times, the foundation of a more extensive emancipation. Like those, however, which were built upon it, it was peculiarly directed against the pecuniary usurpations of Rome, and her claims to the patronage of the Church. The latter subject had indeed occasioned the earliest contentions between the empire and the Vatican, at a time when the rights of the dispute were on the side of the latter. But since the days of Innocent II., the usurpations, whether in the imposition of taxes, or the distribution of benefices, had proceeded from the court of Rome; and Louis IX. having acquired by his personal character, as well as his wise ‘Establishments †,’ the affection and fidelity of his subjects, felt strong enough to repress them.

* See Matthew Paris, ad ann. 1244. We must not confound this affair with a conference which did actually take place two years afterwards between the king and the Pope within the walls of Cluni. See Pagi, Vit. Innoc. IV., sec. xxxiii.

† The ‘Establishments of St. Louis’ belong, for the most part, to civil history. It is

Accordingly, in the year 1269, that he might ensure the tranquillity of his Church and kingdom during his absence, and also secure for his enterprize the protection of God, he promulgated his celebrated Ordinance. It is comprised in six articles. (1.) The churches, the prelates, the patrons, and the ordinary collators of benefices, shall enjoy their rights to their full extent, and each shall be sustained in his jurisdiction. (2.) The cathedral and other churches shall possess the liberties of elections, which shall be carried into complete effect. (3.) We will, that simony, the pest of the Church, be wholly banished from our kingdom. (4.) Promotions, collations, provisions and dispositions of prelatures, dignities, and other ecclesiastical benefices and offices, whatsoever they may be, shall be made according to the institutions of common law, of the councils, and of our ancient Fathers. (5.) We renew and approve of the liberties, franchises, prerogatives, and privileges, granted by the kings our predecessors, and by ourselves, to churches, monasteries, and other places of piety, as well as to ecclesiastical persons. (6.) We prohibit any one from, in any manner, levying and collecting the pecuniary exactions and heavy charges which the Court of Rome has imposed, or may hereafter impose, upon the Church of our kingdom, and by which it has been miserably impoverished—unless it be for a reasonable and very urgent cause, or by inevitable necessity, and with the free and express consent of the king and of the Church*.

Six years earlier, when the archbishop of Tyre arrived in France, as the legate of the Holy See, to impose a contribution on the clergy for the cost of a holy † war, an assembly of bishops referred his Bull to the king, and ordained that, if any chose to accede to the claim, they would do so by their own free will, not through any legal compulsion from Rome. . . . It is obvious, from these occasional ebullitions, to observe, that the sordid policy of Innocent IV. was already producing its effect, in disposing the secular clergy to resist the despotism of Rome. Fifty years had not yet elapsed from the death of that pontiff, when we find the preclacy of France placed in direct opposition ‡ to the Vatican, and a politic prince availing himself of that spirit to the disadvantage of the Holy See. As long as the

only necessary to observe, that though many particular enactments were severe, and even barbarous, according to the estimation of a civilized age, they were founded upon principles of policy, and even humanity, far above those of the times in which they were promulgated. *Le Roi* (says Millot) *devint législateur: l'anarchie féodale devoit finir.* Another half century, and it did so.

* ‘Item exactiones et onera gravissima pecuniarum per Curiam Romanam Ecclesiæ regni nostri impositas vel imposita, quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter depauperatum extitit, sive etiam imponendas vel imponenda, levare aut colligi nullatenus volumus, nisi duntaxat pro rationabili, pia et urgentissima causa, vel inevitabili necessitate, ac de spontaneo ac expresso consensu nostro et ipsius Ecclesiæ regni nostri.’ . . . There are some copies in which the last article does not appear. But there is more reason for the opinion, that it was curtailed in those, than interpolated in the rest. Though the other articles do not make express mention of the court of Rome, yet it seems clear that the second, third, fourth, and a part of the first, are levelled against it. See Fleury, liv. lxxxvi. sec. i. Dupin. *Nouv. Biblioth.*, sec. xiii. chap. vii. The act was cited, as here given, by the Parliament to Louis XI., in 1483, and in the Act of Appeal of the University of Paris, in 1495.

† The Declaration of the bishops is given by Menard in his notes on Joinville, p. 287.

‡ The same spirit, of course, extended itself to the lower clergy. It was during this reign that a Curé at Paris thus addressed his congregation.—‘You know, my brethren, that I am ordered to publish an excommunication against Frederic (II). I am ignorant of the motive. I am only certain that there has been a quarrel between that prince and the Pope—God alone knows which is right. I excommunicate him who has injured the other, and absolve him who has suffered the injury.’ The congregation were amused with the sally. The emperor is said to have sent a present to the preacher; but the Pope condemned him to canonical penance; and he performed it accordingly.

Popes were contented to make common cause with their clergy against the secular authorities, they were indeed strong and formidable. But when they openly distinguished between the interests of the court of Rome and of the rest of the hierarchy—when they proceeded to supply the luxuries, or forward the ambitious projects of the one by invading the revenues of the other—from that moment the despotism of the apostolical Chair, notwithstanding the swarm of Mendicants which it created for its defence, had parted with its only ground or hope of permanence.

SECTION IV.

On the Crusades.

‘The report of the Council of Clermont wafted a cheering gale over the minds of Christians. There was no nation so remote, no people so retired, as did not respond to the papal wishes. This ardent wish not only inspired the continental provinces, but the most distant islands and savage countries*.’ Accordingly a mighty mass of fanaticism put itself in motion towards the East. The frame of society was convulsed, and seemingly dissolved; and as the will of Heaven is not uncommonly pleaded to justify the extravagance of man, the phenomena of the physical world were pressed into the same adventure: meteors and exhalations pointed out the road to Jerusalem, and the most ordinary signs of nature became portents and prodigies. The first burst of the storm fell upon some miserable Jews, who were living in peace under Christian protection, and many were massacred. It then rolled onwards; and the follies, the sufferings, and the crimes, which marked the progress of the first crusade, have not ever been equalled in the history of human madness. Nevertheless, as a military enterprize, it was successful. Some exploits were performed of extraordinary daring. The same agency which had lighted the flame was at hand to nourish it on every occasion of disaster; and the spirit that was chilled by famine or by fear, was immediately revived and inflamed by some new and stupendous miracle. Men who could be brought really to believe, while under the endurance of the most frightful reverses, that the favour of God was especially extended and continually manifested to them, were capable of more than human exertion; the entire abandonment of reason left space for the operation of energies which do not properly belong to man.

The victory of Doryleum was followed by the siege of Antioch; the capture of that city led the way to the investment of Jerusalem itself; and the banner of the cross was finally planted on Mount Sion amidst horrors, which probably had not been paralleled since the triumph of Titus over the same devoted city. Respecting the double massacre inflicted upon the infidels, we shall merely remark, that it had not the excuse of hasty uncontrollable passion, but that it was designed and deliberate. A deeply settled resolution of revenge may have had some share in the deed, but the policy of extermination had probably more; and the spirit of religious persecution certainly directed the weapons and poisoned the wounds. In the mean time, *Deus el volt*—it is the will of God—was the watchword and the battle-shout of the Christians; it overpowered the prayers of the

* Malmsbury, p. 416. He continues: ‘The Welshman left his hunting; the Scotch his fellowship with vermin; the Dane his drinking party; the Norwegian his raw fish.’

women and the screams of their dying children * ; and was then loudest upon Sion and Calvary when the commandments of God and Christ were most insultingly violated.

The loss of the Crusaders, in this first enterprize, is calculated with probability at about 1,200,000 lives ; but the Holy Sepulchre was freed from the pollution of the infidel ; and, what perhaps was of more consequence, as respects the continuance of similar expeditions, a Latin kingdom was established in Jerusalem. It is remarkable, that not one of the sovereigns of Europe adventured his person, or even deeply risked his reputation, in the unknown perils of the first crusade. But, nearly fifty years afterwards, the loss of Edessa, and some other reverses in the East, awakened the sympathy of Louis VII. of France and Conrad III. of Germany, and they determined to aid an afflicted Christian and a brother king. For this purpose it was necessary to rouse the fury of Europe a second time ; and the eager co-operation of St. Bernard secured success. A less powerful instrument might have answered the object. Any intemperate enthusiast † can excite his fellow-mortals to deeds of wickedness ; the genius of St. Bernard was given him to do good to mankind—but it was contracted by the severity of monastic discipline ; it was stained with the prejudices of an ignorant age ; it was distorted by the very austerity of his virtues ; it was misdirected even by his piety. He entered with ardour upon his mission of evil. He traversed fruitful provinces and populous cities. Vast multitudes everywhere assembled to applaud and to listen ; and the energy of his delivery and the vehemence of his tones and action, roused the feelings of many, who were even ignorant of the language in which he addressed them ‡. Such excitement, in a matter where passion and not reason was engaged, produced every effect of persuasion ; and if, besides, there were any so torpid, as to resist the natural eloquence of the holy man, he enjoyed that other resource, so potent in its influence where all the ordinary operations of the mind are suspended,—he possessed the gift of miracles, and proved his heavenly mission (so his credulous panegyrists assert) by many preternatural signs. At the same time he affected, by a more dangerous assumption, the prophetic character ; and, on the faith of Him, who can neither err nor deceive, he foretold and promised a splendid career of triumphs. Armed with so full and various a quiver against the feeble reason of a superstitious generation—with high personal celebrity and eloquence ; with the support of powerful princes ; with pontifical approbation ; with the repute of supernatural aid, and pretensions to heavenly inspiration—what wonder was it that St. Bernard confounded the sense and broke up the repose of Europe ; that he depopulated cities

* Christiani sic neci totum laxaverant animum, ut nec sugens masculus, aut fœmina, nedum infans unius anni vivens manum percussoris evaderet.—Albert, p. 283, cited by Mills, Hist. Crusades, chap. vi.

† It is amusing to observe the contempt with which the Abbot of Clairvaux speaks of the hermit-preacher of the first crusade : ‘ Fuit in priori expeditione, antequam Hierosolyma caperetur, vir quidam, Petrus nomine, cuius et vos (ni fallor) sæpe mentionem audistis,’ &c.—Bernard. Epist. 363, p. 328, vol. i. ed. Mabil. The reference is made by Mills, Hist. Crusades, chap. ix.

‡ Latin was the language which he indiscriminately addressed to the vulgar in all the provinces in which he preached. Since preternatural powers have been ascribed to him, it has been thought remarkable that the gift, of which he seemed to stand most in need, was perversely withheld.

and provinces (such was his own rash boast), and sent forth the whole flower and vigour of Christendom on the holy enterprize!

The history of religious war has not recorded any expedition at the same time more fatal and more fruitless, than the crusade of St. Bernard. After two or three years of suffering and disaster almost uninterrupted, a miserable remnant of survivors returned to relate their misfortunes and marvel at their discomfiture. A general outcry was raised against the author of those calamities; innumerable widows and orphans demanded of the prophet their husbands and their sires; or at least they claimed the sacred laurels which he had promised—the triumphs which he had vouchsafed, in his dispensation of the boons of heaven, to the soldiers of the cross. The detected impostor was not ashamed to take shelter under the usual pretext of religious hypocrites. He asserted that his prophecies (the prophecies of God) were only conditional; that in foretelling the success of the crusaders, he had *assumed* their righteousness and the purity of their lives; that their own enormous crimes had diverted or suspended the designs of Providence, just as in ancient days the sins of the Jews in the wilderness had foiled the policy and foresight of Moses*. If at any time we can regard with levity any pious artifice of the meanest ecclesiastic for the most innocent purpose, still our smile is not unmixed with melancholy or contempt. But the crime of St. Bernard, the most enlightened prelate of his time, who usurped the attributes and forged the seal of God, in order to launch some hundreds of thousands of confident Christians into probable destruction, or at best into successful massacre, excites a serious indignation, which it would be partial to suppress, and which neither his talents, nor his virtues, nor his piety, nor the vicious principles of his age, are sufficient to remove.

Forty years after the departure of this expedition, in the year 1187, Saladin gained the battle of Tiberias, and soon afterwards recovered from the Christians the possession of the Holy City. The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem had struggled through eighty-eight years of precarious existence against internal dissension and tumult, and the perpetual aggressions of the infidel. Perhaps it must have yielded under any circumstances to the genius of Saladin; but its fate was precipitated by the feudal divisions of its defenders, the jealousy subsisting between the Knights of the Temple and those of the Hospital, and the violent quarrels in which the latter were engaged, through the effect of their papal immunities, with the avaricious hierarchy of Palestine †.

The Third crusade (1189—92) was distinguished by the adventures of the lion-hearted Richard. The Fourth followed only three years after-

* This celebrated passage is in the beginning of the second book of his Treatise, 'De Consideratione,' addressed to Pope Eugenius III., and should be cited:—'Moyse educturus populum de terra Ægypti meliorem illis pollicitus est terram. Nam quando ipsam aliter sequeretur populus, solam sapiens terram ejus. Eduxit; eductos tamen in terram quam promiserat non introduxit. Nec est quod ducis temeritati imputari queat tristis et inopinatus eventus. Omnia faciebat Domino imperante, Domino cooperante, et opus confirmante sequentibus signis. Sed populus ille, inquis, duræ cervicis fuit, semper contentiosè agens contra Dominum et contra Moysem servum ejus. Bene illi creduli et rebelles—Hi autem quid? Ipsos interroga. Quid me dicere opus est quod fatentur ipsi? Dico ergo unum—Quid poterant conficere, qui semper revertebantur, cum ambularent? Quando et isti per totam viam non redierunt corde in Ægyptum? Quod si illi ceciderunt et perierunt propter iniquitatem suam, miramur istos, eadem facientes, eadem passos! Sed numquid illorum castus adversus promissa Dei? Ergo, nec istorum. Neque enim aliquando promissiones Dei justitiæ Dei præjudicant.'

† This subject will be again mentioned in the twenty-sixth chapter.

wards, under the auspices of Pope Celestine III., and terminated in inglorious failure. The Germans, of whom it chiefly consisted, accused the faint co-operation of the barons resident in the Holy Land. The Fifth and Sixth were created, or at least protected and fostered, by Innocent III. The former of these may possibly be ascribed to the still surviving spirit of popular superstition, lashed into fanaticism by the preaching, or at least by the miraculous pretensions, of an enthusiast named Fulk. But whatever may have been its origin, its termination—the capture of Constantinople—was certainly neither foreseen nor designed by its advocates. The warriors of the sixth crusade likewise declined from the original object of these military pilgrimages, and deviated, with greater promise of profit if not of glory, into the wealthy plains of Egypt. Their courage was repaid by the conquest of Damietta; but the advantage thus obtained was neither great nor permanent. The force of the Christians in the East was weakened by division, and they were contented to despoil what they could not hope to possess. Still, if we are to assign to this expedition the concluding exertions of Frederic II., it terminated with more honour to the Christian name, and with a nearer approach to the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre, than any which had been undertaken since the first. And that its results were not more lasting, is to be ascribed, not to the insincerity of the emperor, but to the narrow jealousy of a passionate pope *, who roused all his military and monastic myrmidons in opposition to that very cause which he, as well as his faithless predecessor, had dared to designate the cause of God.

The chivalrous enterprize of the Count of Champagne, and Richard Earl of Cornwall, followed the council of Spoleto, in 1234; and the imperfect success, which attended *Those of St. Louis*. it, was rather occasioned by the dissensions of the Mussulman princes, than by the cordial co-operation of the Christians. It added one to the list of the crusades; and was presently succeeded by two others, the Eighth and Ninth, with which the melancholy catalogue at length concluded. Both of these may probably be attributed to the religious fervour of St. Louis. In the access of a dangerous sickness, in the year 1244, that prince vowed the sacrifice of his personal service to God, should his health providentially be restored. It was so. In the following year, the numerous host of prelates, assembled at the council of Lyons, proclaimed the crusade, and enjoined four preparatory years of peace and seriousness throughout the western nations. During this interval large contributions were levied both on the clergy and laity, and other effectual means adopted to secure success; and at its expiration, the pious monarch spread his sails for the East. His immediate object, however, was not the liberation of the Sepulchre, but the conquest of Egypt; and in the conduct of this campaign he closely imitated both the gallantry and the errors of his predecessors, who had triumphed and perished in the same field. The misfortunes of the sixth crusade, though still fresh in the memory of mankind, taught as usual no lesson and conveyed no warning to the generation which followed; and the repetition of similar blunders only led to a more disastrous result. The army

* Gregory IX. Innocent III. died before the departure of the expedition, which he had been particularly and personally diligent in promoting. See the preceding chapter. Not professing to give a regular history of these various expeditions, nor to mention more facts than are necessary for our inferences, we have not noticed the celebrated Crusade of Children under this pope; yet it may fairly be considered as the consummation of the work of fanaticism.

was defeated, and Louis himself fell a captive into the power of the infidel. But his follies were redeemed by the gold of his subjects; and he returned to expiate his fatal enthusiasm by the exercise of peaceful virtues, and to repair, by useful and humane institutions, the wrongs which he had done to his people.

But the spark of superstition was neither extinguished by the discharge of his best duties, nor chilled by the advance of age. After an interval of twenty years of wisdom, he relapsed into the old infatuation, and unfurled, for the last time, the consecrated banner of fanaticism. His second expedition consisted, for the most part, as the first had done, of French and English; and, like the first, it was again directed against the Moslems of Africa, not against the usurpers of the Holy Land. The heroic plains of Carthage were occupied by the Christian force; and the tombs of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustin may perhaps have been rescued from the pollutions of the unbeliever; but the army was still encamped, without any decisive success, before the walls of Tunis, when St. Louis was called away for ever from the sanguinary scene.

His death was immediately followed by the romantic adventures of the English Edward, which closed the long succession of fruitless efforts for a worthless object. The power of the Infidel presently increased in might and boldness; and, in the year 1291, the last fragments of Christian rule were swept away from the surface of Palestine. . . Acre, the conquest of the English hero, was the last possession of the Cross: it had long been the only strong bulwark against the Moslem force. It was important, through its situation at the end of that large and fertile plain which extends to the Jordan eastward, and which has been the field of decisive conflicts in every age of the history of Palestine; it was important, as the centre of commercial intercourse between the east and the west, the resort of all nations and all languages. But the universal profligacy which prevailed within its walls, and the crimes with which it was stained, beyond the shame of any other Christian city, were thought to justify the judgment of God, when at length he delivered it over to a Mahometan conqueror*.

To this hasty, but necessary outline of the history of the Crusades, we are called upon to subjoin some general observations on their causes, their objects, and their results: not aspiring to emulate the eloquence with which this subject has been so commonly treated, nor affecting to add anything original in thought or expression to the successful labours of our predecessors; but simply to justify the pretensions of this work, which would vainly assume the title of an Ecclesiastical History, if it should pass in entire silence over the most amazing phenomena, which ever proceeded from the abuse of religion. And if, indeed, it be a true reflection, that the only enterprize, in which the nations of Europe have at any time engaged with a single arm and a common soul,—and that, too, no vague and transient adventure, but the passion or policy of two hundred years,—stands singularly marked in the historic temple, as a monument of human absurdity: if this be true, is it possible to search too frequently for the sources of such unanimous infatuation, or to ascertain too minutely what passions or what prejudices, or what interests those were, which availed to

* E questo pericolo non fù senza grande e giusto giudizio di Dio, che quella città era piena di più peccatori uomini e femine d'ogni dissoluto peccato, che terra chi fosse tra' Christiani. Giovanni Villani, lib. vii., c. 144, as cited by Mills, *Hist. Crusades*.

dispossess and enchain for so long a period the reason of mankind? Moreover, as we have found occasion to observe, that an indulgent Providence will sometimes extract blessings from man's blindest follies, it becomes us also to inquire, whether the fruits of those wild enterprizes were any other than shame, degradation, and misery. Though, indeed, in this case, it might seem presumptuous to look for any manifestation of divine compassion, where impiety called itself religious devotion, and massacre pleaded for reward, and pleaded in the blessed name of Christ.

To visit the spots which have been consecrated by immortal deeds,—to tread in the footsteps which those have traced whose memory we love and revere,—is the suggestion of natural *Pilgrimage*. piety, not the maxim or observance of religion. Nevertheless, such practice is easily associated with any religion, whenever the qualities of its founder have been such as to excite the enthusiasm of its votaries; and thus the performance of holy pilgrimage became an early, a frequent, and almost a peculiar usage of the Christians. From an innocent, perhaps useful custom, it was gradually exalted into a spiritual duty; and the journey to the sepulchre of the Saviour was encouraged and enjoined by some of the oldest Fathers of the established Church. The pure principle of pilgrimage was presently mixed and alloyed by vulgar motives: a faint shade of superstition was insensibly heightened into a darker; and the traveller returned from the holy places, no longer satisfied with the consciousness of pious intent and sincere devotion, but also charged with relics of departed saints, or fragments of the holy crown or cross. . . This degenerate passion was nourished by the rulers of the church; multitudes thirsted for those vain possessions, whom a mere ardour to worship at the tomb of Christ would scarcely have fortified against the toils of the journey; the Syrian dispensers of the profitable patrimony unceasingly discovered new treasures by revelation, or multiplied the original by miracles; so that the crowds who thronged the sanctuary perpetually increased, and the sources which fed their credulity were never closed nor lessened.

It was natural to expect that the conquest of Palestine by the unbelieving Saracens would have abolished the means, if it did not desecrate the objects, of pilgrimage. But it proved otherwise. The enlightened Caliphs immediately perceived the policy of toleration; they saw the direct advantages which flowed into Syria through the superstition and commerce of the West; they may even have learned from their own practice to respect the motives of the travellers, and the kindred passion which occasioned an annual visit to the Christian Mecca. Certainly they received the visitors without insult, and dismissed them without injury.

During the concluding portion of the tenth century, a strange impulse was given to the spirit of pilgrimage by an accidental cause, which, as it was sown in delusion, produced the customary harvest of wickedness. The belief prevailed of the approaching dissolution of the world and the termination of earthly things; Mount Sion was to become the judgment-seat of the Most High; and the Christian nations were taught to depart and humble themselves before his throne. Those interested exhortations were too obsequiously obeyed; and though the notion which created them was after a few years falsified and exploded, yet the habit of journeying to the Holy Land had in the meantime gained great prevalence, and the idea of an expiatory obligation became commonly attached to it. In the century following, the journey assumed not unfrequently the form of an expedition, and was sometimes undertaken by considerable bodies of associated

and even armed devotees. We still peruse, in the narrative of Ingulphus, a native and historian of England, the adventures of seven thousand holy Germans, who engaged in the enterprize under the direction of the archbishop of Mayence, and in the society of thirty Norman horsemen. They encountered many dangers and suffered many losses; but they attained their object, and worshipped at the fountain of their religion. And when they recounted, in domestic security, their various fortunes, their listeners were more likely to be inflamed by the admiration of their success, than deterred by sufferings or perils, which greater foresight or felicity might easily ward off from themselves.

Towards the close of the eleventh age, about the year 1076, the dominion of Palestine was torn from the Arabian dynasty by the wilder hand of the Turks. The pure fanaticism of that rude people was not yet softened by friendly intercourse with the followers of the adverse faith, nor would it stoop to yield even to the obvious dictates of interest. Many outrages were at this time unquestionably perpetrated upon the strangers who visited the sepulchre, and upon the Christian natives and sojourners in Syria. Those who returned from the East were clamorous in their descriptions and their complaints; and tales of suffering and of sacrilege, of the prostration of Christ's followers, the profanation of his name, the pollution of his holy places, tales of Moslem oppression and impiety, were diffused and exaggerated and believed, with fierce and revengeful indignation, from one end of Europe to the other.

Whatsoever may have been the merits of the feudal principles in earlier times, they had degenerated, in the eleventh century, into a mere code of military service and subordination. The whole business, the pleasure, the passion of that age was war. It animated alike the cities and the villages; it presided over the domestic regulations of every family; it was familiar with the thoughts, where it did not constitute the habits, of every individual. Even the higher orders of the clergy forgot their spiritual in their secular obligations, and very commonly engaged in the same pursuits from a common necessity*. It was in vain that Charlemagne had restrained by his Capitularies that preposterous practice. The policy of Charlemagne was too wise for the times in which he lived: he attempted to anticipate the operation of progressive ages; he enacted some useful laws; but he was unable to perpetuate a premature, and therefore transient, civilization. No sooner was he removed by death than inveterate barbarism resumed its sway, and the bulwark which his single hand had raised against the principles, customs, and prejudices of ancestral ignorance, was hastily swept away. During the two centuries which followed, in spite of the general exertions of the clergy, as a body, to arrest the desolating spirit, in spite of canonical legislation and ecclesiastical censure, the practice of private warfare continued with no mitigation. Early in the eleventh age, the *Treuga Dei* (the Truce of God) was solemnly enjoined, with the purpose of enforcing a suspension of hostilities during certain days in every week. But though this humane ordinance was frequently confirmed and reiterated, there was no age in which the military frenzy had such general prevalence throughout Europe, none in which

* *Olim* (says Guido, abbot of Clairville) *non habebant castella et arces ecclesiæ cathedrales, nec incedebant pontifices loricati. Sed nunc, propter abundantiam temporalium rerum, flamma, ferro, cæde possessiones ecclesiarum prælati defendunt, quas deberent pauperibus erogare.* Du Cange, *Gloss. Lat., art. Advocatus.* The abbot's *olim* extended through the first five centuries, and not much later.

the exercise of arms and the effusion of blood were so completely the habit, the motive, almost the morality, of the western nations.

At a period when religious notions or observances were mingled with all customs and all institutions, and thus interwoven with the whole texture of private as well as public life,—and when, besides, the corruptions of Christianity had so superseded its genuine spirit, that the notions which we have called religious should rather have been designated superstitious,—the ruling passion of the age was easily associated with its ruling weakness. Martial enterprise went hand in hand with enthusiasm, misnamed pious; the exploits of the one were consecrated by the expressions, sometimes by the feelings, of the other; and the words of the priest were repeated, or the image of the Saviour embraced, even in the fiercest moments of the strife. Abject ignorance, followed by credulity, held dominion almost undisputed; and the minds of men were destitute of any moral principles to restrain, or any moral knowledge to direct, the course of their passions. The faculties which distinguish sense from absurdity, piety from fanaticism, truth from falsehood and imposture, were extinct or dormant; and a restless and irrational generation lay exposed to the impulse of any rising tempest.

On such an age and race,—so inured to the use of arms, so alive to the emotions of religion, so familiar with the practice of holy pilgrimage,—the indignity of Turkish oppression, the outrages on the name and sepulchre of Christ, fell with an electric efficacy. At another time, under other circumstances, the bolt might have passed by unfelt and almost unheeded; but at that moment it was no premature nor unseasonable visitation, but it found men prepared, and intensely sensible to its operation; and the flash which attended it descended on materials prepared for explosion.

It argues a superficial knowledge both of nature and of history to suppose that a phenomenon, so astounding as the first crusade, could have been produced in any condition of society without strong predetermining causes; and that the preaching of the Hermit or even the indulgences of the Pope could have excited to that enterprise minds, that were not deeply disposed to receive the impulse. There are some, indeed, who consider the increase of pontifical power during the eleventh age, under the auspices of Hildebrand, to have been a leading cause in producing the Crusades. It is true that, a century earlier, the aspirations of Sylvester II. were without effect: it is more remarkable that even Gregory himself, though professing an ardent and even personal eagerness for the enterprise, carried his project to no result; while Urban, with much less individual influence, accomplished the work with great facility. But in the time of Sylvester, some of the popular motives for the crusade did not yet exist, others had not attained sufficient prevalence and maturity; and Gregory was diverted from his scheme by the more pressing solicitations of domestic ambition. But when Urban threw the torch among the multitudes of Placentia and Clermont, their hands were prepared and eager to seize it, and extinguish it in Moslem blood. A pilgrimage to the sepulchre of Christ was then a common and almost customary act of devotion; a pilgrimage in arms was congenial with the spirit of a warlike race; to liberate the holy places and to chastise the usurpers were objects consistent with each other, and with the ruling principles of the age.

And such were the *objects* of the first crusade—to deliver the Holy Land from a state of imaginary pollution, and to take vengeance on the infidel possessor. No consideration of distant consequences, nor even of

immediate utility, entered into them. Reason was not consulted, nor were her precincts approached: of the passions themselves, those most akin to reason had no share in the *Objects of the first Crusade.* adventure. Ambition was silent in the uproar*. Policy might, indeed, have offered plausible justification, by suggesting that the hurricane which had wasted Asia might presently break over Europe; but the *argumenta justi metus*, if they have satisfied some writers on this subject, entered not in any degree into the motives of the Crusaders. They were not men to calculate remote dangers; still less did they perplex themselves with any theoretical speculation as to the right of hostility, or seek their excuse in the antichristian *principles* of their enemy. From the rule and practice of Mahometan aggression, they might almost have inferred the right of reciprocal invasion; but they looked for immortality, not for justification; it never occurred to them to doubt the justice, or rather the holiness, of their cause; they sought no plea or pretext, except in the passion of their religious frenzy and in the sharpness of their sword.

There was still another motive which might have seemed substantial to the warriors of those days, and which they might equally have borrowed from the Infidel—a design to convert the miscreants by force, and to drag them in chains to the waters of baptism; but even this project held no place among the incentives to the *first* crusade. In later times, indeed, when in the vicissitudes of military adventure the arms of the Mahometan were found to preponderate, some faint attempts were made, or meditated†, to convince those whom it proved impossible to subdue; but the earliest soldiers of the Cross were moved by no such design: they rushed in thoughtless precipitation to an unprofitable end, and they believed that a Power irresistibly impelled them, and that that Power was—the Will of God.

These remarks are properly confined to the origin of the first crusade—to that burst of pure fanaticism which was itself unmingled with worldly incentives, though it opened the field for other enterprises, proceeding from the usual motives of human action. An inattention to this distinction has misled some writers, who, failing to discriminate between the circumstances which produced, and those which nourished, the crusades, have not taken an accurate view of either. A multitude of causes combined to impel the machine when it was once in motion, though the agency which launched it was simple and uniform. In

Of those which followed. the first place, by the success of the first expedition, an important kingdom was established in the East. Immediately measures were taken to provide for its protection, and secure its stability. Natives of most of the western states settled in Palestine. The *Latin* colony adopted the feudal discipline, and the common constitution of Europe. Hence a thousand links were extended of sympathy and of interest; and together they formed an

* The success which had attended the Asiatic, and even Syrian, campaigns of Nicephorus, Phocas, and John Zimisces (963—975) might have offered reasonable hopes to the ambition of the Crusaders, and almost justified the military policy of the expedition—if ambition or policy had ever entered into their consideration.

† In 1285, Honorius IV., in order to convert the Saracens, strove to establish at Paris schools for Arabic and other oriental languages. The Council of Vienna, in 1312, recommended the same method; and Oxford, Salamanca, Bologna, as well as Paris, were places selected for the establishment of the Professorships. But the decree appears to have remained without effect, until Francis I. called it into life.

entirely new ground for exertion, and gave a different character to the movement which agitated the West. Henceforward, reciprocal relations existed; the honour of Christendom was now engaged to maintain its conquests over the unbeliever; it was held base to relinquish a possession, acquired through so many losses, even by those who might not think the losses counterbalanced by the possession. It is one thing to rush into a desperate enterprise, and another to encounter some additional risk in defence of that, which by much previous risk has been achieved.

Not one of the sovereigns of Europe was either personally engaged in the first crusade, or very zealous in promoting it: it proceeded from sources wholly distinct from the policy of courts and the springs of civil government. But the second, and most of the following expeditions, were undertaken, some with the aid and countenance, others under the very authority and direction, of the leading monarchs. It is unnecessary to observe how many different ingredients were thrown into the cup of fanaticism by such co-operation,—obedience to the command, affection for the person, gratitude for the favour, hope from the generosity, of the prince—and, what was scarcely less potent than these, the seal of approbation which stamped the practice, which gave it prevalence and fashion, which placed it among the ordinary means of distinction, among the legitimate duties of military service. . . . Again, the policy, which mixed itself almost necessarily with the royal motives, entirely lost sight in some cases of the original object. The pollution of the holy places was forgotten in the fruitful prospect of the plains of Egypt, or of the commerce which thronged the African ports; in such manner, as to make it very questionable whether plunder, rather than conquest, was not the principal motive of three, at least, among the latest crusades. St. Louis himself was, perhaps, as politic as he was pious; and it is not easy to perceive how the sufferings of the Holy Land could have been much alleviated by any advantages which he might have achieved before the walls of Tunis. At any rate, though the same vows and intentions might still be professed, very different incentives were certainly proposed, and very different methods adopted, to accomplish them.

The principles and motives of the Vatican, which are generally found so consistent, were subject to some fluctuation in the encouragement which it extended to the crusades. The feeling of Sylvester appears to have been the anticipation of that, which animated the first adventurers a century afterwards. Gregory VII. had more specific and tangible objects. His practical mind was not perhaps much moved by the tears of Palestine and the tales of her pollution; but he considered the union of the rival churches, and the general triumph of the Christian over the Moslem cause, as projects not unworthy of the confederacy of the West, and of his own superintendence.

The Popes of the 12th century followed, where they did not direct or inflame, the passion of their age; and the successive armaments of martyrs were launched with the apostolical benediction on their holy destination. But the designs of Innocent III. were of a different and more selfish description; and he did not fear to pervert to their accomplishment the machine entrusted to him for other purposes. The arms which had been consecrated to the service of Christ, against the blasphemers of his name, were now turned against the domestic adversaries of the See of Rome. The views and policy of Innocent were purely ecclesiastical; they did not extend in any direction beyond the interests

of the Church over which he presided; and it was the impulse of the moment to crush the foe in his bosom, before he sought for a remote and defensive enemy.

When the precedent of converting the banner of the Cross into a badge of Papal subservience was once established, the name and object of a holy war passed through different methods of profanation; and the sword of the Crusader, after being steeped in heretical blood, was drawn, in the same hateful service, against a Catholic adversary. The Popes had thus accomplished their final object in substituting the defence of the Church—which really meant the temporal interests of the See of Rome—as a recognized object for arming the subjects of all governments, in the name of Christ; and to this purpose the plenary indulgence, still the great lever of popular fanaticism, was commonly and not vainly applied.

From that time forward it does not appear that the Vatican pursued any fixed policy respecting the expeditions really undertaken for the chastisement of the Infidel. Its general voice was indeed loud in their favour; and bulls and exhortations were perpetually promulgated to quicken or revive the ardour of the Faithful. Notwithstanding, there were particular occasions—such as the attempts of Frederic II. and the Seventh Crusade—on which the pontifical power was employed to thwart, or even to prevent, the enterprise. But the secret of this fluctuation was too often and too openly betrayed. The advantage and aggrandizement of Rome was now become in papal eyes the only legitimate object of the religious spirit; and, according to the more modern and favourite method, she now turned that spirit into the channel of her avarice. The Indulgence, which in the first instance was only granted as the reward of actual service in the holy cause, was, in process of time, publicly exchanged for gold; and the timid or indolent devotee was first permitted, and afterwards encouraged, to redeem by his wealth the toils and dangers of a military penance. Again: Innocent III. had taxed the clergy of Europe for the benefit of the Holy Land; but presently we find complaints, that the tax was become the object, instead of the means, and the crusade only the pretext. And thus the treasury of Rome was filled, amidst the disappointment of all honest enthusiasts and the murmurs of a defrauded priesthood. The memory of Gregory VII., and the fame of his spiritual triumph and lofty ambition, were put to shame by the sordid cupidity of his degenerate successors.

The above observations are sufficient to show how widely both the causes and objects of the Crusades varied during the long period of their continuance, and how far they sometimes deviated from the pure martial fanaticism of their origin. As they were thus mixed up with the ordinary motives of policy, and were degraded to the selfish service of Rome, so the fuel by which they were nourished gradually disappeared, and the flame insensibly burnt out; and in this circumstance we observe the limits to which the influence of the Vatican itself was confined. When popular spirit was kindled by other causes, the Pope was abundantly powerful to fan and excite it; when it had risen to the height of its fury, he had control sufficient to misdirect it; but when it began to sink and die away, his utmost efforts were unable to sustain or revive it. As long as the Vatican was contented to feed and minister to the universal passion, its influence, which was really great, appeared to have no bounds; but when that passion had once subsided, the Pontiff's lost their

Decline of the Crusading Spirit.

hold on human weakness; and neither the increase of exemptions* or indemnities, nor the multiplication of indulgences, availed to inflame the descendants of those spontaneous enthusiasts, who, in obedience to the preaching of the Hermit, had rushed forth to restore the honour of Christ, and avenge the wrongs of his worshippers.

As the causes, from which the crusading frenzy at first broke forth, were of long and regular growth, so likewise was the process of its extinction slow and gradual. Throughout the space of two hundred years, the original flame, though continually sinking, was not wholly lost;—it was still mingled, though in smaller proportions and fainter colours, with the various mass of new motives, which ineffectually endeavoured to supply its place, and which really derived their brightness from it. But when at length the sky cleared, and the last clouds had passed away, what were the traces of evil or of good which were left upon the face of the earth? What permanent effects were engraven upon the destinies of Europe by the violent hand which had so long directed them? From a system of military aggression, which had no foundation in reason, or even in those passions which are nearest to reason, few indeed were the fruits which could be expected for the benefit of society; and if any such did in effect proceed from the crusades, it was through circumstances wholly independent of their design. It appears to us, that these fortuitous advantages were both few in number and extremely partial. Perhaps it would be unreasonable to dispute that the decline of the baronial despotism, with the birth of municipal rights on the one hand, and the just extension of royal authority on the other, was accelerated by the violent alienations of property which the crusades occasioned; but those salutary changes would have been produced, and perhaps at no later period, by the sure agency of wiser principles, advancing with the advancement of knowledge. We may indeed hail the accident which hastened (if it hastened) their appearance; but we should err were we to ascribe to it their existence. The commercial benefits which historians too generally connect with the expeditions to the East were principally confined to three cities of Italy—Venice, Genoa, and Pisa †; and if they were thence partially reflected to some other parts of the Peninsula, that was a poor compensation to the commonwealth of Europe for the violent extortions which exhausted its more powerful members—France, Germany, and England. Their treasures were drained, and the mighty sources of their national industry dried up, that the sails of two or three

*Effects of the
Crusades.*

* The Crusaders, besides their plenary indulgences, had several alluring temporal privileges, which are perhaps correctly reduced under the following heads:—1. They were exempted from prosecution for debt during the time of their service. 2. From paying interest for the money which they had borrowed for the outfit. 3. For a certain time, if not entirely, from the payment of taxes. 4. They might alienate their lands without the consent of the superior lord. 5. Their persons and effects were taken under the protection of St. Peter, and anathemas denounced against all who should molest them. 6. They enjoyed all the privileges of ecclesiastics; such as not being bound to plead in civil courts, &c.—(See Robertson's Proofs and Illustrations.) It remained, of course, very uncertain how far these privileges would be acknowledged by the secular authorities, and to what extent those civil courts would consent to forego their jurisdiction over so large a multitude; and thus the real value of these papal immunities depended on the Pope's influence and various other causes. The serfs who exchanged their agricultural service for that of the Cross appear by that act to have obtained their freedom: at least, that which was conferred by common military service would scarcely be withheld from the crusader.

† The results were probably unfavourable to Hamburgh, Lubeck, and the other towns forming the Hanseatic League, by draining the capital southward. Besides the aristocratic military spirit, which was nourished by the Crusades, is essentially anti-commercial

small republics might overspread the Mediterranean, and receive the first fruits of the contributions so painfully levied for the chastisement of the Infidel.

The loss of Christian life occasioned by the crusades is fairly calculated at more than two millions. But if the mutual animosities of princes, or, what was even more destructive, the rage of private warfare, had been suspended during their continuance, some consolation for the sacrifice would have been offered to humanity by the repose and concord of the survivors. The fact, however, was otherwise: for a very few years after the departure of the first crusaders, the Truce of God was indeed observed; but immediately the tide of feudal barbarism returned into its former channel, and proved that the passion for international or domestic broils was neither consumed in foreign adventure, nor superseded by the thirst for it. It is even probable that the nature of such contests was still further embittered by the introduction of those habits of unrelenting ferocity, which are invariably generated by religious warfare.

It is, again, at least questionable, whether the arts of peace and civilization acknowledge any obligation to the influence of the Crusades. The barbarians gazed in ignorant admiration at the splendid magnificence of Constantinople—'How great is this city! how noble and beautiful! What a multitude of monasteries and palaces it contains of exquisite and wondrous fabric! How many structures are scattered even in the streets and alleys, which are marvellous to behold! It were tedious to recount what an abundance of all good things is found there, of gold and of silver, of every form of vestment, and of *the relics of the saints*.* The records of the time are filled with similar expressions of wild astonishment. But have we any proof that these enthusiasts profited by what they beheld?—that they imitated what they admired?—that they strove to transplant to their own soil that exotic genius and taste of which they felt the excellence? Or were they merely ruffled by a transient inconsequential emotion, unconnected with any principle of action, or intelligence of observation? . . . It is asserted, that if the Greeks were far superior to the western nations in the culture of humanity, the Saracens were scarcely less so; and the strangers had thus a double opportunity of discovering and correcting their deficiencies. But it is forgotten that the soldier of the Cross was no enlightened and leisurely traveller, searching to instruct himself and his generation; but a fierce, unlettered fanatic, proceeding on a purpose of bloodshed. In his prejudiced eyes, the civilization of the Greeks was inseparably associated with luxurious indolence and effeminate timidity; that of the Saracens with an impious faith and blaspheming tongue; and the disdain with which he regarded the one, and the detestation with which he approached the other, repelled him equally from the imitation of either. And if it be true, that, during the long period of two hundred years, some trifling advancement in the arts of civilization did in fact take place, it would still be difficult to specify a single invention as the indisputable effect of the Crusades. Chronological coincidences are sometimes mistaken for moral connexions; and the

* Fulcher. ap. Bongars. vol. i. p. 386. Fulcherius Carnotensis was chaplain to the Count of Chartres. The original passage is cited by Mills, Hist. Crus. chap. iii. It is certain that the collecting of relics was a very favourite occupation with the crusaders, who thus enriched with many remarkable treasures the sanctuaries of the West. But to this pursuit their curious industry seems to have been confined. We do not learn that they brought back any other contributions to the store of European piety, or any to the store of its learning. On the other hand, many monks took up arms, who would have been more innocently and more profitably employed at home.

changes which distinguish any age are thus too commonly ascribed to the passion or principle which may have predominated at the time. But in the present case, when we reflect that during the eleventh century—before the commencement of the crusades—the human mind had already revived and entered upon its certain career of improvement, we may indeed wonder that its progress was so slow, and its exertions so barren, during the two which followed; but it would be preposterous to attribute the few advantages, which may really have been introduced, to a cause which was in itself decidedly hostile to every moral melioration.

For, since knowledge is the only sure instrument for the elevation of man, can we imagine a condition of society more fatal to its progress than that which was regulated by the co-operation of superstitious zeal with military turbulence?—wherein two principles, separately so fruitful of mischief and misery, were leagued together against the virtue and happiness of mankind? What need we to pursue the inevitable consequences? War assumed a more frightful character by the impulse of fanaticism; and the ordinary barbarities of European strife were multiplied in the conflicts of the East. This necessarily grew out of the very nature of the contest. When the authority of Heaven is pleaded for the infliction of punishment, it creates an implacable and remorseless spirit; since it supersedes, by a stern necessity, all ordinary motives, and stifles the natural pleadings of humanity. The crusaders exclaimed, ‘It is the will of God!’ and in that fancied behest the fiercest brutalities, which the world had ever beheld, sought, not palliation, but honour, and the crown of eternal reward.

The spirit of religious persecution appears to have borrowed the peculiar * features, which afterwards distinguished it, from the practice, and even from the principles, of the crusades. To destroy the votaries of a different faith was esteemed an act of religion; and that, too, not so much because they were dangerous, as *because they differed*. The principle, which was originally intended against Mahometans only, took root generally. The rude understandings of a superstitious race were perplexed. One sort of difference might be as offensive to Heaven as another. The word heresy was not less diligently and deeply stigmatized in the tablets of the church, than infidelity. To the Pope, the infallible interpreter of the spiritual oracles, the former was at least as formidable and as hateful as the latter. And thus the weapon which had been applied with so much praise of piety to chastise the one, might be turned, with the same salutary efficacy, to the extirpation of the other. Through such an inference, which then appeared not unreasonable, urged by the authority of a powerful pontiff, the practice of religious massacre was introduced into the church of Christ; and when the ministers of bigotry had once revelled in blood, they were not soon or easily compelled to relinquish the cup. Among the many evil consequences of the crusades, we may account this, perhaps, as the worst,—that they put arms into the hands of intolerance, and finally kindled in the bosom of Europe the same fanatical passions, with which they had desolated the East.

* We more particularly mean the practice of assaulting whole sects and districts of heretics, as such, by authorized military force. The religious wars between the Catholics and the Arians were of a very different character from those between the Church and the Albigois, &c.; and from the Arian Controversy to the time of the Crusades, persecution, in the West, had never the opportunity, whether it had the will or not, of destroying by wholesale. The existence of the heresy of the Vaudois during that period, though not improbable, is not historically certain.

It we are to believe the contemporary historians, the heroes of the cross were remarkable for their contempt of every moral principle; and the cities of Palestine were peculiarly polluted by the prevalence of vice. If those who resorted to the birth-place of their religion were not touched even on that holy spot by its plainest precepts—if the women were involved with the men, the priest with the warrior, in equal and indiscriminate profligacy—there can be no doubt in which direction the moral system of Europe was influenced by the crusades; nor can we suppose that the habits acquired in Syria were forgotten or abjured by the returning pilgrim.

Ecclesiastical writers are equally loud in their complaints, respecting the corruption sustained through the same means by the discipline of the church. The final cessation of canonical penance is ascribed to the introduction of the plenary indulgence. In uncivilized ages, the moderate use of the spiritual authority was unquestionably attended with advantage. The practice of prayer, of fasting, of alms-giving, under the superintendence of a pious confessor, was salutary to the offending individual and useful to society. It taught humiliation to the proud spirit; it taught the exercise of charity; and it may often have produced the genuine fruits of repentance. It is true that, in early times, some discretion had commonly been entrusted to the bishop, to mitigate and even, within certain limits, to commute the ordinary penalties; and it was not later than the eighth century, that even pilgrimages to certain specified places were substituted for the appointed penance. But before the times of the Crusades there was no mention of plenary indulgence. It had not hitherto been held out to the sinner that, by a *single act*, he might be discharged from all the temporal penalties imposed on him by the Divine Justice. This was an innovation exceeding the boldness of all former changes, and suited to the extraordinary occasion which called for it. But it is properly observed, that those who introduced it had forgotten the legitimate object of canonical penance; that it was enjoined to the sinner, not so much for his chastisement, as for the discipline and purification* of his soul. But what, after all, were the religious duties or merits, which took the place of the original system, and through which this full indulgence was acquired? To wear those arms, of which it had been penance indeed to be deprived; to turn them against a foreign, instead of a domestic foe; to engage in a mighty and soul-inspiring enterprise, instead of contesting the boundaries of a manor, or the fosse of a fortress. Such were the previous habits of the crusaders; and a system, which offered pardon on such easy terms, must have acted with many as a positive encouragement to sin.

As the process of canonical penance was commuted for the plenary indulgence, so was the indulgence itself directly and unreservedly † commuted for money. On the consequences of this second corruption we shall not further dwell, than to mention it among the causes which finally operated to quench the crusading ardour. So soon as absolutions were made matters of open traffic, the motive became too manifest; and thus

* Such was the original design of penance; but it is also true, that the idea of expiation, or an atonement for sin by suffering, very soon entered into the consideration, and very commonly took place of the first motive. That idea is at variance with the first principles of Christianity; and so far as it was prevalent, the penitential system was founded on a false principle, and its abolition can be no matter of regret to any true Christian.

† Penances, as we have mentioned, had been previously commuted, and commuted for money too, when they were commuted for alms: only, that which had hitherto been sparingly and decently and indirectly practised, grew into an avowed, authorized, habitual abuse.

at length the preachers of crusades attracted so few listeners, that it became necessary to promise temporary indulgences—of days or even years—to any who would consent to attend their sermons*.

The evil did not expire with its occasion; and after the Crusades were at an end, the popes discovered for it a new, an easier, and perhaps a more profitable object. By the institution of the Jubilee (in the year 1300), the place of pilgrimage was skilfully changed from Jerusalem to Rome; and the Tombs of the Apostles supplied, in the popular infatuation, the Cross and the Sepulchre of the Saviour. A consoling compensation was thus made both to the avarice of the Vatican and the superstition of the people; and the indulgence was not abandoned, nor its venality at all restrained, until the insulted sense and piety of mankind at length revolted against the enormous abuse.

If, then, we are obliged to admit that the effects of the Crusades were generally pernicious; if it is true that they caused an useless waste of human life, that they increased the ferocity of war, that they gave a deadlier form to religious persecution, that they depressed the level of morality, that they introduced into the discipline of the church its mortal corruption,—their good effects will be found insignificant in the comparison, even though we should account among them the aggrandizement of the sacred order; for one of their effects certainly was the immediate increase of the ecclesiastical revenues. The property of the crusaders was commonly placed, during the expedition, under the bishop's protection; and in case of his death, it often fell, without supposing any direct fraud, into the possession of the church. Again,—though there were wanting neither priests nor monks who assumed the cross in person, yet the number of those was by no means proportionate to the wealth and multitude of the holy community; so that they suffered less severely than any other class the immediate evils of the conflict. But the tax which was imposed on them by Innocent did in effect much more than counterbalance those temporary gains; and even in the most sordid calculation of the sacerdotal interests, we may safely pronounce that they did not permanently profit by that commotion, which overthrew for a season the general welfare of society.

NOTE (A) ON PAPAL DECRETALS.

IN the first ages of Christianity the letters written by the leading Fathers of the Church for the regulation of doctrine and discipline were called Decretals (*Epistolæ Decretales*). As the authority of the bishop of Rome gradually rose above that of other bishops and patriarchs, he also claimed an especial deference for his epistles; and in a synod held at Rome, in 494, under Pope Gelasius, the decretals of the Roman prelate were invested with the same authority as the canons of councils.

After the time of Charlemagne, the Popes, as they felt their growing power, proceeded not only to deny the necessity of any confirmation of their decretals, but to distinguish and exalt them, so as to supersede the canons of the church. As they increased in weight, they multiplied in number. Gratian, a native of Chiusi in Tuscany, a monk of St. Felix of Bologna, published his celebrated collection in 1151. Many had been previously put forth, but without obtaining any public authority. But that of Gratian was more favourably received, and was made the subject

* See Fleury's Discourse on the Crusades.

of the public lectures of the canonists. It was entitled the Book of Decretals, or simply *The Decretal*—*Decretum**, and was divided into three parts. The first of these, called *The Distinction*, comprised one hundred and one articles, regarding chiefly the different descriptions of laws, ecclesiastical and civil; the authority of the canons and decretals; the ceremonies of ordination; the duties of the clergy; the power of the pope. The second—*The Causes*—contained thirty-six sections, relating to various matters of church discipline and jurisdiction;—simony, appeals, evidence, elections, censures, testaments, sepultures, usury; of the rights of monks and abbots; of commendams, oaths, war, heresies, sorcery, &c. The third part—*On the Consecration*—treated of the consecration of churches; of the celebration of mass and the divine offices; of the eucharist and other sacraments; of fasts and festivals, and some other subjects. The work abounded in errors, not only as it attributed to the false decretals and other fabrications the authority of genuine compositions, but also as it falsified many of the passages cited from unsuspected monuments. Nevertheless, it was received without hesitation; and, after furnishing alone the materials of canonical learning to the schools of Europe, it became a sort of basis on which new and additional decrees and commentaries were fixed and long supported. Another collection was made by Bernardo Circa, Bishop of Faenza, in the year 1191. This work was intended as a supplement to the Decretals of Gratian, and was therefore called the Book of *Extravagants*, *i. e.* of matters not comprised in the Decretals. But as this was a private compilation, it obtained no force; and accordingly, about the year 1210, Innocent III. caused a more perfect collection to be made, and gave it the seal of public authority. This was called the *Roman Collection*.

As circumstances changed, and edicts increased in multitude, fresh compilations were thought necessary; and Gregory IX.† availed himself of so favourable an occasion for establishing and extending the monarchy of his see. In that, which was published under his auspices, and which affected to be modelled on the code of Justinian‡, such former constitutions, as seemed to him unsuitable to the character of his own times, were fearlessly cut away, and others inserted, on the plenitude of his own authority, which were more congenial to the age and more favourable to pontifical usurpation. As the compilation of Tribonianus had been divided into five books, so was that of Gregory. This work was immediately published throughout all the schools and universities of Europe; and as it was composed with great diligence and enforced by the highest authority, it was very generally and even eagerly received.

To this collection Boniface VIII. added, about the year 1299, an additional book, commonly known as the *Sixth* (*Liber Sextus*), and containing

* The author admitted the object and difficulty of his work, when he called it *Concordia Discordantium Canonum*.

† It is usual to reckon five different compilations of Decretals between Gratian and Gregory IX.—that of the Bishop of Faenza, three during the pontificate of Innocent III., and a fifth containing the Letters of Honorius III.—Dupin, *Bibl. Nouv.*, S. XII. ch. iii. and x. Raimond de Pennafort was the person to whom Gregory committed the labour of his compilation. The effect of these successive collections (as even the moderate Roman Catholic Historians avow) was to complete the overthrow of the ancient law, to establish the absolute and unbounded power of the pope, and to create an infinity of suits and processes, to be decided by the venal justice of the court of Rome. They were extensions of the principles of Gratian, as Gratian had enlarged upon those of the false Decretals, in at least two important points—in exempting the pope from the authority of the canons, and the clergy universally from every sort of lay jurisdiction. See Fleury's Seventh Discourse.

‡ The MS. of the Pandect was discovered among the ruins of Amalfi, in 1137.

all the constitutions posterior to the pontificate of Gregory IX. This too was universally acknowledged, excepting perhaps in France. It was further augmented, in the following age, by the *Clementines**; and they were succeeded by the *Extravagants*—a name adopted, probably, from the work of the Bishop of Faenza. These were the labours of the popes of Avignon; and as the Decretum was intended to correspond with the Pandects, and the Decretals with the Code, so the Extravagants had their model in the Novella of the imperial legislator. Under these heads the different branches of pontifical jurisprudence were, for a long period, comprised †, until they were further augmented by the much more modern addition of the Institutions.

NOTE (B) ON THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS.

The numerous public schools or academies which had previously been formed in various parts of Italy and France, at Salamanca, at Cologne, and elsewhere, assumed the form by which they were afterwards characterised during the thirteenth century. The most celebrated was that of Paris. It was adorned more than any other by the multitude, the rank, and the diligence of its students, and by the abilities and various acquirements of its professors; and since, while other academies confined their instructions to particular branches of science, that of Paris alone pretended to embrace the entire range, it was the first which took the title of University. In its origin ‡, in the century preceding, it had been composed of two classes—of artists, who gave instructions in the arts and philosophy; and of theologians, who delivered expositions and commentaries, some of them on the Holy Scriptures (they were afterwards called *Biblici*); others (denominated *Sententiarum*) on Peter the Lombard's Book of the Sentences. These two appear to have been the earliest *Faculties*; nor is mention made of any others§ in the Constitutions delivered in 1215 by the legate of Innocent III. But the other two—law and medicine—were founded immediately afterwards; and in a letter addressed by the university, in 1253, to all the prelates of the kingdom, the four faculties are boldly compared to the four rivers of the terrestrial paradise. Over each of these societies a doctor was chosen to preside, during a fixed period, by the suffrages of his colleagues, under the title of doyen, or dean.

In the first instance, the members of the academy were divided into two classes only—masters and scholars. There were no distinctions in grade or title; no previous ceremonies were necessary for advancement to any office. But the introduction of various degrees, to be conferred after certain fixed periods of study, followed very soon; and four were expressly specified—those of bachelor, licentiate, master, and doctor—in the reform by which Gregory IX. gave a permanent character to the university. While some of the Italian academies may have been more

* John XXII. published, in 1317, the Constitutions of his predecessor, Clement V. They were divided, as was the *Liber Sextus*, into five books, and recommended by a bull to the most eminent universities.

† In this short account we have chiefly followed Giannone, *Stor. di Nap.*, lib. xix. cap. v. s. 1. See also Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, Siecle XII. chap. xvii.

‡ We refer not to its antiquity,—since it boasts to have been founded by Charlemagne, and augmented by Lewis the Meek and Charles the Bald. Its completion it certainly owed to the kings of the third race, especially Lewis the Young and his son Philippe Auguste. It had some celebrity at the end of the tenth century; but before that epoch, the academy at Rheims seems to have been in greater repute.

§ Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, Siec. XIII., chap. x. Mosheim, *Cent. XIII.* p. ii. chap. i.

eminent for a peculiar proficiency in the science of law or of medicine*, the palm of theological superiority was conceded, without any dispute, to Paris. To afford still greater facilities and encouragement to this study, Robert de Sorbonne, a man abounding both in wealth and in piety, the chaplain and friend of St. Louis, founded, about the year 1250, that very renowned institution, which has associated his name, for so many centuries, with the theological labours, glories, and controversies of his countrymen.

These few sentences may be sufficient to call the reader's attention to an important and attractive subject, and even to render intelligible such passing mention, as will be made hereafter, of the university of Paris. But as the particulars of its origin, its construction, its growth, and its prosperity, do not strictly belong to ecclesiastical history, we must not permit them to usurp those scanty pages, which may be more appropriately, if not more instructively, occupied.

NOTE (C) ON CERTAIN THEOLOGICAL WRITERS.

The fathers of the early Church were cautious in provoking subtle speculations on the holy mysteries, and seldom engaged in that field of theology, unless to repel the invasion of some popular error. And even then they were usually contented to arm themselves with scripture and tradition as the principles of their defence, reserving the resources of reason for what they considered its legitimate object in theological controversies, the interpretation of the sacred writings. When philosophy was at length admitted to partake in these debates, the method first adopted, as most congenial to the sublime truths of religion, was that of Plato; and if they were sometimes exalted by this alliance into fantastical mysticism, they at least escaped the degrading torture of minute and pugnacious sophistry. But the rival system also found some early advocates †, though insufficient to give it general prevalence. Boethius applied the principles of Aristotle to the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, thus moving many abstruse and inexplicable questions; and John Damascenus afterwards published a methodical exposition of all the questions or difficulties of theology. In the West, in the ninth century, John Scotus Erigena fell into the same snare; but his method of subtilizing was not suited to the genius of his age; and during that which followed, every operation of the human mind was suspended.

But when reason again awoke, she was straightway delivered into the

* As was Bologna, for instance, for the former, and Salerno for the latter. Gratian published his Decretal at Bologna; and the stimulus thus given to the study of canon law continued long to produce its effect. The study of civil law in the same school is dated from about twenty years earlier—i. e. from the discovery of the Pandect. The medical precepts, which issued from Salerno, are said to have been derived from the books of the Arabians, or the schools of the Saracens in Spain and Africa.

† To such, and to the errors occasioned by them, is the allusion of Prudentius. *Pref. secunda in Apotheosim.*

Statum lacessunt omnipotentis Dei
Calumniosis litibus:
Fidem minutis dissecant ambagibus,
Ut quisque lingua nequior:
Solvunt ligantque quæstionum vincula
Per syllogismos plectiles.
Væ captiosis sycophantarum strophis,
Væ versipelli astutiæ!
Nodos tenaces recta rumpit regula,
Infesta dissertantibus.

Prudentius flourished at the end of the fourth century

fetters of Aristotle. Towards the middle of the eleventh century, his philosophy was taught, after the Arabian method, in the public schools; and though, in the first instance, it was confined to the illustration of profane subjects, yet as men became commonly imbued with its principles, and as the whole system, political and moral, in those days, was interwoven with religious, or at least with ecclesiastical, considerations, it was not long before the prevalent system passed obsequiously into the service of theology*. John the Sophist, Rocellinus, Berenger, Lanfranc, Anselm, introduced that method: it was improved by Abelard; it was rapidly propagated in all the schools of Europe †; and its immediate and necessary effect was to multiply, without any limit, the difficulties which it affected to resolve. The objects of the investigation were too immense for human comprehension, yet they were sought by the meanest exercise of human ratiocination. The end was unattainable; and, had it not been so, the means were those least likely to have attained it. Nevertheless, the disputants proceeded with eagerness and confidence; and thus it proved that, in this boundless field, the most different conclusions were reached by paths nearly similar; and that out of every question which it was proposed to resolve, a thousand other questions started forth, more abstruse, more absurd, more immeasurably remote from the precincts of reason and of sense ‡ than the original.

To impose some restraint on this great intellectual licentiousness,—to revive some respect for ancient authorities,—to erect some barrier, or at least some landmark, for *Peter the Lombard*, the guidance of his contemporaries, Peter the Lombard published, about the middle of the twelfth century, his celebrated ‘Book of the Sentences.’ Born in the country whence he derived his surname, and educated at Bologna, then more famous as a school for law than divinity, he proceeded to Paris for the prosecution of the latter study. He was recommended to the patronage of St. Bernard; and presently attained such eminence in academical erudition, that he was raised, in the

* ‘Fatendum simul est, (says Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*), ex quo Philosophia Saracenica seculi xii Occidentis Christianis innotuit, plenius eos amplexibus inconditum philosophiæ genus recepisse, et insanientium more in Dialecticam debacchatos, malum malo augendo ad Theologiam eam transtulisse.’ (See *Per. ii.*, par. ii., lib. ii., cap. ii. and iii.) That author shows, that, from the seventh until nearly the twelfth age, philosophy was confined to the possession of ecclesiastics, and to the limits of the Trivium and Quadrivium. The system which succeeded was called scholastic, as emerging from the schools of the monasteries. After the time of Gratian, the study of canon law was very commonly mixed up with it; and the combination of the three incongruities, Canon Law, Scholastic Philosophy, and Theology, formed what Brucker aptly denominates a *Triplex Monstrum*.

† Otho Frisingensis introduced the scholastic system into Germany. That prelate, the son of Leopold, marquis of Austria, and Agnes, daughter of Henry IV., was made bishop of Frisingen, in Bavaria, in the year 1138. He attended Conrad to the Holy Land in 1147, and died nine years afterwards. He wrote (in seven books) a Chronological History of the World, from the Creation to his own time, which is frequently cited by the ecclesiastical annalists.

‡ Among the multitude of these questions, there were some which ended, and after no very long investigation, in absolute infidelity. The Latin writers of the thirteenth age abound with complaints (exaggerated, no doubt, but not unfounded) of the progress of unchristian opinions, directly deduced from Aristotelian principles—that the soul perished with the body—that the world had had no beginning, and would have no end—that there was only one intellect among all the human race—that all things were subject to absolute fate or necessity—that the universe was not governed by Divine Providence, &c., &c. We should observe, that the Aristotelians declined what might have been the personal consequences of these opinions by a subtle distinction. These matters (they said) are philosophically true—but they are theologically false—*Vera sunt secundum Philosophiam, non secundum Fidem Catholicam*. See Mosheim, *Cent. XIII.* p. i. chap. ii., and p. ii. chap. v.

year 1150, to the See of Paris. The Book of the Sentences is a collection of passages of the Fathers, especially of St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustin, explaining and illustrating the principal questions, which then so violently agitated the scholastic doctors. The author was cautious in intermixing original observation with the venerable oracles of the early Church; and he trusted, by the ancient simplicity of his work, and his contempt of the fashionable subtleties, to restore some respect for the less vicious system of older times. The intrinsic merit of this production, the talents and extensive learning which it exhibited, recommended it to universal attention; and the 'Master of the Sentences' long retained an undisputed supremacy in the theological schools. But the effect of his work was not that which he had warmly and, perhaps, reasonably anticipated. The schoolmen made use of his text, principally that they might hang on it their futile disceptations and commentaries; and so fruitful was that elaborate book in matter for ingenious disputation, that Peter the Lombard, so far from having arrested the current, is usually ranked among the chiefs or fathers of the scholastic* theology.

If the dominion of Aristotle was for a moment suspended by the decree of the council of Paris †, (in 1209) which condemned to the flames his metaphysical works, it was effectually restored by the patronage of Frederic II. That emperor caused numerous translations to be made from his most celebrated compositions, and diffused through Italy, and especially at Bologna, the genius which had hitherto ruled with peculiar prevalence in France. At the same time, a new description of disputants had grown up, for whose character and offices the scholastic method was admirably calculated, and who carried it to its most pernicious perfection ‡. The mendicants now gave laws to the academies of Europe;

* See Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, Cent. XII. chap. xv. Néanmoins on peut le considérer comme le chef de tous les scholastiques; car quoiqu'il ait suivi dans son ouvrage une méthode bien différente des autres, quant à la manière de traiter les questions de Théologie; son livre leur a toutefois servi de fondement et de base, et ils n'ont fait en apparence que de commenter.

† The reason assigned for the condemnation of Aristotle on this celebrated occasion was, that his works had given occasion to the errors of Amalric, and might probably do so to many others. (See Brucker, *Loc. cit.*) And they did so; but the errors which scholastic subtlety raised, were as easily laid by a different formula of the same incantation—they appeared and disappeared, fleeting, impalpable, unsubstantial. The permanent heresies of the age stood on firmer ground. The grievances of the Waldenses and the Wicliffites were not the creations of sophistry; so neither could sophistry, though backed by persecution, silence the murmurs which they caused.

‡ We should here observe that the popes, however they profited by the influence of the mendicants, were by no means decided advocates of the scholastic theology. The celebrated Epistle of Gregory IX. to the doctors of Paris, contains (for instance) these words—*Mandamus et strictè præcipimus, quatenus, sine fermento mundanæ scientiæ, doceatis theologicam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei philosophorum figmentis . . . sed contenti terminis a patribus institutis, mentes auditorum vestrorum fructu cælestis eloquii saginetis, ut hauriant a fontibus Salvatoris.* The passage is cited by Mosheim. Cent. XIII. p. ii. chap. iii. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philosoph.* p. ii. Pars. ii. lib. ii. c. iii.) cites the following passage from a bull of the same pope published in 1231.—*Magistri vero et Scholares Theologiæ . . . nec philosophos se ostentent, sed satagant fieri Theodidacti—nec loquantur in lingua populi linguam Hebræam cum asotica confundentes, sed de illis tantum in scholis quæstionibus disputent, quæ per libros theologicos et sanctorum patrum tractatus valeant terminari.* But the system was extremely popular with the *students*; their ardour was aided by the edicts of Frederic II.; and the system of Aristotle, superior to all edicts, was destined to yield only to the predominance of another system, that of polite literature and natural reason. See Petrarch's complaints of the dishonour brought on theology, by 'the profane and loquacious dialecticians' of his day. *De Remed. Utriusq. Fortun. and Tiraboschi*, vol. v. p. i. lib. ii.

and the rules which they imposed were drawn from the code of Aristotle. At this time arose Thomas Aquinas, the 'angelic doctor,' the Coryphæus of the disciples of the Stagyræite. He was descended from an illustrious family and born in the neighbourhood of Naples, in the year 1224. He entered very young into the Dominican Order, and studied at Paris and at Cologne, under Albert the Great, a German scholastic, the dictator of his day*. St. Thomas (he was in due season canonized by John XXII.) died at the early age of fifty; but the writings which he has left behind him compose seventeen folio volumes. The most important among them are his Commentaries on Aristotle, and his Sum of Theology. But they likewise contain most voluminous observations on various books of the Old and New Testament, and investigations of many theological, metaphysical, and moral questions. They were studied in those days with insatiable avidity. They are now confined to the shelves of a few profound students, whence they will never again descend. It might seem harsh indeed to say of them, 'that they are of less account in the eyes of a sage, than the toil of a single husbandman, who multiplies the gifts of the Creator and supplies the food of his brethren †.' But there is room for doubt whether any important practical benefits were ever derived from them; whether the reflections which they awakened were generally profitable either to the present condition of man, or to his future prospects. And we certainly cannot question, that the spirit of contentious disceptation, which they nourished and propagated, was injurious to one of the best principles of religion, religious forbearance and universal charity ‡.

Contemporary with St. Thomas Aquinas was another celebrated ornament of the church, St. Bonaventura. He was a native of Tuscany§, and entered in the year 1243 *St. Bonaventura*, into the Order of the Franciscans. He likewise completed his studies at Paris, and with such success, as to acquire the title of the Seraphic Doctor. In the year 1256 he was appointed General of his Order, and died at no very advanced age. His works are less voluminous than those of Aquinas, and bear the stamp of a very different character||. The tendency of his mind was rather towards the extreme of mysticism, than that of minute and frivolous disputation. It rose into the regions of spiritual aspiration; it courted no intellectual triumphs and

* This honour was, however, contested by our countryman, Alexander Hales, a Franciscan, who taught philosophy at Paris, and acquired the formidable title of 'The Irrefragable Doctor.' Another and more attractive appellation was 'The Fountain of Life.' He entered into the Franciscan Order in 1222, and died at Paris twenty-three years afterwards. His most important work was a Commentary on the 'Book of the Sentences,' composed by the order of Innocent IV.

† The words are Gibbon's—applied to a different subject.

‡ Fontenelle, we believe, (see Tiraboschi, Stor. Lett. Ital., vol. iv. p. i. lib. ii.) has somewhere said of St. Thomas Aquinas, 'that in another age and under other circumstances he would have been Des Cartes.' No one ever questioned his genius and immense erudition; or that he has intermixed some sensible remarks with the fashionable sophistry,—only we should not value him too highly for this. A great mind should oppose the evil principles of the time—at least it should lend no aid to them. Roger Bacon in the same age acted a nobler part.

§ The Italians are justly proud of the success of their countrymen in the schools of Paris. Besides the three eminent ecclesiastics mentioned in the text, they enumerate, among the Parisian Professors of the same age, John of Parma, a Franciscan; Egidio da Roma, an Augustinian; Agostino Trionfo of Ancona; and Jacopo da Viterbo. Through the following century the series continued, though with diminished brilliancy—and then it ceased.

|| Both these doctors are praised for professional disinterestedness. Bonaventura is related to have refused the archbishoprick of York; Aquinas that of Naples, as well as other dignities.

despised the abuse of reason. By this quality he has obtained, and in a great degree merited, the eulogies of Gerson* ; who has pronounced (and the authority is respectable) that his works surpass in usefulness all those of his age, in regard to the spirit of the love of God and Christian devotion which speaks in him ; that he is profound without being prolix, subtle without being curious, eloquent without vanity, ardent without inflation. There are many (says the critic) who teach the accuracy of doctrine ; there are others who preach devotion ; there are few who in their writings combine both these objects. But they are united by St. Bonaventura, whose devotion is instructive, and whose doctrine inspires devotion.

The celebrated controversy between the Realists and the Nominalists †, of which the origin was not long posterior to the general study of Aristotle, was continued with no great intermission till the days of Luther. The fourteenth century was particularly disturbed by its violence. Two of the leading champions of that age were John Duns Scotus ‡, and his disciple William of Occam. The former had ventured boldly to impugn some of the positions and conclusions of St. Thomas Aquinas, and his opinions found many advocates. These formed the party of the Nominalists ; and since, in the political disputes of the day, they favoured the cause of the emperor, they fell under the spiritual denunciations of the Vatican. Again, the Dominicans for the most part rallied round the banners of Aquinas and the pope, while the Franciscans commonly defended the tenets of Scotus, a member of their own order. Thus the controversy assumed a new name, as its character became more rancorous ; and the ambitious polemics of that and of succeeding ages severally enlisted among the conflicting ranks of the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*. The principal points § of theological difference between these renowned adversaries, were ‘ the nature of the divine co-operation with the human will,’ and ‘ the measure of divine grace’ necessary for salvation. These were subjects which have employed the devout in every age, and provoked the perpetual exercise of reason. But the production, which was more effectual, perhaps, than any other in exalting the reputation of Scotus, was his demonstration of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. The Dominicans maintained that the holy Virgin was not exempt from the stain of original sin ; the deeper devotion, or the bolder hypocrisy of the Franciscan supported the contrary opinion. That either party was right, it is beyond the capacity of man to ascertain ; and it is clear, that both were equally absurd, in as far as both were equally positive. Yet, will it be believed that this inscrutable and most frivolous question formed an important subject of difference in the Roman Catholic church—a subject deemed not unworthy of the cognizance of popes and of councils—for the space of more than two hundred years ?

* See Dupin. *Nouv. Biblioth. Cent.* XIII., chap. iv.

† Roscellinus, a native of Brittany, has the repute of having invented these opinions. He was opposed by Anselm, and compelled to abjure before a Council at Soissons, in 1092. He seems also to have incurred some danger from a popular tumult. He was exiled from France, and then passed a short time in England, where he gave great offence by censuring the concubinage of the clergy, attested by their numerous illegitimate children, and by calumniating (as is said) Archbishop Anselm. The writers of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* treat him throughout as a heretic—but none of his writings (if any ever existed) now remain.

‡ This—the subtle—doctor died in the year 1308. He was a native of Dunse in Scotland, and a Franciscan.

§ See Mosheim, *Cent. XIV.*, p. ii., chap. iii.

CONTENTS OF PART V.

CHAPTER XXII.—*Residence of the Popes at Avignon.*

(I.) History of the Popes—Clement V.—Council of Vienne—Condemnation of the Templars—John XXII.—his contest with Lewis of Bavaria—supposed heresy—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—the Jubilee—Innocent VI.—Urban V.—goes to Rome but returns to Avignon—Gregory XI.—dies at Rome. (II.) General history of the Church—Decline of papal power—Rapacity and profligacy of the Court of Avignon—Attempts at Reform—Schism among the Franciscans—their disputes with John XXII. and other Popes—Change in the Imperial policy—The Beghards—The Lollhards—Heresy and fate of Dulcinus—The Flagellants—Conclusion.

CHAPTER XXIII.—*The Grand Schism of the Roman Catholic Church.*

Turbulent election of Urban VI.—his harshness—secession of the college to Anagni, and election of Clement VII.—his retreat to Avignon—division of Europe—Boniface IX. succeeds Urban—his extraordinary avarice—Pietro di Luna (Benedict XIII.) succeeds Clement—Attempts to heal the schism—Boniface succeeded by Innocent VII.—he by Angelo Corrarío (Gregory XII.)—his reputation—Collusion of the two pretenders—Council of Pisa—their deposition and election of Alexander V., who is succeeded by John XXIII.—Council of Constance—escape and deposition of John—Abdication of Gregory—Conference of Perpignan and deposition of Luna—Election of Martin V.—Fate and character of Gregory—Benedict and John.

CHAPTER XXIV.—*Attempts of the Roman Catholic Church at Self-Reformation.*

Spirit manifested at the Council of Pisa—Testimonies of Churchmen against ecclesiastical corruption—extent of their complaints—Conduct of Alexander V.—Council of Constance—Gerson—The Committee of Reform—their labours—nature of the opposition—how their exertions are eluded—Election of Martin V.—who succeeds in evading all efficient Reform—Real objects of the Reformers—Remarks—Assembly of the Council of Basle—Eugenius IV.—Three objects of the Council—Cardinal Julian Cesarini—Struggle between the Council and the Pope—Substance of the enactments of the Council for Church Reform—New differences with Eugenius—Council of Ferrara and Florence—Cardinal of Arles—Deposition of Eugenius—Felix V.—Confirmation of the liberties of the Gallican Church—Conclusion.

CHAPTER XXV.—*History of the Hussites.*

Wiclif—his opinions—introduced into Bohemia—John Huss—his proceedings—arrival at Constance—Safe-conduct of Sigismund—Various charges and processes of the Council against him—His firmness and execution—Jerome of Prague—his persecution—vacillation and final execution—Remarks—Insurrection of the Bohemians—their sanguinary and prolonged contest with the Church.

CHAPTER XXVI.—*History of the Greek Church after its separation from the Latin.*

The Paulicians—their history and opinions—Various mystics—Messalians, Quietists and others—Dispute on the God of Mahomet—Attempts to re-unite the two Churches—System of the Greek Church—distinguished from Latin—The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—duration and consequences—Latin conquest of Constantinople—Establishment of a Roman Catholic Church in Greece—its endowments—Embassy to Nice for the re-union—its failure—other similar endeavours—faithless reconciliation at Lyons—attempts renewed in the fourteenth century—Negotiations with Eugenius IV.—Council of Ferrara—removed to Florence—its deliberations—Conditions and decree of union—Reception of the Greek deputies on their return to Constantinople—Violence of the Greeks—unabated—till the taking of Constantinople by Mahomet II.

CHAPTER XXVII.—*History of the Popes, from Nicholas V. to Leo X.*

Nicholas V.—his popular character—Callixtus III.—Æneas Sylvius or Pius II.—his election—exertions against the Turks—Paul II.—Sixtus IV.—his literary pretensions—Innocent VIII.—Roderigo Borgia or Alexander VI.—consummation of papal iniquity—Pius III.—Julius II.—his warlike talents, enterprize and success—Leo X.—The Lateran Council convoked by Julius and carried to its conclusion by Leo.

CHAPTER XXVIII. and Last.—*Preliminaries of the Reformation.*

(I.) A review of the decline of the papal system—in respect to its temporal power and pretensions—its internal constitution—its discipline, and moral instruction and practice—its spiritual innovations—Festivals, controversies, &c.—the mystics. (II.) On the endeavours of the Church to remove its own abuses—to what limits they were confined—On the exertions of Sectarians or Separatists—how early they began, and to what objects they tended—the treatment which they received from the Church—Some distinguished Reformers of the fifteenth century—A particular reference to the German Church—The conclusion of this history.

HISTORY AND ART OF PRINTING,

In one very large volume, royal 8vo. (upwards of 1000 pages) Price £3. 3s.
neatly bound in cloth.

TYPOGRAPHIA: An Historical Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the ART OF PRINTING; with practical Directions for conducting every department in an Office; and a description of STEREOTYPE and LITHOGRAPHY. Illustrated by numerous Engravings of Antiquities relative to the subject, curious and beautiful Portraits of eminent characters allied to the Art, Presses from the origin of the Art to the Machinery of the present improved state, and various Machines, Apparatus and Utensils used in Letter Press, Copper Plate, Stereotype, and Lithographic Printing, &c. &c. interesting both to the Antiquarian, the Printer, and the Amateur.

BY THOMAS CURSON HANSARD,
OF THE PATERNOSTER-ROW PRESS.

Part I.—History of the Art.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.—SECTION I. The Origin of Printing considered, unconnected with the idea of making Books. The first step in the Art referred to the Second Age of the World, or that immediately succeeding the Flood. Description of the Printed Bricks of Babylonia, with an Engraving. Opinion of the mode by which the impressions on these Bricks were effected. Of cylindrical pieces that present curious specimens of Clay-printing, with an Engraving. Failure of the learned in their attempts to decypher the contents of these Chaldean Prints. Hypothesis as to the intended use of such mementos. Reasons for concluding the origin of Alphabetic Writing to have been divine. Specimen of the most ancient Alphabetic Writing extant. Description of a Roman Signet used for Stamping. Concluding Reflection.

§ II. Origin of Printing connected with the idea of forming Books. Divided into Two Periods.

FIRST PERIOD. Of the invention of symbols or figures, with words, engraved on blocks. Finiguerra. Earliest prints from blocks. Mode of obtaining impressions at that early time. Subsequent stages of block-engravings. Wohlgemuth. Albert Durer. Holbein. Original Specimens of Durer. Chronological view of the Four Grand Steps of the Art. Books of Images with and without text. Description of the "Biblia Pauperum" Description of the "Speculum Humane Salvationis."

SECOND PERIOD. Moveable Types. Gutenberg. Fust or Faust. Schoeffer. Works executed by these Artists. Claims in favour of Haerlem. Decision in favour of Gutenberg, Schoeffer, and Fust. Brief view of the Rise, Progress, and Diffusion of the Art in Europe in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Its extension to the East Indies, Tranquebar, Russia, and Africa. Religious Establishments great promoters of the Art. Revival of Greek Literature. First appearance of Newspapers, Magazines, Reviews, Annual Registers, &c. General Eulogium on the Art by the late Earl Stanhope.

§ III. The Preface of Luskombe, as taken from Ames's Typographical Antiquities. Books esteemed real Treasures. Cicero's desire to form a Library. Instances of large Sums given for Books. Introduction of Printing. The Downfall of Scribes and Illuminators. Alarms of the Priestcraft. University of Cambridge. Vicar of Croydon. Cardinal Wolsey. Share of Printing in effecting the Reformation. Freedom of the Press. Usefulness of the Art. Introduction into England. Digression on the value of Books before Printing was invented. Opposition of Scribes and Monks. CAXTON Attempts to rob him of his glory. Refutation of the Arguments against him, and Proofs for him. His Press at Westminster. Sketch of his Life and Character. His Book of the Game of Chess, the first printed in England, 1471. The Dedication. Caxton's Type. Fac Simile. Characteristics of the First Printed Books.

§ IV.—First Printer in England. Earliest Masters in London. Protecting Statutes, Patents, and Exclusive Privileges. Origin of the existing Patent of King's Printer. Copy of the Patent to Reeves, Eyre, and Strahan. Earliest Printers in OXFORD, CAM-

BRIDGE. St. Alban's. York. Beverley. Tavistock. Southwark. Canterbury, &c. SCOTLAND. IRELAND. First Practice of the Art in the most important Cities and Towns on the Continent.

§ V.—ON PAPER.—Invention of Paper. The Papyrus of Egypt and Italy. Paper made from Cotton. Bark. Chinese (or India) Paper. Lincu Rags. General Description of the Method of making Paper by Hand. Machines for making Paper. Reasons for its adoption in England. Injurious Effects to the Journeymen, and to the General Interest of Trade, of their frequent Combinations, particularly exemplified in the Paper Manufacture. Mr. Whatman, his Efforts for the real Improvement of Paper. How counteracted. Didot, Fourdrinier, Dickenson. Chemical Aids. Gypsum. Calculations of Value. Injurious effects of Earthy Substances, and Gas Bleaching. Specimen of what Paper ought to be.

§ VI.—THE STATIONERS' COMPANY. Their Antiquity. Their Halls. Description of the present. Its Site. Elevation. Great Room. Court Room. Stock Room. Paintings. Stained Glass. Anecdote of Alfred and the Pilgrim. Escape of Mary, Queen of Scots. Portraits. Government, Charters, Grants, &c. of the Company. Powers formerly exercised by them. Mode of Appointment of Court and Officers. Renter-Wardens. Stock. How rose and divided. Dividends. Widows. Charitable Donations.

§ VII.—"THE PRESS," Mr. McCreery's Poem. Annotations by the Editor of this Work, with Biographical Notices of Eminent Printers. Faust. Jenson. Aldus. The Printer's Chapel. Antient Customs of the Printing Office. Baskerville. Bodoni. Bulmer. Bensley. McCreery. Moxon. Enemies to the Press. Pleasing Digression. ADDENDA. Biographical Notices of the Bowyers. Griffith Jones. John Nichols, Mr. Hughs. Mr. Strahan. The Hansards.

§ VIII.—TYPE FOUNDING.—The Rev. Mr. Rowe Mores' "Dissertation upon English Typographical Founders and Foundries." Early Printers Founders also. CAXTON. His Type; Fac-similes not like the Original. WYNKYN DE WORDE. PYNSON. FAQUES. DAY. Those that followed. Separation of Printing and Founding. Star Chamber Decrees and Regulations for those Trades. Appointed Printers and Founders. Mr. Pitt's Precedent for intimate acquaintance with the Fraternity. Mr. JOSEPH MOXON. His work on Type cutting and Casting. University of Oxford Foundry; Bp. Fell's, Junius's, Grover's, Andrews's, James's, John James, Ilive's, CASLONS, I. II. III. IV., JACKSON, Cotterell, FRY, FIGGINS, THORNE, Martin, and many others.—Scotland. WILSON, MILLER, &c. Properties and Shapes of Types. Type Metal. Of Roman. Of Italic. Old English, New Old English, Modern, or Black. Names of Letter. Proportion to each other. Different sizes in England. Founts of Letter as with Letter-founders.

Part II.—Practice of the Art.

CHAP. I.—General Description of the Apparatus for, and Process of, Moveable-Type Printing.

CHAP. II.—CASE.—Of Compositor's work. Description of a Fount. Upper Case. Lower Case.

Capitals. Small Capitals. Accented Letters. Numerical Letters. Figures. Reference Marks. Points. Quadrats. Spaces. Rules. Space-rules. Braces. Superiors. Fractions. Quotations. Two-line Letters. Flowers. Leads, or Space-lines. Greek and Hebrew. Mathematical, Algebraical, and Geometrical sorts. Of Casting-off Copy; various methods. Different Scales and Tables. Frame. Cases. Stone. Boards. Furniture. Side-sticks. Gutters. Cast-iron Gutters and Side-sticks. Quoins. Shooting-stick, &c. &c. Chases. Observations on Composing. Schemes of Cases. Lord Stanhope's plan. Laying of Letter. Distributing. Composing. Composing-stick. Imposing. Schemes of Imposing various sizes of Works. Dressing the Forms and making Margin. Tables of Signatures and Folios. Locking up. Proofs. Expedition-work. Companionships.

CHAP. III.—THE PRESS.—Construction of the original Printing Press by Blaew of Amsterdam. Perspective and Geometrical Views of every part of the Press. Of Press-work. Practical directions particularly applicable to those Presses. Putting up a Press. Making-ready. Inking. Beating, &c. Pulling. Wetting Paper. Balls. Rollers. Printing in Red, or other Colours, with Black. Mixing and grinding Colours with Varnish.

CHAP. IV.—FINE PRINTING.—Of Fine Printing. Baskerville. Ritchie. Bulmer. Bensley. McCreery. Bad effects on other Work. Small Type. Various Notions of Fine Printing. Wood-cut Working. Obstacles to Fine-work. Mutation of Taste in the Form of Types. Monstrosities of 1824. Requisite Materials.

CHAP. V.—INKING APPARATUS.—Apparatus for Inking the Type. Lord Stanhope's attempts unsuccessful. Effected by a peculiar Composition. Forster's Composition Balls and Cylinders. Value to Printing Machines. Ingredients of the Composition. Apparatus for Melting and Casting. Directions for keeping the Balls and Rollers in good order. Effects of the Atmosphere. Applegath and Cowper's Iron Table and Apparatus. Forster's, of Wood. Arding's, of Iron and Wood. Parkin's Inking Apparatus.

CHAP. VI.—IMPROVED MANUAL PRESSES.—Of modern invented or improved Manual Printing Presses. The STANHOPE; Descriptions and Engravings of its various Parts; application of the principle to the old Press. The Ruthven Presses of Ridley and others. Cogger and Scott. Clymer's Columbian. Stafford. Napier. Treadwell's Tredde. Watts. Barclay. Medhurst. Stafford. Hope, of Jedburgh. Taylor and Martineau. Church. Babbage. Wilson. Hansard.

CHAP. VII.—PRINTING MACHINES.—Of Steam-engine and other Machinery applied to Printing. General feature. Mr. Nicholson; his Patent, as containing the Principle of every subsequently invented Machine for Printing. Machine of König. The Times Newspaper. Mr. Bensley's first application of it to Book-work. Machines of Applegath and Cowper. Rutt. Brightley and Donkin. Bacon. Cooper and Millar. Applegath again. Bold. Sir William Congreve. Parkins. Mr. Spottiswoode. Mr. Hansard's Napier's 'NAY-FEER' Machine.

CHAP. VIII.—PRINTING INK.—First Improvements in Ink, by Baskerville, in 1760. Mr. Bulmer, 1790. First Manufacture for Sale. Mr. Blackwell. Mr. Thomas Martin. Martin and Grafton of Birmingham. Secrets of Ink-making. The Black. Qualifications of Good Ink. Receipt for making Baskerville's Ink. Of the Varnish. Dangerous Process. Receipts for Black Ink and Red Ink. French mode of making the Varnish, Blacks, and mixing for Ink. Mr. Savage's Receipt. Coloured Inks. Observations on the Colour to be kept up. Specimens of Qualities. Mr. Griffiths, and other Makers.

CHAP. IX.—THE OVERSEER, &c.—Of the Overseer of a Printing-Office. His Duties. Rules for the good Government of the Office.

CHAP. X.—THE READER.—Correction of Proofs. Marks of Corrections. Correcting in Metal.

CHAP. XI.—THE ACCOUNT BOOKS.—On the Mode of keeping the Accounts of a Printing Office. Work-Books. Warehouse-Book. MASTER'S BOOK.

CHAP. XII.—WAREHOUSE DEPARTMENT.—Of the Warehouse. Duties of the Warehouse-man. Giving out Paper, Hanging up, Taking down, Laying down a Gathering, Gathering, Collating, Folding, Pressing, Making up Waste, Booking.

CHAP. XIII.—PRICES.—Journemen's Wages. Price scale of 1785. Subsequent Advances and Regulations. Charges to the Booksellers and Employers. Comparison of Expenses, Wages, Charges, and Profits. Warehouse. Cold pressing with glazed Paper.

CHAP. XIV.—On the Rolling Press, or Copper-plate Printing. Description of the Press. Mode of Inking and Pressure. Charcoal Vapour exchanged for Heat of Steam. Further exemplification of the difference of Type and Plate Impression.

CHAP. XV.—Construction of a Printing-Office. Space required. Health of Workmen; Safety from Fire; Security of the Work, gained by a new mode of Drying the Sheets. Effectual mode of Warning and Ventilating an Office. Description of Apparatus. Best method of Lighting.

CHAP. XVI.—STEREOTYPE PRINTING.—SECTION I.—General Description of the Process. Origin of the Principle. Modern application. Van der Mey's process of forming Type into solid blocks, not Plates. Mr. Tilloch's Statement. Mr. Nichol's account of Ged's Stereotype. Mr. Tilloch's invention of a similar process fifty years afterwards. Didot. Lord Stanhope and Mr. Wilson.

§ II.—Inquiry as to the probable Advantages of Stereotype. Controversy on the subject. Mr. Wilson's Reply, and Propositions in favour. Arguments in opposition. Calculations of relative expenses.

§ III.—Minute detail of the Art of Stereotyping. Form of the Type, Quadrats, and Spaces. Chases and previous preparation. Stanhope Manuscript, with Observations upon each head. Stereotype Imposing Furniture. The Gypsum. The Foundry; its Fittings up and Fixtures. The Moulding Process. The Oven for baking the Moulds. The Process of Casting. Various utensils required. The Picking Process. The Lathe for turning the backs of the Plates. Metal.

§ IV.—Various other modes of Stereotyping. The French. Hoffman's Process. Fingeron. Rochen. Carez foundation of an English Patent. Gengembre and Herhan. Efforts in the Art, to form Assignats. Herhan's Process of striking the Mould in Semi-fluid Metal. His new method of composing Matrices instead of Types. Applegath and Cowper's New Patent for striking the Mould. Similarity to the Methods of Carez and Herhan. Mr. Brunel. His Patent for a New Mode of Stereotyping. Advantages. Not yet applied to Book-work. Very similar to Hoffman's.

§ V.—Of fixing Stereotype Plates for working. Nailing on blocks of Wood. Lord Stanhope's Iron Blocks, with Ledges and Screws. Cement Blocks. Universal Plate, with moving Ledges. The Author's invention for this purpose.

CHAP. XVII.—ON POLYAUTOGRAPHIC PRINTING, OR LITHOGRAPHY.—Invention by Senefelder. His work; published by Mr. Ackerman. Origin of the discovery. Lithographic Stone. Ink for Lithography, and method of inking it. Paper for transfer. Preparation of the Stone. Cylinders for inking the Stone. Paper for Lithographic Printing. Numerous causes of failure in the Drawing. Lithographic Presses. The Upright Lever, or Pole Press. The Bavarian Cylinder, or Star Press. Mr. Ruthven's Press. Various styles of Drawing applicable for Lithography. Advantages of Original Drawings on the Stone. General opinion upon public advantages of the Process, and how far Lithography and Typography are likely to affect one another. Comparison of Prices.

CHAP. XVIII.—DECORATIVE PRINTING.—Revival by Mr. Savage. The Chiaro Oscuro. Colours by suites of blocks. Manner of Papillon. Mode of Printing. Paper Hangings. Chinese. Initial letter B of the Mentz Bible. New Mode of producing such a Specimen, Mr. Savage's Specimens. Requisites of the Artist. CUI BONO. Calculation of Cost. Failure of the Chef-d'œuvre. Pleasing relief on referring to the first principle of the Art of Printing. Branstons's Cave of Despair—reversed.

P A R T V.

CHAPTER XXII.

Residence at Avignon.

(I.) *History of the Popes.*—Clement V.—conditions imposed on him by Phillip—he fixes his residence in France—Charges against the Templars—their seizure—Council General of Vienne—its three professed objects—Condemnation and punishment of the Templars—Remarks—Question on the orthodoxy of Boniface VIII.—Ecclesiastical abuses—Attempt at Reform—Elevation and character of John XXII.—his avarice—the apostolical chancery—his contest with Lewis of Bavaria—The Emperor advances to Rome—creates a rival Pope—fruitless issue of the struggle—appeals from Pope to a General Council—charges of heresy against John—his opinion respecting the intermediate State—commotion in the Church—his dying confession—Remarks—Benedict XII.—his virtues and endeavours to reform the Church—Clement VI.—Deputation from Rome—its three objects—the Jubilee—multitude of pilgrims—conduct of the Romans—Temporal prerogatives exercised by this Pope—Restrictions imposed in conclave on the future Pope—Innocent VI.—and instantly broken by him—his character and objects—disputes with the German Church—Urban V.—passed some time at Rome—but returned to Avignon—Gregory XI.—deputation from Rome—Catharine of Sienna—her pretensions—Embassy to Avignon—interview with the Pope—he goes to Rome and dies there—Observations—(II.) *General history of the Church, its heresies, &c.*—(1.) Decline of the papal power—Intestine convulsions of the Ecclesiastical States—consequent deficiencies in papal revenues—means employed to replenish them—profligacy of the Court of Avignon—surpassing that of Rome—Temporal weakness and dependence of the Avignon Popes—Growing contempt for spiritual censures—Appeals to General Council—Disputes between the Pope and the Franciscans—Diffusion of knowledge among the laity.—(2.) Attempts at Reform feeble and ineffectual.—(3.) The character of the rigid Franciscans—Schism in that Order—The Spirituals and Brethren of the Community—Their treatment by Clement V.—By John XXII.—The Bull *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*—Some Spirituals burnt for heresy—their consequent increase—they unite with Lewis of Bavaria—The Pope aided by the Dominicans—Remarks—Charles IV.—Change in the Imperial policy—Triumph of the Pope and Inquisitors—Final division of the Franciscans—The Beghards—The Lollards—their origin and character—their alleged opinions and mysticism—Some contemporary institutions of the Church—Heresy and persecution of Dulcinus—The Flagellants—their origin—progress—practice—and sufferings—Concluding observations.

SECTION I.

History of the Popes.

WHEN Philip undertook to raise the archbishop of Bourdeaux to the pontifical chair, six conditions are believed to have been imposed by the monarch, and accepted by the subject. Five of them stipulated for the entire forgiveness of all the insults which had been offered to Boniface, and the Roman See; for the restoration of the friends of Philip to communion and favour; for the power of exacting tenths for the five following years; for the condemnation of the memory of Boniface; for restitution of dignity to two degraded cardinals, and the creation of some others, friends of the king. The sixth was not then specified; the mention of it was reserved for a more convenient season*; and we may remark, that the others were obviously not suggested by any long-sighted policy aiming at the permanent humiliation of the Roman See, but rather by passion and temporary expediency. If we except the nomination of new cardinals, who would probably be French, there is not one among the conditions dictated, under the most favourable circumstances, by the great

* Bzovius, *Contin. of Baron. Annal. Ann. 1305, i. Fleury, liv. xc. s. xlix.* Gianone, *lib. xxii. cap. viii.* Historians are not agreed what the sixth condition was—some assert that it was to heap additional anathemas on Boniface, and burn his bones; others suppose it to have been fulfilled by the condemnation of the Templars, others by the transfer of the papal residence to France. The violence of Philip's character, and the mere temporary character of most of his other stipulations, make the first, perhaps, the most probable conjecture.

enemy of the See, which tended in effect to reduce it to dependence on his own throne, or even materially to weaken any one of the foundations of its power. Nor should this surprise us; since the violence which Philip exhibited throughout the contest, and the provocations which he received, make it probable, that his animosity was rather personal against Boniface, than political against the Church, or even Court, of Rome.

The first act of the Pope elect was to assemble his reluctant cardinals at Lyons, to officiate at his coronation*; *The Secession to Avignon.* and his reign, which began in 1305 and lasted for nine years, was entirely passed in the country where it commenced. Clement V. was alternately resident at Bourdeaux, Lyons, and Avignon; and he was the first among the spiritual descendants of St. Peter, who insulted the chair and tomb of the apostle by continual and voluntary absence: his example was followed by his successors until the year 1376. Thus for a period of about seventy years, the mighty pontifical authority, which was united by so many ties to the name of Rome, which in its nature was essentially Italian, and which claimed a boundless extent of despotism, was exercised by foreigners, in a foreign land, under the sceptre of a foreign prince. This humiliation, and, as it were, exile of the Holy See †, has been compared by Italian writers to the Babylonian captivity; and a notion, which may have originated in the accidental time of its duration, has been recommended by other points of similarity. French authors have regarded the secession to Avignon in a very different light—but we shall venture no remarks on the general character of this singular period, until we have described the leading occurrences which distinguished it.

Clement V. immediately fulfilled most of the stipulated conditions—he restored the partizans of the French king to their honours; he created several new cardinals, Gascons or Frenchmen; he revoked the various decrees made by Boniface VIII. against France, even to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*—at least he so qualified its operation, as not to extend it to a country which had merited that exception by its faithful attachment to the Roman See;—but when called upon to publish a formal condemnation of the memory of that pontiff, he receded from his engagement with the direct avowal, that such an act exceeded the limits of his authority, unless fortified by the sanction of a General Council.

Very soon afterwards, rumours were propagated respecting various abominations, both religious and moral, perpetrated by the Order of the Knights Templars—not in occasional licentiousness, but by the rule and practice of the society. Information of these offences was first communicated to Philip, afterwards to the pope; both parties attached, or affected to attach, infinite importance to it; and at length it was determined to refer that question also to a General Council. The Pope issued orders for such an assembly, and appointed Vienne, in Dauphiny, as the place of its meeting. In the meantime, Philip caused all the Templars in his dominions to be seized in one day (October 30, 1307); and Clement exerted himself with various, but very general, success to engage the other sovereigns of Europe to the same measure.

* King Philip officiated also, and condescended to lead the Pope's horse by the bridle, according to the ancient fashion of Imperial humiliation. Lyons boasted to be a free city, and the bishop had, in fact, gained the principal authority there, to the exclusion of that of the king of France.

† The Popes who reigned at Avignon, and who were all French, were—Clement V.—John XXII.—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—Innocent VI.—Urban V.—Gregory XI.

On October 1, 1311, the Council assembled. Its professed objects were three:—1. To examine the charges against the Templars and secure the purity of the Catholic Faith. 2. To consult for the relief of the Holy Land. 3. To reform the *Council of Vienne*. manners of the clergy and the system of the Church*. The first of these terminated in the entire suppression of the Order; their property† was transferred to the Knights of the Hospital, who were considered a more faithful bulwark against the progress of the Infidel—(it was thus that the *second* purpose of the assembly was also supposed to be effected;) while their persons were consigned to the justice of provincial Councils, to be guided by the character, confession, or contumacy of the individual accused. By these means the greater part unquestionably escaped with their lives; but several were executed, and among these the Grand Master and the Commander of Normandy suffered under singular circumstances. They had confessed their guilt, and were consequently condemned by the bishops, to whom that office had been assigned by the Pope, to the mitigated punishment of perpetual imprisonment. On hearing this sentence, they retracted their confession and inflexibly protested their entire innocence. The cardinals remanded them for further trial on the morrow, but in the meantime, Philip, having learnt what had passed, and not brooking even so trifling a delay in the chastisement of an enemy, caused them to be burnt alive in a small island in the Seine, on the same evening. They endured their torments with great constancy; and the assembled crowd, as it believed their guilt, was astounded by their firmness.

On the reality of their guilt or innocence depends the character of Clement V.; for it is not probable that he was deceived in a matter so important, involving the *Probable Innocence of the Templars*. lives and property of so numerous and powerful a body, and to a certain extent the interests and honour of so many kings and nations. It is true, that it was by Philip that the first attack was made both upon their character and their persons; but the blast which he sounded was presently repeated by the Pope, and reiterated in every quarter of Europe. Again, the Templars were rich; and notwithstanding the nominal disposal of their property which was made at Vienne, there were few princes who entirely lost so favourable an opportunity for spoliation‡. It is admitted, indeed, that Philip continually disclaimed any avaricious motive for his aggression; and that he does not appear in fact to have turned his success to those ends; but he was irritated by their opposition to some former schemes, and against the Grand Master, in particular, he was known to entertain a personal and implacable animosity. . . . As to the proofs of their guilt—the confessions, which several are affirmed to have made, do not rest on any satisfactory evidence, though it seems probable, that some did really acknowledge all that was imputed to them. But of these, some may have been driven into weakness by

* Bzov. Contin. Baron. Ann., 311, s. i. Fleury, l. xci. sect. xxvi.

† Excepting that in Spain and Portugal, which was consecrated to the formation of a new order, with the prospect of a Moorish Crusade, under the especial superintendence of the pope. We find it, moreover, affirmed by Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. Cent. XIV. chap. ii.* that the publication of the Bull for the dissolution of the order was prevented in Germany, and that the Templars were there acquitted by a Provincial Council.

‡ As the princes enjoyed the rents of the landed estates, until the commissioners of the Knights of Rhodes had made out their claims, there arose great delays in resigning them. Philip himself retained a certain sum for the expenses of the prosecution; but not sufficient to justify any suspicion of rapacity.

torment or terror; while others, individually guilty, may have imputed to the society their private crimes. At any rate, their confessions are confronted by the firmness of many others, who repelled, under every risk and torture, the detestable accusations. Indeed many of the charges were of a nature so very monstrous*, so very remote from reason or nature, as almost to carry with them their own confutation—at least, the most explicit and unsuspecting evidence was necessary to establish their truth; and none such was offered.

Philip was more successful in his efforts to destroy an ancient and powerful Military Order, than to disgrace the memory of an insolent pontiff; and the Council, which suppressed the Templars with such little show of justice or humanity, contended with invincible eagerness for the reputation of Boniface. It was perseveringly attempted to attach the stain of heresy to his name; but though the king pursued this design with all the vehemence of malignity and revenge, the prelates assembled at Vienne, three hundred in number †, unanimously proclaimed his spotless orthodoxy—that he died, as he had lived, in the bosom of the Catholic faith. Disappointed in this favourite hope, the king was compelled to seek consolation in an edict published at the same time by the pope, which accorded a gracious pardon to the enemies and calumniators of Boniface.

For the third and worthiest object of the labour of the Council, an abundant harvest was provided by the multiplied abuses of the Church. It was complained that (in France at least) the Lord's day was more generally devoted to business or to pleasure than to divine worship; that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was frequently delegated to improper persons, and by them so scandalously perverted, that the censures of the Church had lost their power and their terrors; that many contemptible individuals, defective alike in learning and in morals, were admitted to the priesthood; that prebends and other dignities, being now in most cases filled by the pope, seldom by the bishop, were usually presented to strangers and even foreigners, men of dissolute morals, elevated by successful intrigues at the Court of Rome; and that thus the young and deserving aspirants for ecclesiastical promotion were frequently compelled to abandon the profession with disgust, and invariably became the bitterest and most dangerous enemies of the Church. Another abuse was, the immoderate indulgence of pluralities; many held at the same time four or five, some not fewer than a dozen benefices. Another evil mentioned, is the non-residence of many of the higher clergy, occasioned by the necessity of personally watching their interests at the Vatican. The sumptuous luxury in which they lived, and the negligence and indecency with which the divine services were performed, constituted another

* They are contained (see Bzovius, Ann. 1308, s. iii.) in six charges and fourteen questions—involving infidelity, blasphemy, and the most abominable impurities. That which the sufferers appear most generally to have confessed under the torture, was the public denial of Christ, as a condition of admission into the Order, attended with insults to the cross. We need scarcely refer the reader to the excellent remarks of Voltaire and Sismondi on this subject. The latter especially confirms his opinion, that the Templars were sacrificed, by contemporary authority and substantial reasons. Ital. Rep., ch. xix.

† Bzov. ad ann. 1312, i. A very tedious process against the orthodoxy of Boniface had been carried on in 1310, before the pope at Avignon, where Nogaret appeared as his principal accuser, and the agent of Philip. But Clement, unwilling on the one hand to offend the King, and not daring on the other to scandalize the Church, interposed so many delays, that Philip at length decided to await the decision of the General Council. See Fleury, l. xci. s. xliii.

charge against the beneficed clergy. The profligacy and simony, publicly practised at the Roman Court, swelled the long list of its acknowledged deformities *. On the dissolution of the Council, Clement published, in 1313, its canons, which were fifty-six in number. Most of these were, indeed, nominally directed to the reformation of the Church; the progress of heresy was vigorously opposed; and attempts were made to prevent or heal some divisions now beginning to spring up *within* the Church: subjects to which we shall presently recur. Some constitutions likewise regulated the relation of the bishops to the Monastic Orders; and others imposed greater decency on the *lower* † orders of the clergy; but the grand and vital disorders of the Church, those from which its real danger proceeded, and which were in fact the roots whence the others started into life and notice, these were left to flourish unviolated, and to spread more and more deeply into the bosom of the communion.

Clement V. died ‡ very soon afterwards, and his death was followed by an obstinate difference between the French and Italian cardinals respecting the *nation* of his *Election of John XXII.* successor. This was prolonged by the impatient interference of the populace §, excited, as it would seem, by some Gascon soldiers, who proposed to terminate the dispute by seizing the persons of the Italians. Accordingly, they set fire to the conclave; but the terrified cardinals escaped by another exit, and immediately dispersed and concealed themselves in various places of refuge. Such, indeed, was their panic, or at least their disinclination, that two years elapsed before they could be reassembled. At length, after a second deliberation, which lasted forty days, they elected James of Euse, a native of Cahors, cardinal bishop of Porto—such long delay and repeated consultation did it require, to add to the list of pontifical delinquents the name of John XXII. ! That Pope was of very low origin, the son of a shoemaker or a tapster ||; but he had natural talents and a taste for letters, which were early dis-

* The pope ordered all the bishops to bring with them to the Council expositions of all which seemed to demand correction. Two of these memoirs are still extant, and from them the abuses here briefly enumerated are taken. See Fleury, liv. cxi. s. li., lii. Semler, sec. xiv. cap. ii. 'Infinita fere sunt quæ reformari debent; ignorantur quasi totaliter a Christianis articuli fidei et alia quæ ad religionem et salutem animarum pertinent . . . Monachi non vivunt in suo monasterio; sicut equus effrenis discurrunt, mercantur, et alia enormia faciunt, de quibus loqui verecundum est et turpe . . . prælati non possunt bonis personis hodie providere obstante multitudine Clericorum apud Curiam Romanam impetrantium, qui quidem nunquam Ecclesiam intrantur . . . etiam pueri obtinent dignitates . . . Utinam *Cardinales*, qui sunt animalia pennata, plena oculis ante et retro, talia perspiciant . . . similes sibi similes eligunt . . . bene dico opus esse in *Capite* etiam et in membris reformatione.' The author of this bold appeal to the Head, which was not itself excepted from the general censure, is not known to posterity—the document is given by Raynaldus e Cod. Vaticano. Bzovius (ann. 1310, sec. vi.) enumerates, at great length, fifteen of the principal abuses with which the Church was charged on this occasion.

† The following is the Twenty-second Canon. 'Clerici conjugati carnificum seu macellariorum aut tabernariorum officium publicè et personaliter exercentes, vestes virgatas, partitas, neque statui suo conducentes, portantes severius puniantur. See Bzovius, Contin. Ann. Baron., ann. 1313, sec. i.

‡ He died immensely rich, through the sale of benefices and other such traffic; and the moment that he was known to have expired, all the inmates of his palace are stated to have rushed with one consent to his treasury: not a single servant remained to watch the body of his master, inasmuch that the lights which were blazing round fell down and set fire to the bed. The flames were extinguished; but not till they had consumed half the body of the richest Pope who had yet governed the Church. Sismondi believes this anecdote.

§ The conclave was held at Carpentras, a place on the banks of the Rhone, not far from Avignon. It happened that the Court was assembled there when the Pope died; it therefore became the legal place for the new election.

|| Giovanni Villani, lib. ix. c. lxxix. Giannone, lib. xxii. cap. viii.

covered and encouraged, and his gradual rise to dignity in the Church was not disgraced by any notorious scandals*. But he had not long been in possession of the highest eminence, before he abandoned himself, without scruple or shame, to his predominant passion, avarice. He was not, indeed, exempt from the ambitious arrogance without the Church, and the vexatious intolerance within it, which seem at this time to have been communicated by the chair of St. Peter to its successive possessors—in a greater or less degree to each, according to his previous disposition to those qualities; but avarice was the vice by which John was individually and peculiarly characterized, and to which he gave, during his long pontificate, the most intemperate indulgence. Not contented with the usual methods of papal extortion, he displayed his ingenuity in the invention of others more effectual; he enlarged and extended the Rule of the Apostolical Chancery†; he imposed the *The Apostolical Chancery*. payment of *annates* on Ecclesiastical Benefices; he multiplied the profitable abuse of dispensations; he increased in France the number of bishoprics; and commonly took advantage of the vacancy of a rich See, in order to make five or six translations, promoting each prelate to a dignity, somewhat wealthier than that, which he had before held: so that all were contented, (says Giannone‡) while all paid their fees. In a word, he considered kingdoms, cities, castles and territories to be the real patrimony of Christ, and held the true virtue of the Church to consist, not in contempt of the world and zeal for the faith and evangelical doctrine, but in oblations and tithes, and taxes, and collections, and purple, and gold and silver. Such is the language of the Italian historians, and if it be somewhat exaggerated by their general prejudices against the popes of Avignon, the immense § treasures which were unquestionably amassed

* The violent party-writers of the day, Franciscans and Ghibelines, who heaped every epithet of abuse upon the hostile name of John XXII., have been too hastily credited by some modern writers. Giovanni Villani admits that he was modest in his manner of life, sober, not luxurious, nor profuse in his personal expenditure. In the course of almost every night, he rose to say his office and to study; he celebrated mass almost every day; was easy of access and rapid in the performance of business. He was hasty in temper, of an informed and penetrating understanding, and magnanimous in affairs of importance. (See Fleury, l. xciv. s. xxxix.) These qualities and habits at least repel the charge of universal profligacy which has been brought against him. Nevertheless, it is the opinion of Sismondi (chap. xxix.) that his elevation was not less ascribable to his intrigues and effrontery than to his talents; and the public acts of his pontificate require no comment.

† He reduced the system of Apostolical taxation to a code of canon law. A deacon or sub-deacon might be absolved for murder, for about twenty crowns; a bishop for about three hundred livres: every crime had its price. See Denina, 14, vi.

‡ We might be disposed to receive this with some little suspicion, even from Giannone—since he was not only an Italian, but a decided anti-Gallican also—were not the facts directly derived from Giov. Villani.

§ Giov. Villani (lib. xi. cap. xx.) asserts (on the authority of his own brother, resident at Avignon, who received his information from the treasurers of the pope) that the treasure found on the death of John XXII. amounted to more than eighteen millions of florins in gold coin; while that in services of the table, crosses, crowns, mitres and other trinkets of gold and precious stones, rose to about seven millions more—total, twenty-five millions of golden florins. The greater part of this was amassed by John, and chiefly by his reservations of all the benefices of all the collegiate Churches of Christendom. His ordinary pretext was the liberation of the Holy Land.

The ‘*Storia or Nuova Cronica*,’ of Giovanni Villani, a citizen of Florence, begins at the earliest age and continues to the year of his death, 1348. It chiefly relates to the affairs of Florence, and is most instructive during the last century. His brother Matteo continued the *History* (with an addition by his own son Philip) as far as the year 1364.

by John, prepare us to believe much that is asserted respecting the methods of his exaction.

But the circumstance, by which this pontificate was most distinguished, and which for a moment raises us from the sordid details of fraud and extortion to the recollection of the loftier vices of the Gregories and the Innocents, was a contest which the Pope perseveringly maintained with the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria. Having entered at greater length, perhaps, than was necessary into the description of the two former conflicts between the empire and the holy see, and of that also between Philip and Boniface, we shall not pursue the particulars of this last and feeblest effort of declining papacy. The leading events are briefly these. The Electors assembled at Frankfort in 1314 were divided; and while some chose Louis for successor to the throne, others supported Frederic, Archduke of Austria. John* refused to confirm either of the Pretenders, and they continued to dispute the empire with the sword till the year 1323, when Frederic was defeated and taken prisoner. The Duke of Bavaria then took upon himself the imperial administration, without at all soliciting the sanction of the Pope. Thereupon the latter pronounced sentence against him, and prepared to support Leopold, the brother of Frederic. Louis boldly appealed to a General Council, and to a future and legitimate Pope, and he received in return an ineffectual sentence of excommunication and deposition. In the mean time, the war between the opposite parties had been maintained with great fury in Italy, and upon the whole to the advantage of the Guelphs, through the powerful aid of the King of Naples, still faithful to the Roman see. Consequently Louis was pressed to cross the Alps. He assembled a parliament at Milan, and assumed with great solemnity the iron crown. From Milan he advanced to Rome: the celerity of his march anticipated all opposition, and the ceremony of his coronation was there performed, with abundant pomp and acclamation, in January, 1328. Vigorous measures of hostility were at the same time adopted—a sentence of degradation against John XXII., and the appointment of a new and imperial Pope, who assumed the name of Nicholas V. But though an emperor might at this time be sufficiently powerful to répel with impunity the pontifical censures, his aggressive attempts were at least as futile as those of his adversary. Nicholas was rejected by the Catholic world; and, after two years of vain pretension, surrendered his title and his person† to John. The Emperor had been previously compelled to retire from Rome. So that, after a fruitless contest of about seven years, the relative situation of the combatants was little altered; and the sentences

* In a bull published in 1317, John maintained that all imperial vicars lost their authority at the death of the Emperor, and that it devolved on the Pope. 'God himself,' he continued, 'has confided the empire of the earth, as well as that of heaven, to the sovereign pontiff. During the interregnum, all the rights of the empire devolve upon the church; and he who, without the permission of the apostolic see, continues to exercise the functions entrusted to him by the Emperor in his lifetime, offends against religion, plunges into crime, and attacks the divine Majesty itself.' See Sismondi, Rep. It., ch. xxix. This claim was pressed more than once by the Avignon Popes—the more eagerly because the legitimacy of 'the King of the Romans' was involved in that of the Emperor; and the Pope, who pretended to the prerogatives of the one, had a nearer interest in usurping the functions of the other.

† According to the account of Giovanni Villani (lib. x. cap. clxiv), he was delivered up by the Pisans, and sent to Avignon. He threw himself at the feet of the Pope, and prayed for mercy: e con bel sermone e autorità se confessò peccatore eretico col Bavero insieme, che fatto l'avea. It should be added, that John treated him extremely well, and that he died a natural death, at Avignon three years afterwards.

of degradation and deposition, mutually reiterated, had no other effect than to prove to the world (though not so to the individuals engaged) that there was something in the claims of both parties extravagant and unfounded; and that the temporal authority on the one hand, and the spiritual on the other, though occasionally confounded by the abuse of both, were in fact, as they were in essence and origin, independent.

We observe that, in one respect at least, Louis deviated during this contest from the tactics of his two predecessors, and adopted those of the French King. The appeal from the authority of the Pope to that of a General Council was the severest wound which could be inflicted on papal arrogance. It was more than that,—since it led almost necessarily to the limitation of papal power. In an age of darkness, such an appeal might have been treated as a wanton, though bitter insult. But reason was at length awakened, and men were beginning to consider what ought to be, as well as what had been. The promulgation of a new and grand ecclesiastical principle, on the authority of a king and an emperor, would excite some consideration even among the most bigoted; and there would be few who did not begin to entertain a question respecting the spiritual omnipotence of the Pope.

Another measure was taken by the Emperor, also after the example of Philip, which tended more directly to the same end. In the Assembly held at Milan, at which *Charges of Heresy against John XXII.* several prelates attended, John XXII. was formally impeached on the charge of heresy. Sixteen articles were specified, in which he erred against the constitutions of the General Councils; and he was pronounced to have virtually forfeited the pontifical dignity. It was a bold proceeding in Louis, on the judgment of a provincial meeting of his own partizans, to convict the Vicar of Christ of heretical depravity*. It was indeed to repel usurpation by usurpation, and to seize the spiritual sword in his strife to recover the material. The accusations were probably false, and certainly fruitless: they acquired no general credit at the time, nor have they adhered to the memory of the accused. Nevertheless, the mere assumption of papal fallibility in matters of faith by two powerful monarchs, and the vigour of the measures taken on that assumption, naturally confirmed the confidence of those whom reason had already led to the same conclusion.

But it also happened very strangely, that the same extraordinary charge was again incurred by John XXII. towards the end of his life, and with much greater appearance of reason. In some public discourses delivered in the course of the years 1331 and 1332, he had rashly declared his opinion, that the souls of the faithful, in their intermediate state, were indeed permitted to behold Christ as a man; but that the face of God, or the Divine Nature, was veiled from their sight until their reunion with the body at the last day†. The publication of this new doctrine produced a

* The Pope's disputes with the Spiritual Franciscans had raised a considerable party, even in the church, against him. Besides, all the theologians and sectarians, who were discontented with papal government, declared in favour of Louis. See the latter part of this chapter.

† Mosh., Cent. XIV., p. ii., ch. ii. 'The recompense of the saints, before the coming of Jesus Christ, was the bosom of Abraham; after his coming, his passion, and ascension, their recompense, till the day of judgment, is to be under the altar of God, that is, under the protection and consolation of the humanity of Jesus Christ. But after the judgment they shall be on the altar, that is, on the humanity of Jesus Christ, because then they shall behold not only his humanity, but also his divinity as it is in itself; for they shall see the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' These are the expressions of John, as given by Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xxi.

deep sensation throughout Christendom. The immediate admission to the beatific Vision, a received and popular tenet, had been openly impugned by the highest spiritual authority: it became necessary either to resign the tenet or to condemn the Pope. Robert, King of Sicily, warmly exhorted John, whom he had attached by a long and useful alliance, to retract the offensive declaration. Philip VI. of France united with equal ardour in the same solicitation. The most learned Dominicans, together with all the doctors and divines of Paris, humbly urged the same entreaty. Laymen joined with churchmen, the friends of the Pontiff with his bitterest enemies, in rejecting and denouncing his error. The Pope was so far moved by such general and powerful interference, that he assembled, at the close of 1333, his Cardinals in public consistory; and after having caused to be read in their presence all the passages of all writers who had treated the subject, (the labour of five days,) he protested that he had not designed to publish a decision contrary to Scripture or the orthodox faith; and that, if he had so erred, he expressly revoked his error. This explanation may possibly have been considered somewhat equivocal; at least it had not the effect of allaying the irritation which prevailed, and a second consistory was appointed for the same purpose in the December following. But on the evening preceding its assembly, John was seized by a mortal malady. Nevertheless, he summoned his Cardinals around him, and one of the last acts of his long life (he died at 90) was to read in their presence a bull, containing the following declaration: 'We confess and believe that souls purified and separated from their bodies are assembled in the kingdom of heaven in paradise, and behold God and the Divine Essence face to face clearly, in as far as is consistent with the condition of a separated soul. Anything which we may have preached, said, or written contrary to this opinion, we recall and cancel*.' Still even the expiring confession of the Pontiff was not considered sufficiently explicit to satisfy the measure of orthodoxy; and thus it came to pass that John XXII., after having ruled the apostolical church for above eighteen years, which he passed for the most part in amassing treasures†, in fomenting warlike tumults, and in chastising heretics, died himself under the general imputation of heresy. But the error of the pontifical delinquent was discreetly veiled by the church which it scandalized; and when Benedict XII., his successor, hastened, in the year following, to restore the unanimity of the faithful respecting the Beatific Vision, he described it as a question which John was preparing to decide, when he was prevented by death‡.

The reasons which gave such popularity to the orthodox opinion on this subject, and excited such very general opposition to the other, were chiefly these:—If the Virgin, the Saints, and Martyrs, were not yet admitted to the Divine presence; if they were only in distant and imperfect communication with the Deity, it was absurd to uphold their mediatorial office; it was vain to supplicate the intercession of beings who had no access to the judgment-seat of Christ. Moreover, the mere insult thus offered to the dignity of the saints, and the disparagement of their long-acknowledged

* Bzov., Ann. 1334. i. Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xxxviii.

† In the histories of his life we find many edicts directed against alchymists and the adulterers of coin,—proving at least how much of his attention was turned in that direction. He issued money from the pontifical mint, and counterfeited, with some loss of reputation, the florins of Florence. Giov. Villani, lib. ix., cap. clxx.

‡ In the bull *Benedictus Deus*, of which the substance is given by Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xlv.

merits, were offences very sensibly felt and resented throughout the Catholic world. Another reason is likewise mentioned; and it may, in fact, have been the most powerful motive of dissatisfaction—if the dangerous opinion were once established, that the souls of the just, when liberated from purgatory, must still await the day of judgment for their recompense, the indulgences granted by the Church would be of no avail; ‘and this (as the King of France very zealously proclaimed) would be effectually to vitiate the Catholic faith*!’

Benedict XII. was born at Saverdun, in the county of Foix, and was the son of a baker. He possessed considerable theological learning, but such little talent for the management of an intriguing court, that he suspected and proclaimed his own incapacity† for the pontifical functions. But it proved otherwise; for he brought to that office a mind sensible of the corruption which surrounded him, and of the abuses which disfigured his Church, and he employed his useful administration in endeavours to remedy such of them as were placed within his reach. In the first exercise of his power, he dismissed to their benefices a vast number of courtly ecclesiastics, who preferred the splendour, and perhaps the vices, of Avignon to the discharge of their pastoral duties. A large body of cavaliers had been maintained by the pomp of his predecessor, with whose services Benedict immediately dispensed. He was sparing in the promotion of his own relatives, lest the king should make them the means of exerting influence over himself. He undertook the serious reform of the Monastic Orders—not confining his view to the less powerful communities, but purifying, with indiscriminate severity, the poor and the opulent, the Mendicants, Benedictines‡, and Augustinians; and the Order of Citeaux, to which he had himself belonged, was the first object of his correction. He established numerous schools within the monasteries, and also compelled the young ecclesiastics to frequent the universities of Paris, Oxford§, Toulouse, and Montpellier. In the education of the clergy he saw

* See the end of the Tenth Book of Giovanni Villani. In the course of the controversy, excited solely by his own vanity, John professed the most impartial desire for truth; but it was observed that he showered his benefices most liberally upon those who supported the new opinion. Philip of France came boldly forward as the champion of orthodoxy, and the inviolable unity of the Church—‘dicendo laicamente come fidel Christiano, che invano si pregherebbero i Santi, ò harebbesi speranza di salute per li loro meriti, se Nostra Donna Santa Maria, e Santo Giovanni, e Santo Piero, e Santo Paolo e li altri Santi non potessero vedere la Deitade al fino al dì del Giudizio, e havere perfetta beatitudine in vita eterna; e che per quella opinione ogni indulgenza e perdonanza data per antico per Santa Chiesa, ò che si desse, era vana. Laqual cosa sarebbe grande errore e guastamento della Fede Catholica.’

† The cardinals, twenty-four in number, agreed with an unusual decision and unanimity, ascribed by some to divine inspiration, by others to a ridiculous mistake. Jacques Fournier (such was his name) being also a cardinal, was present at his own election, and when he heard the determination of his brethren, he reproached them with having elected an ass. He was certainly the least eminent member of the Sacred College; and to that circumstance, according to Giovanni Villani (lib. xi. cap. xxi.), he was indebted for his elevation. The cardinals, intending in the scrutiny to throw away their votes, fatally concurred in heaping them upon him—‘ch’era tenuto il più menomo de’ Cardinali.’

‡ Vit. Benedict. XII. ap. Baluzium. Benedict has been celebrated by the pen of Petrarch—

Te cui Telluris pariter Pelagique supremum
Contulit Imperium virtus meritumq; pudorque.

Yet we observe (in Bzovius, ann. 1339, s. 1.) that on one occasion this virtuous pontiff reserved the appointment to all the prelacies of all the churches for the space of two years. Did he overlook in his reforming zeal the abuses by which he profited?

§ About twenty years later, an Archbishop of Armagh complained, that when he was

the only reasonable assurance for the stability of the Church. Lastly, he even displayed a willingness to restore the papal residence to Italy, if it should appear that his Italian subjects were desirous of his presence; but the Imperialists were at that moment so powerful, and the party-spirit so highly inflamed, that he received little encouragement in that design.

Clement VI., who succeeded Benedict, in the year 1342, did not imitate his virtues; but while, in his public deportment, he more nearly followed the footsteps of John XXII., he appears *Clement VI.* even to have outstripped that pontiff in the license of his private life. He was scarcely installed in his dignity, when he was addressed by a solemn deputation from the Roman people. It consisted of eighteen members*, one of whom was Petrarch; and it was charged with three petitions. The first was, that Clement would accept, personally and for his life only, the offices of Senator and Captain, together with the municipal charges; the second, that he would return to the possession of his proper and peculiar See; the third, that he would anticipate the Secular Jubilee ordained by Boniface VIII., and appoint its celebration in the *fiftieth* year. The Pope accepted for himself the proffered dignities, but without prejudice to the rights of the See; to the second, which was an important and wise request, he returned a friendly but decided refusal; but the third, which only tended to swell the profitable abuses of religion, he accorded without hesitation. The following is the substance of the bull which he issued (in 1343) for this purpose—‘That the love of God has acquired for us an infinite treasure of merits, to which those of the Virgin and all the Saints are joined;—that he has left the dispensation of that treasure to St. Peter and his successors;—and consequently, that Pope Boniface VIII. had rightfully ordained, that all those who in the year 1300, and every following centurial year, should worship for a specified number of days in the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Rome, should obtain full indulgence for all their sins. But we have considered (he continues) that in the Mosaic Law, which Christ came spiritually to accomplish, the fiftieth year was the jubilee and remission of debts; and having also regard to the short duration of human life, we accord the same indulgence to all henceforward who shall visit the said churches, and that of St. John Lateran, on the fiftieth year. If Romans, they must attend for at least thirty following days; if foreigners, for at least fifteen.’

This proclamation was diligently published in every part of Christendom, and excited an incredible ardour for the Pilgrimage. During a winter of unusual *Celebration of the Jubilee.* inclemency, the roads were thronged with devout travellers, many of whom were compelled to pass the night without shelter or nourishment, in the fear of robbery, and the certainty of extortion. The streets of Rome presented for some months the spectacle of a vast moving multitude, continually flowing through them, and inexhaustibly renovated. The three appointed churches † were thronged

resident at Oxford, the University contained thirty thousand students; whereas, at the time when he wrote (in 1358) it contained only six thousand. The reason given for the decrease was, that the Mendicants, who occupied several of the chairs, had seduced so many of the young students into their Order, that parents were no longer willing to expose their children to that risk.

* The orator on this occasion was Colas di Rienzo, afterwards the Tribune of the Republic.

† ‘In visiting the three churches (says Matt. Villani), including the distance from his lodging and the return to it, each pilgrim performed about eleven miles. The streets

with successive crowds, eager to throw off the burden of their sins, and also prepared to deposit some pious offering at every visit.

It is affirmed, that from Christmas till Easter, not fewer than a million, or even twelve hundred thousand strangers, were added to the population of the pontifical city; for as many as returned home after the completion of the prescribed ceremonies, were replaced by fresh bands of credulous sinners,—and those again by others, in such perennial abundance, that, even during the late and unwholesome season of the year, the number was never reduced below two hundred thousand. Every house was converted into an inn; and the object of every Roman was to extort the utmost possible profit from the occasion: neither shame nor fear restrained the eagerness of their avarice. While the neighbouring districts abounded with provisions, the citizens refused to admit a greater supply, than was scarcely sufficient to satisfy, at the highest expense, the simplest demands of the pilgrims; and thus those deluded devotees, after surmounting all other difficulties on their errand of superstition, were at length delivered up to be starved, as well as plundered, by the inhabitants of the Holy City. Such was the moral effect produced upon the Roman people by a festival, which was established for their pecuniary profit, and which disturbed the social system through every rank and profession, from one end of Christendom to the other*.

Clement renewed with Louis of Bavaria those vexatious disputes, which had been begun by John XXII., and conducted with so little advantage or honour to either party. Neither had the present difference, after many haughty words, any lasting result; though it seems probable, that the Pope might have succeeded in exciting a civil war in the dominions of his adversary, had not the latter escaped that calamity by death. The same pontiff defended his temporal prerogatives in a correspondence with Edward III. of England. At another time, publicly and in full consistory, he presented to Alphonso of Spain the sceptre of the Fortunate Islands. Nor was this right contested: the less so, perhaps, since St. Peter had claimed, in much earlier ages, the peculiar disposal of all insular† domains. Clement also made an important acquisition to the patrimony of the Apostle by the purchase of the city of Avignon. The jurisdiction over that territory belonged to the Queen of Naples, as Countess of Provence; and for 80,000 golden florins she consented, in a moment of poverty, to part with the valuable possession. A splendid palace, which Benedict XII. had begun, was now completed and amplified by Clement; and the luxury of the cardinals followed, at no very humble distance, the example of the popes. These circumstances seemed to remove still farther the prospect of the Pope's restoration to his legitimate residence, and thus heightened

were perpetually full, so that every one was obliged, whether on foot or on horseback, to follow the crowd; and this made the progress very slow and disagreeable. The Holy Napkin of Christ was shown at St. Peter's every Sunday and solemn festival, for the consolation of the pilgrims (*Romei*). The press then was great and indiscreet; so it happened that sometimes two, sometimes four, or six, or even twelve, were found there crushed or trampled to death.'

* This account is abbreviated from Mattoo Villani, lib. i. cap. lvi. It is to be observed, that the Pope received a share of the oblations left by the pilgrims in the different churches. Clement VI. employed the fruits in an unsuccessful attempt to recover the property of his church from the nobles, who had usurped it.

† Urban II., in his Bull of 1091, presented the island of Corsica to the Bishop of Pisa; and we all recollect that our Henry II. received from Adrian IV. the donation of Ireland. En quoi (says Fleury) ce qui me paroît le plus remarquable n'est pas la prétention des Papes, mais la crédulité des Princes. But credulity, like many other weaknesses, is very commonly the offspring of interest.

the alarm, which some were beginning to entertain for the stability of the papal power.

Clement VI. died five years afterwards, in 1352—celebrated for the splendour of his establishment, for the sumptuousness of his table, and for his magnificent display of horses, squires, and pages; for the scandalous abuse of his patronage; for manners little becoming the sacred profession, and for the most unrestrained and unmuffled profligacy*.

During the vacancy of the see, the cardinals, while in conclave, passed certain resolutions for the limitation of the pontifical power and the extension of their own wealth and privileges; and the whole body bound themselves by oath to observe them. One of their number was then elected, Etienne Aubert, bishop of Ostia, who took the name of Innocent VI.; and almost his earliest act was to annul, as pope, what he had subscribed as cardinal. We must detest his private perjury; yet, as the Sacred College had no power of legislation, unless under the presidency of the pope, and as their office while in conclave was expressly restricted to the election of a pope, their constitutions could not legally be binding either on the church or on the future pontiff. The attempt of the cardinals is chiefly important, as it shows the power and the arrogance into which they had risen during the disorders of the Church; and the conduct of the pope is remarkable, as having furnished an example and a plea to several of his successors, who violated similar engagements in after times with the same perfidy. In every instance the future pope was a voluntary party to the compact deliberately made in conclave; in most cases he confirmed it after his election; he finally broke or evaded it in all.

*Oath or Capitulation
taken in Conclave.*

Yet Innocent VI. was a man of simple manners and unblemished moral reputation; and having found the Church nearly in the same condition in which John XXII. bequeathed it to Benedict, he imitated the latter in his judicious efforts to reform it. But, though he held the See for more than nine years, it seems doubtful whether his mild and perhaps feebly executed measures were effectual in removing any important abuse. At least, in the year 1358 we perceive him engaged in a dispute with his German clergy, not respecting the relaxation of their discipline, but upon a subject which was usually much dearer to the Popes of Avignon. Innocent demanded an extraordinary subsidy of the tenth of all ecclesiastical revenues, for the use of the apostolical chamber. The clergy of the three provinces of Treves, Mayence, and Cologne boldly refused payment; the spirit of interested opposition spread rapidly; and all orders of ecclesiastics throughout the whole empire united to resist the demand. The Pope yielded without struggle or remonstrance; but he immediately sought his consolation in the exercise of one of the grossest usurpations of his See.

* See Matt. Villani, lib. iii. cap. 43. He delighted to aggrandize his relatives, by conferring on them baronies in France, and raising them, however young and abandoned, to the highest dignities. 'At that time there was no regard to learning or virtue; it sufficed to satiate cupidity with the Red Hat—Huomo fù di convenevole scienza, molto cavallaresco, poco religioso. Delle femine essendo Archivescovo non si guardò, ma trapassò il modo de' secolari giovani Baroni: e nel Papato non sene seppe contenere ne occultare; ma alle sue camere andavano le grandi dame, come i prelati, e fra l'altre una Contessa di Torena fù tanto in suo piacere, che per lei faceva gran parte delle grazie sue. Quando era infermo le Dame il servivano, e governavano come congiunte parenti gli altri secolari. Il tesoro della Chiesa sribuì con larga mano. Delle Italiane discordie poco si curò, &c.' We observe, that some of the cardinals so appointed incurred the severe reproach of Innocent VI. by their undisguised debaucheries. Matt. Villan. lib. iv. cap. lxxvii.

He sent his messengers into every part of Germany, with orders to collect half the revenues of all vacant benefices, and to *reserve** them for the use of the Holy See. The Emperor (Charles IV.) approved the resistance of his bishops †; but on the one hand he denounced, in the strongest language, their pride, their avarice, and luxurious indulgences; while, on the other, he warmly demanded of the Nuncio from Avignon, wherefore the pontiff was so forward in taxing the property of the clergy, so remiss and languid in the restoration of their discipline? We should add, however, that Innocent, on his side, did not disregard that appeal, but turned himself to restrain the vices of the German prelates; while the Emperor exerted his authority to protect them from the spoliations to which they were perpetually liable from powerful laymen.

He was succeeded, in 1362, by Urban V., whose reign was distinguished by the first serious attempt to restore the pontifical court to *Urban V.* Rome. On the solicitation of his Italian subjects, urged by the eloquence of Petrarch ‡, and on an understanding of perfect friendship and mutual co-operation with the emperor, he abandoned the splendid security of Avignon, and departed, with his reluctant court, for Rome. On his way, a popular tumult at Viterbo dismayed and even endangered some of the cardinals; but no other impediment was offered; and in October, 1367, the pope once more occupied the half-dismantled palace of his predecessors. He divided a peaceful residence of about three years between Rome § and Montefiascone, where he passed the summer months; and his alliance with Charles IV. of

* Even the see of Avignon was left without a bishop during this and the preceding pontificate; it was reserved, and its revenues usurped by these popes at their own pleasure. Thus it would seem that the reforms of Innocent VI. were not more disinterested than those of Benedict. See *Vita Urbani V.* ap. Baluz. and Baluzius's Notes.

† In an assembly of the princes of the empire held on this subject in 1359, Conrad d'Alzeia, Count Palatine, who was charged with the defence of the clergy, addressed the meeting to this effect:—'The Romans have always considered Germany as a mine of gold, and have invented various methods to exhaust it. And what does the pope give in return, but epistles and speeches? Let him be master of all the benefices as to their collation, but let him leave the revenues to those who own them. We send abundance of money into Italy for divers manufactures, and to Avignon for our children who study there, and who there solicit, and let us not say purchase, benefices. No one is ignorant what sums are every year carried from Germany to the court of Rome, for the confirmation of prelates, the obtaining of benefices, the carrying on of suits and appeals before the Holy See—for dispensations, absolutions, indulgences, privileges and other favours. In all former days the archbishops used to confirm the elections of the bishops their suffragans; but in our time John XXII. violently usurped that right. And now another pope demands from his clergy a new and unheard-of subsidy, threatening his censures on all who shall refuse or oppose. Resist the beginning of this evil, and permit not the establishment of this degrading servitude.'—(Fleury, l. xcvi. s. xxxviii.) It was in the same year that the Emperor addressed to the Archbishop of Mayence the following complaints respecting the secular habits of his Clergy:—*De Christi Patrimonio ludos, hastiludia et torneamenta exercent; habitum militare cum prætextis aureis et argenteis gestant, et calceos militares; comam et barbam nutriunt, et nihil, quod ad vitam et ordinem Ecclesiasticum spectat, ostendunt. Militaribus se duntaxat et secularibus actibus, vita et moribus, in suæ salutis dispendium et generale populi scandalum, immiscent.*—The passage is cited by Robertson, *Hist. Charles V.*, B. ii.

‡ 'Cogita tecum' (says Petrarch) 'in die ultimi iudicii an resurgere amas inter Avinionicos peccatores famosissimos nunc omnium qui sub celo sunt, an inter Petrum et Paulum, Stephanum et Laurentium, &c. &c.' The same argument, which is the concluding one, may probably have been adopted a few years afterwards by Catharine of Sienna. Petrarch became a very ardent eulogist of this Pope.

§ The Pope had the honour, during this period, of entertaining *both* the Emperors as his guests. Charles IV. visited him at Montefiascone in 1368; John Palæologus in the year following at Rome.

Germany, whatever may have been the dispositions of his subjects, guaranteed him against any political outrage. Nevertheless, in 1370, probably on the persuasion of the French cardinals *, he returned to Avignon, where he died immediately afterwards.

Again was a Frenchman, Gregory XI., elected to the chair, and he professed his inclination to repeat the experiment which had been made by his predecessor; but his resolution *Gregory XI.* was weakened and retarded by the intrigues of his countrymen. He listened, indeed, with attention to the prayer of a solemn deputation from the Roman people, in 1374; but he took no immediate steps to grant it. Two years afterwards he was still at Avignon, when he was again importuned on the same subject by a very different instrument of solicitation. There was one Catharine, the daughter of a citizen at Sienna, who had embraced the monastic life, and acquired extraordinary reputation for sanctity. In the rigour of her fastings and watchings, in the duties of seriousness and silence, in the fervency and continuance of her prayers, she far surpassed the merit of her holy sisters; and the austerities which she practised prepared people to believe the fables which she related †: for she professed to have derived her spiritual knowledge from no human instructor—from no humbler source, than the direct and personal communication of Christ himself. On one occasion especially she had been blessed by a vision, in which the Saviour appeared to her, *Catharine of Sienna.* accompanied by the Holy Mother and a numerous host of saints, and in their presence he solemnly espoused her, placing on her finger a golden ring, adorned with four pearls and a diamond. After the vision had vanished, the ring still remained, sensible and palpable to herself, though invisible to every other eye. Nor was this the only favour which she boasted to have received from the Lord Jesus: she had sucked the blood from the wound in His side; she had received His heart in exchange for her own; she bore on her body the marks of His wounds—though these too were imperceptible by any sight except her own ‡.

We do not relate such disgusting impiety, either because it was uncommon in those days, or because it was crowned by the solemn approbation of the Roman Church; for the wretched fanatic was canonized, and occupies no despicable station in the Holy Calendar: but it is a more extraordinary circumstance, awakening a deeper astonishment, that Catharine of Sienna was invited from her cell by the messengers of the Florentine people, and officially charged, by the compatriots of Dante and the contemporaries of Petrarch, with an important commission at the Court of Rome; the office of mitigating the papal displeasure, and reconciling the Church with the Republic was confided to her enthusiasm. She was admitted to an early audience. Her arguments, which she delivered in the vulgar Tuscan, were explained by the interpreter who attended her; and in conclusion, the Pope (assured, no doubt, of her devoted attachment to the Church) expressed his willingness to leave the

* Spondanus, Ann. 1370, s. iv. St. Brigida, who was at that time in Italy, is related to have assured the Pope, on the authority of an express revelation from the holy Virgin, that his return to Avignon would be immediately followed by his death—*abiit nihilo-minus.* Peter of Arragon likewise prophesied the Grand Schism from the same event.

† Fleury thinks that she believed them herself, and he may be right:—*Une imagination vive, échauffée par les jeûnes et les veilles, pouvoit y avoir grande part: d'autant plus, qu'aucune occupation extérieure ne détournoit ces pensées.*—Liv. xvii. s. xl.

‡ On the body of St. Francis the wounds were *visible*—a distinction conferred, as his disciples assert, on him alone. See Spondanus, ann. 1376. s. iv.

differences entirely to her decision*. But the embassy of Catharine was not confined to that object only; for, whether in obedience to the wish of the Florentines or to the suggestions of her own spirit, she urged at the same time the duties, which the pontiff owed to his Italian subjects, to the tombs of the Apostles, to the chair of his mighty predecessors; and her reasons are said to have influenced a mind already predisposed to listen to them.

Respecting the motives which created that disposition, it must be mentioned that the residence at Avignon was no longer recommended by that careless security which at first distinguished it from Rome. The open country had been invaded and the city menaced by one of those *Companies* of associated brigands who were the terror of the fourteenth century. During the pontificate of Innocent VI. the inhabitants and the court had been compelled to seek for safety sometimes in their arms †, sometimes in their riches; and though the danger might not be very pressing, yet being near at hand and fresh in recollection, it perhaps influenced beyond its importance the councils of Avignon. The Pope's resolution, however, still wavered; and was at length decided by a second embassy from Rome, which arrived about two months after the visit of St. Catharine. The envoys expressly assured him, that unless he returned to his See, the Romans would provide a Pope for themselves, who would reside among them; his cardinal legate at the city gave him the same assurance; and it afterwards appeared, that overtures had already been made to the Abbot of Monte Cassino to that effect. This was no moment for delay. Gregory immediately departed for his capital; and thence, whatever may have been his private intentions, he was not destined to return.

The place of the death of a pope was at that time of more lasting importance to the Church than his living residence, because the election of a successor could scarcely fail to be affected by the local circumstances under which he might be chosen. There could be no security for the continuance of the papal residence at Rome, until the crown should be again placed upon the head of an Italian. At Avignon, the French cardinals, who were more numerous, were certain to elect a French pope; but the accident which should oblige the Conclave to assemble in an Italian city, might probably lead, through the operation of external influences, to the choice of an Italian. That accident at length occurred, and its consequences will be pursued in the following chapter.

SECTION II.

IN the meantime, the account which has been given of the pontiffs of Avignon is sufficient to throw some light on their individual merits, and, what is of much more consequence, on the general character and principles of their government. But a deeper consideration of this important period, suggests some reflections which it is proper to express; while there are some facts, less closely connected with papal biography, but not less strictly appertaining to the history of the Church, which have not been noticed, but which cannot wholly be overlooked. Accordingly, we shall first observe the decline which took place, during these seventy years, in

* Spondanus, ann. 1376, s. ii. It does not appear, by the way, that the Florentines were ready to extend the same deference to her judgment. See Sismondi, chap. xlix.

† Matt. Villan., lib. vii. cap. xcvi.

the pontifical power, and point out some of its most efficient causes. We shall then inquire, whether any attempts were made to obviate that decay, by measures of reform or renovation. The heresies which divided the Church, and the efforts which aimed to extinguish them, will be the last, and not the least instructive, subject of our examination.

I. The various and desultory warfare, alike savage in its circumstances and fruitless in its results, which was waged in Italy by the legates and mercenaries of the Pope*, in defence of the patrimony of St. Peter, is described by the civil historians of those times; nor shall we descend to recount the intrigues which were employed in the same contest, or the bulls which were so repeatedly and vainly *Decline of the* launched from Avignon. But the evil, which these *papal power.* measures were intended to repress, was deeply felt at the time, and was fatally pernicious in its consequences. We have observed that, even during his residence at Rome and in the fullness of his power, the Pope was seldom in undisputed possession of the apostolical domains. But, in the season of his emigration, he could place little reliance on the friends whom he had deserted, while the licence of his enemies and depredators increased without restraint. Cities and populous districts were thus separated from the ecclesiastical states, and several among the Roman barons, who were his feudatories, usurped in perpetuity the lands of the Church. The deficiency thus occasioned in the pontifical treasury must needs be supplied from some new source; since the change in nation and residence had abated nothing of the pomp and prodigality of the Vicars of Christ. The funds to which they had chiefly recourse for this purpose were twofold. By the more general and easy sale of indulgences, they levied a productive tax upon the superstition of the people; at the same time they made a dangerous experiment on the submission of the clergy by various imposts on all ecclesiastical property†. The right of presentation to all vacant sees appears to have been first usurped by the Popes of Avignon. It was abused as soon as usurped; and the system of reservation deprived the diocese of its pastor, while it carried away its revenues into the apostolical chancery. At the same time the frequent contribution of tenths and first-fruits, raised under crusading or other pretences, gave deeper offence to the sacred order, as it touched their interests more directly and personally. It was vain to imagine, that the monstrous

* It is truly remarked by Sismondi, that the Avignon Popes prosecuted these wars with greater ardour, than they would have done, had they been resident in Italy, or than they could, had they drawn their resources only from Italy. They suffered no personal dangers, they saw nothing of the evils which they inflicted, and they derived their supplies from the contributions of the whole church. The complaints which the Florentines had against the papal *Gubernatores* are enumerated with great warmth by Leonardus Aretinus. Hist. Florent., lib. viii., 181, 2.

† The following are mentioned as the sources of the papal exactions from England during the fourteenth century:—(1.) Peter's Pence; for the supposed support of the English pilgrims at Rome: it scarcely exceeded 200*l.* a-year. (2.) King John's census, of 1000 marks. This was tolerably well paid, till the time of Urban V., in 1366, when king, clergy, lords, and commons, proclaimed the payment illegal, and it ceased. (3.) The payment of First-fruits. The origin of this is referred to the presents which, in very early ages, a bishop at his consecration, or a priest at his ordination, paid to the officiating prelate. It was abolished by Gregory the Great, but soon grew up again, and insensibly came to be rated at a year's income. Presently, when prelates obtained their sees by provisions, those first-fruits flowed into the apostolical treasury. Those of smaller benefices were at first granted, seemingly in the thirteenth century, to bishops and archbishops. At length, Clement V. reserved for his own use all first-fruits, and John XXII. imitated his example. See Lingard's History.

system of papacy could long subsist, unless supported by the attachment and almost unanimity of the ecclesiastical body; nor could such concord easily take place, unless the Pope could contrive to identify his interests with those of the clergy, or at least to persuade the clergy of such identity. But from the hour that his exigencies could only be supplied at their expense,—that his dignity, his luxuries, his very vices, tended to impoverish, and no longer to enrich, them; from that hour a very powerful, though very sordid instrument of connexion began to give way, and the discontent, which might originate in pure selfishness, found abundant fuel, as well as ample justification, in the manifold abuses which disgraced the papal court.

Still there had been less danger from this disaffection, had the Popes pressed their impolitic exactions with any show of moderation; had they been contented to satisfy their necessities, or even to maintain with judicious liberality the ceremony and pomp of office.

Rapacity of the Popes, and profligacy of the Court. But so far were they removed from any such discretion, that it rather seemed their object so to reign, as to unite prodigality with avarice—to spend profusely and hoard insatiably. It was this spirit of rapacity which presided over the councils of Avignon. The lofty pretensions which animated and even dignified the Pontiffs of former days, were degraded into mere lifeless instruments to the lowest worldly purposes. We seek not now for the deep religious enthusiasm of the earliest Popes, for that had long been extinguished; but the exalted and magnanimous audacity of the Gregories and even the Innocents,—the settled *ecclesiastical* fanaticism (if we may use the expression), which so long dazzled the reason of man,—these too had at length given place to baser principles and passions. The cloud of mystery, which had so long hung over the chair of St. Peter, filling the nations with awe for the invisible power and majesty residing there, was at length dispersed and broken away, and in its place was discovered the nakedness of human turpitude. The charm of opinion began gradually to dissolve; and whatsoever prejudices many still retained in favour of the papal government, they were weakened by the sordid motives which now directed it; and an unpopular vice became still more detested, when it was found engrafted upon the ecclesiastical character.

Another cause, which materially assisted, during this period, in hastening the decline of papacy, was the shameless profligacy of the court of Avignon. There is no dispute as to this fact; and even moderate writers have strained their language, in order to present a just picture of that deformity. We refer not to the partial philippics of Petrarch; nor to the unholy name of Babylon, which may first have been affixed to the city of the Popes, from a similarity in crime. But when Denina assures us, that the licentiousness of the clergy became excessive and universal, from the time that the scandals of Avignon had removed all restraint and shame; and when Sismondi* declares, that that people and that court made themselves manners out of the vices of all other nations, those historians do not exceed the testimony of contemporary authorities. The causes and sources of this pestilence are disputed: it is ascribed by the French writers to the importation of Transalpine fashions and morals into their less corrupt climate; while the Italians retort the charge of greater impurity, and enlarge, perhaps with more justice, on the temptations

* Denina, *Delle Rivoluz. d'Italia*, lib. xv., cap. vi. Sismondi, *Rep. Ital.*, chap. xlviii. See Baluz., *Pref. in Vitas Pontif. Avenionensium*.

which may ensnare a bishop who resides at a distance from his diocese, who is surrounded by a court of prelates also non-resident, without any spiritual care or any restraint from the observation of the people. Howbeit, this argument would have had more weight, had the court of Rome been less polluted: but whatever may have been the comparative delinquencies of Rome and Avignon, it is at least certain, that the latter were more indecent and more notorious; that offences, which (if they were really practised) had been heretofore veiled or only partially known; were now exposed and stigmatized universally; and that the only alternative thenceforward remaining to the pontifical government was to correct those flagrant abuses, or by their means to fall*.

The publication of the celebrated bull, called *Unam Sanctam*, in which Boniface VIII. asserted the extreme pretensions of his see to both descriptions of supremacy, may be viewed, perhaps, as the great Crisis in papal history. As far as that moment, nothing had been ceded in the pontifical claims, and nothing abated in the arrogance with which they were pressed. It may be, that their foundations had been silently crumbling beneath them, but their actual instability was still concealed by outward show and magnificent pretension. But from this point the descent was perceptible, and it soon became very rapid; and Philip, having penetrated the secret of the real weakness of the see, effectually brought about its humiliation. His attack on the personal safety of Boniface, though in a great measure defeated by the undaunted constancy of that Pontiff, disclosed to the whole world the domestic insecurity of the Bishop of Rome.

Still it must be acknowledged that a Pope, as long as the seat of his government was his own capital, could not ever be the mere dependent of any sovereign; and this is the argument by which Roman Catholic writers most plausibly defend the temporal power of the Chief of their church. But no sooner had he crossed the Alps and transferred his court to France, than he descended to the condition of a subordinate prince. It was in vain, that the formalities of respect, and even the show of equality, were observed: the influence of the King of France predominated in the councils of Avignon; and the sense and the notoriety of temporal dependence discouraged the ghostly pretensions of the Pope, and blunted the edge of his weapons. For this, among other reasons, we are not surprised to observe, that the ecclesiastical censures lost much of their efficacy during this age; that they were received in various countries with various degrees of indifference, but that this indifference was everywhere increasing. Italy herself was the most conspicuous for the general neglect with which she treated them; and Italy, in her spiritual rebellion, did no more than imitate the pre-eminent obduracy of Rome. For Rome was irritated by the absence of her prelate; and her habitual contumacy and lawlessness found great pretence and some justification, when she was deprived even of the ordinary advantages of an episcopal residence.

Another severe, and even incurable, wound, was inflicted on papal despotism by the threat of appeal to a General Council, which was first urged by Philip, and eagerly repeated by Louis of Bavaria. That there was a power superior to the Pope within the church itself, was a principle

* During the pontificate of John XXII., complaints against the clergy began to break out very commonly in France, occasioned by the excess to which they carried their jurisdiction, as well as other offences. But Philip the Regent protected them,—‘*Jura ecclesiarum auxerim potius quam imminuta velim.*’ It is remarkable, that it was to this declaration that the kings of France are indebted for the title of *Catholic*,—so, at least, says Bzovius, *Ann.* 1329, s. xxiii.

which was sure to find many advocates even in the ecclesiastical body. Once broached, and on such high authority, it was commonly discussed, and by discussion gained ground; and though the progress of reason against established prejudice is usually very slow, the minds of many were prepared for this innovation during the first half of the fourteenth century; but it was not carried into full effect till somewhat later.

Of the dissensions which divided the church during this period, and which we shall presently notice, none probably occasioned so great scandal at the time, as the disputes carried on by the more rigid Franciscans against the Pope himself. Between the higher ranks of the secular clergy and their acknowledged head, we have observed differences not uncommon respecting their authority, their revenues, or the removal of their corruptions. But the regular orders had hitherto observed the strictest allegiance to a president, whose interests were inseparably connected with their own; and this was the first occasion on which the pontifical court was disturbed by the sound of monastic insubordination. There was danger in an example, which might be followed by any discontented branch of the priesthood; but the consequence, which really and immediately followed it, was to open the eyes of the laity to the deformities of the system, and to rouse them against those abuses, which ecclesiastics themselves no longer conspired to defend.

But another, and a still more certain instrument for the subversion of papacy had been now for some time in operation, and it acquired additional power during the fourteenth century; an instrument, independent of the accidents of papal 'captivity' or ecclesiastical discord, and one which, however aided by such circumstances, would surely have accomplished its task without them. Human reason had at length been awakened from its long lethargy; and though its first flights were wild and irregular, it was beginning to extend its influence and to know its authority. The means of education were multiplied, its character was varied and exalted; and what was most important to all purposes of general improvement, its advantages were no longer confined to a privileged body, but were diffused through every condition of society. The subjects, indeed, which still engrossed the greater portion of the learning of those days, were generally connected with theology, or with the constitution and discipline of the church. Still it was not to churchmen alone, that such discussions were confined. Those who profited by the ecclesiastical system were no longer the only persons qualified to argue respecting it. No sooner were the gates opened, than the laity rushed into that province with great eagerness; and the seeds of the Reformation were already scattered, though it was uncertain when they would break forth, or what fruits they would bear in their maturity.

II. The abuses which gave most offence at the commencement of this period, so as to excite the indignation of the better portion of the clergy, and even to claim the attention of the hierarchy, have been enumerated in a former page, as they were presented to the Council of Vienne. They were not corrected on that occasion, and they increased in consequence.

We must not, however, suppose, that no regulations were enacted under the Avignon Popes for the amendment of the ecclesiastical system; they were very numerous*; but the misfortune was, that they were generally

* A number of the Councils assembled for this purpose, and the principal canons enacted by them are mentioned by Semler, sec. xiv., cap. ii. The following are specimens:—Concil. *Coloniense*, ann. 1313. *Ne clericis publica pœnitentia imponatur, cum*

misdirected. They descended to insignificant particulars, or were fabricated by one portion of the clergy against another, or by the orthodox against the heretics; or they related to the imposts of the Pope and the means of evading them; they never reached those grand deformities which endangered the church, through the just offence which they gave to the laity. It is true that some papal constitutions were published both against the non-residence of the clergy and the holding of pluralities. But the first could not be consistently enforced by a prelate who had never visited his own see; and the Popes, though they held decisive language*, were manifestly insincere in the second. Or, if we are to admit that one or two among them were really earnest in their wishes and endeavours, they were at least prevented from taking measures to effectuate them by the fear of offending the most powerful, though perhaps the least deserving, part of the sacred body.

III. When Francis of Umbria first established his rigid Order, his rule was celebrated by the applause of successive popes. The impious fables which he propagated, *Divisions and Heresies*, respecting the miraculous impression of the Saviour's wounds on his body, and other such matters, were countenanced and dignified by the authority of the Church; he was adopted with eagerness into the family of the Saints†; and the extreme austerity of the institution seemed in some fashion to be sanctified by the superstitious reverence, thus studiously thrown around the name of the Founder. We are not, then, to be astonished when we observe, that several among his followers adhered to the very letter of his instructions with unprecedented pertinacity, and scorned the vulgar temptations to soften their severity. The example of relaxation set to them by almost every other Order, the desertion of the more numerous part even of their own brethren, the moderate indulgence enjoined by the Pope himself, were insufficient to seduce those honest fanatics from strict obedience to their law, or to abate the vivid faith which they placed in their master. For indeed it was

alii in albis procedunt, alii in nigris cappis, in facie laicorum. Ne fiant imprecationes contra aliquas personas. Concil. *Trevirensis*, *cj. ann.* Contra gerentes cucuteras, seu cucusas, mitras, virgatas, scacatas vestes. Contra convivia in exequiis. . . Ut ante vel post vel super altare sit imago, sculptura, pictura, in ejus Sancti meritum constructum sit. . . Si infans caput ex utero emiserit a muliere baptizetur; si solum caput vel pars corporis major appareat nec discerni potest sexus: dicat, *Creatura Dei*, ego, &c. &c., et erit baptizatus.

* John XXII. in 1317 put forth a constitution against all ambitious and avaricious clergymen, complaining of their non-residence, neglect of hospitality, the ruin of their churches, &c. And we observe, at the same time, that he deposed a bishop; not, however, on any of these grave charges, but for the offence of contumacy. (*Bzov.*, ann. 1317, s. xiii.) The same pontiff also published an edict against pluralities, beginning '*Erecrebilibis quorundam*,' &c., and continued in a strain of emphatic abuse. (See *Vit.*, (3tia.) *Joh. XXII.* ap. *Baluzium*.) Similar laws were launched, with the same inefficiency, by *Benedict XII.*, and afterwards by *Innocent VI.* A curious story is told to prove the zeal of this last. *Innocent*, before his elevation, had a favourite chaplain, on whom had been conferred seven benefices. As soon as he became Pope, the chaplain again presented himself, bringing with him a little godson, for whom he wished also to procure a benefice. But the Pope, like a just man, answered him: 'You have seven good benefices; resign the best of them to that boy.' On which, when *Innocent* saw that the petitioner was discontented, he again said, 'You have still six benefices, and fewer would suffice for your necessities: choose, then, for yourself the three best of them, and resign the others, that I may bestow them, for the honour of God, on three poor clergymen.' The Pope was highly applauded for that act, as having therein followed the path of spiritual, rather than carnal affection. See *Vita* (4ta) *Innocent. VI.*, apud *Baluzium*.

† Both Francis and Dominic were canonized by the same pope, *Gregory IX.* (about 1235); so likewise was *Anthony of Padua*, and other less considerable personages.

to faith that their feelings amounted, when they maintained that St. Francis was a second Christ—nothing inferior or dissimilar to the first; and that the institution which he left behind him was the true gospel of salvation.

Entire and absolute poverty, the complete renunciation of all property, whether common or personal, was the fundamental principle of the society, the only principle of Christian obedience—the only rule of evangelical perfection. In defence of that position, it became them at the same time to profess and argue, that the practice of Christ and his Apostles had been rigidly formed upon the same rule; and this became accordingly the question in dispute with their theological adversaries. Those adversaries, as we may well suppose, were neither few nor of humble rank. A courtly and luxurious hierarchy were scandalized by that unqualified assertion of the necessity of poverty; and Christ's imperious vicegerent upon earth was shocked by so homely a picture of the humility of his heavenly Lord.

Some unsuccessful endeavours were made in the preceding century to bring the Fratricelli, or Minorites (so they were denominated) to a more reasonable view of the gospel institution, and of the *spirit* of their own rule: but it does not appear that any personal outrage was offered them until the year 1306; and even then it proceeded, as was naturally to be expected, from the more worldly members of their own fraternity. From Italy, many then fled into Provence, and were scattered over the south of France; and at this time they are represented to have united with the Spirituals, and the Beghards and Beguines. The name Spiritual is said to have been first assumed by the followers of a schismatic of that age, named Pierre d'Olive; the others were the Tertiarii, or third order of Franciscans. All were equally opposed to the existing system of papal government. As their principles were henceforward identified, so also was their history; and the term *spiritual* is that by which the observers of the rule of absolute poverty were commonly distinguished from their less austere *Brethren of the Community*.

Clement V. interposed his mediation between these contentious mendicants; and at the Council of Vienna he issued the Bull *Exivi de Paradiso*, with the design of bringing them to concord by mutual concession. He permitted to the Spirituals the enjoyment of the most abject poverty; while at the same time, to such Franciscans as resided in barren countries, where the resources of mendicity were precarious, he allowed the use of granaries and store-houses, as places of deposit for their common alms. Nevertheless, though all acts of violence were for the moment suspended, the division of the Order continued as before, and the mutual animosity was in no degree abated; and a distinction in dress at this time introduced by the Minorites, who adopted a meaner and coarser habit, contributed no little to inflame the controversy.

Matters stood thus, when John XXII. was raised to the pontificate; and since the moderation of his predecessors had not availed to heal the schism, he entered without any delay into the opposite system. We observe that the Fratricelli are enumerated among the *heretics* condemned in an edict which he published in 1317; and in the year following he made them the object of a memorable bull:—"The glorious Church which has neither stain nor wrinkle, which Christ loved, and for which he delivered himself to death, that he might sanctify it by washing it with water in the Word of Life—this Church the Prophet knew by the revela-

tion of the Spirit to be placed before all nations; and admiring the splendour of so much dignity, he exhibited it under the similitude of royalty, saying—A queen stood on thy right hand, in gilded garments, &c. &c.*” After describing the nature of the union between Christ and his spouse the Church, and especially eulogising the charity of the latter, the Pope proceeded to expose the errors of the Minorites. He classed them under five heads, and showed how they combined the various enormities of the Donatists, of the Waldenses, and the Manicheans, while they also followed the ‘foul traces’ of Montanus† and Priscilla. The burden of their offence was contempt of the ‘bonds of the Church,’ and ‘disrespect for its ministers; howbeit, being convicted by the edict of John of certain condemned and stigmatized heresies, they were consigned by the same act to inquisitorial authority. The agents of oppression executed their part with no delay; and the very same year four of the Fratricelli were seized at Marseilles, and burnt to death.

From this moment the contest assumed a much more serious character. The devotion of the Spirituals was now sealed, and their resistance sanctified, by the blood of their martyrs; their zeal, their activity, their numbers everywhere increased; and the more violent were the proceedings of the inquisitors, the more advocates did the persecuted acquire, the more generally they rose into respect and consideration. Their great principle respecting the poverty of Christ was now made the subject of solemn deliberation; and the most celebrated divines of the age, especially those of Paris, were officially consulted on the question, and finally the Pope himself descended into the field of controversy—and happier had been his fortunes, and his memory more honoured, had he confined his hostility to that bloodless warfare. At the end of 1322 he published a Constitution, in which he confuted the arguments of the Franciscans, and asserted for the monastic orders the right of property, instead of the simple *use* of their immediate necessaries. The Spirituals rejected the right with the same obstinacy, with which it was dictated by the Pope; and it was at least a singular contest, and worthy of a more

* ‘*Gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, quam Christus dilexit, pro qua semet ipsum tradidit, &c. Nimirum ipsa Christi Sponsa Virgo Mater Ecclesia, quia inelyto Capiti suo Domino Jesu Christo inviolabilis fidei glutino copulatur, et ejus imperio prona obedientia substernitur, cum Illo unum effecta, tam incomparabilis unionis merito rebus omnibus, more regio, principatur. Quæ dum pia et devota religione terrena despicit, cælestia petit, omne sinistrum premens, à dextris Sponsi gloriosa consistit. Et quia geminæ charitatis splendore omni ex parte rutilat, in vestitu aureo etiam angelicis spiritibus admiranda coruscat. Cujus inæstimabilis decor, quia vario vivendi genere in una tamen charitate perficitur, quasi de vestis pulcherrima varietate lætatur.* . . .’

Such were the senseless and even impious rhapsodies, with which a very bad pope celebrated the corrupt church, which he still further corrupted by his acts and his eulogies;—not that he was really blind to its deformities, but because he was too timid or too wicked to correct them, and because he believed that the system, with all its vices upon its head, would still last and be profitable for his own time.

† In the account of Montanus (given in Chap. V. p. 69.) it is too confidently asserted that he professed to be the Paraclete or Comforter. It is indeed the deliberate opinion of Mosheim that he professed to be the Paraclete, sent down to complete the Christian system; but that writer supposes the fanatic to have distinguished between the Paraclete and the Holy Spirit, and not to have proceeded so far as to assert his identity with the latter. Bishop Kaye is of opinion that Montanus only laid claims to *inspiration* by the Holy Ghost; and he certainly shows that the distinction, supposed to have been made between the Holy Ghost and the Paraclete, has no foundation. It seems probable that the bishop’s opinion is correct. At least the only alternative is to believe, that Montanus pretended to be the Holy Ghost—an absurdity by no means unparalleled in the history of heresy.

religious age and more reasonable motives, where the one party indignantly repudiated the worldly possessions, which the other imperiously obtruded—where a body of beggars preferred the endurance of a deadly persecution to the sacrifice of the duty of poverty.

In this manner the dispute proceeded, until the rupture between John and Lewis of Bavaria became open and decided. Then the Emperor, as if to turn against the Church the old ecclesiastical policy, hastened to profit by the divisions of his adversary, and to foment the spiritual rebellion. The provinces of the empire were thrown open to all the denominations of schism and heresy; and the multiform enemies of papacy found refuge in the dominions of Lewis, and honour at his court. Marsilius of Padua, Cæsenas, Bonagrata, and William Occam, were the most illustrious among those exiles. They directed their eloquence, their learning, and their satire, both personally against John, and generally against the system of the Church; and their writings, which were eagerly read even by that generation, were transmitted with still greater profit to a less prejudiced posterity.

On the other hand, the Pope* was ardently supported by his Dominican emissaries. Their thirst for heretical blood was heated by a particular jealousy of the Franciscan Order. Wherever an avenue was open they penetrated. They pursued the fugitives even into the remote plains of Poland and Hungary, and introduced into those ignorant regions the machinery of the Inquisition. But France and Italy† were the scene of their most successful exertions; and these were not confined to the pontificate of John. Even the virtuous Benedict began his reign by an anathema against the Fratricelli; and it is remarkable, that, in the Constitution which he published on this occasion‡, the articles of their heresy are swelled to fifty-five. Their denial of *the power of the Pope to permit them to have property* is among the most curious, and not the least grave, of their offences;—some very gross absurdities were also imputed to them, which may have been calumniously, as indeed they may have been truly, alleged. . . . But there is one observation here necessary, which will tend to account for the great multiplicity and vagueness of the charges advanced. A furious war was at that time raging in Italy between the imperial and papal factions; and it was a part of the crooked policy of the churchmen of Rome to confound political enmity with spiritual perversity, and to brand the adversaries of the visible church with the crime of heretical depravity. Among the adversaries of the church they usually classed its reformers—those who were indeed its only real friends; and thus it happened, that the term heresy came now to comprehend every opinion unfavourable to the ecclesiastical government of the day, and the gates of the Inquisition received without distinction a various and indiscriminate multitude.

Still, as long as the reign of Lewis continued, a secure asylum was

* The history of John XXII. abounds with edicts against the various denominations of heresy. We are also bound to mention that he published (in 1326) one Constitution to repress the *too great zeal* of certain inquisitors in Sicily; but when we examine the nature of that zeal, we find that it had ventured to attack 'nostros et apostolicæ sedis officiales vel nuntios, &c.' John, as well as several other popes, extended more protection to the Jews than they enjoyed elsewhere.

† Vit. John XXII. ap. Baluz. Mosheim calculates, from various records published and unpublished, that the names of about two thousand persons, of both sexes, may be enumerated, who suffered martyrdom in France and Italy for their inflexible attachment to the poverty of St. Francis. Cent. xiv. p. 2. ch. ii.

‡ Bzov. ad ann. 1335. s. ii.

offered to all descriptions of Dissenters ; and these, being already connected by one common principle and one common wrong, may have adopted from each other the absurd opinions, which some of them certainly held. But the spirit which united them was deep animosity against the Pope, whom they accused in their turn of impiety and usurpation. In the year 1345 *, Lewis was succeeded by Charles IV. ; and as that Prince was chiefly obliged for his elevation to pontifical influence, so his policy followed the interests of the Court of Avignon. If the principles of the Bavarian had continued to govern his dominions for another generation, it is not improbable that the empire would have wholly freed itself from papal supremacy, and raised the banners of Reformation in the fourteenth century with no inconsiderable advantage to religion. But such anticipation of the more perfect triumph of a more enlightened age was cut short by the perfidy † of the Imperial counsels. The numerous insurgents against the despotism of Rome, whom Lewis had encouraged and protected and created, were betrayed by his successor into the hands of the avenger. The peaceful provinces of the empire, hitherto sacred from the inroads of persecution, were now thrown open to the Dominicans. Their irruption was supported by secular edicts and arms ; and the extirpation of the ' Voluntary beggars '—the enemies of the Church and the ' *Roman empire*, '—was pressed with equal ardour by the pope and the emperor. The houses of the offenders were given to the tribunal of the Inquisition, to be converted into prisons for heretics ‡ ; and their effects were publicly sold, for the equal profit of the inquisitors who ordered, of the magistrates who enforced, and of the poor who witnessed, their execution. The survivors fled towards the banks of the Rhine, to Switzerland, Brabant and Pomerania ; but they were followed by a tempest of mandates and bulls, and hunted by the keen Dominicans even into their most distant retreats ; till at length it is admitted, that the greater part of Germany was restored, after this sanguinary purification, to the peaceful embrace of the Church.

But neither edicts, nor bulls, nor inquisitors, could suppress the spirit of the schism, though they might extinguish its name ; and those who preserved their obedience to the more rigid rule, were still found to be so numerous, and the love of that discipline was still in some provinces so prevalent, that the popes at length thought proper to sanction the Institution. Accordingly, the Franciscan Order was by authority divided into two bodies, which subsist to this day—the more indulgent were called the Conventual Brethren—the more austere, the Brethren of Observance. The disputes which afterwards disturbed this arrangement were partial and insignificant ; and the historian may express his astonishment mixed with

* About the same time died William Ockham, ' pestilentissimus Hæresiarcha. '—Bzovius (ann. 1347, s. xxxvi.), though he designates this Englishman to have been ' omnium inceptor malorum, auctor scelerum, cultor tenebrarum, &c. &c. ' still does not attribute his death to divine interposition ;—which is the more surprising, because he had not hesitated to pronounce somewhat earlier (ann. 1321, s. xxi.) that Dante died through the peculiar vengeance of Heaven, which visited his calumnies against the popes.

† This is no ground perhaps for imputing to Charles *personally*, that his intolerance was aggravated by treachery. The individual stands convicted of persecution only. But the circumstance of this change adds one to the many instances, in which the steady, consistent perseverance of the Vatican has carried its point, through the fluctuations of the Imperial policy.

‡ See Mosheim, Cent. xiv. p. ii. ch. ii. Their crime is mentioned in the edict (published at Lucca in 1369) which condemns them. ' They are a pernicious sect, who pretend to a *sacrilegious* and heretical *poverty*, and who are under a vow that they neither ought to have, nor will have, any property, whether special or common, in the goods they use—which they extend even to their wretched habits.'

sorrow, that so simple a method of reconciliation could only be reached through the paths of intolerance and oppression.

The term Beghard was in this age commonly applied to the Tertiaries of St. Francis; and, though in its origin probably innocent of such principles, it was now involved in the guilt and fate of the anti-papal heresies. The 'Brethren of the free spirit,' the harmless mystics of the last century*, had been some time known by that appellation; and sometimes they are designated as *Lollards*, in the records of the following age. The reason of their confusion is, that both names were indiscriminately used by the Church to stigmatize those who dissented from it, without any new inquiry as to the grounds and points of their dissent. Mosheim, who has investigated this subject with great diligence, considers the Lollards † to have been a society of pious laymen, formed in the first instance at Antwerp, for the purpose of visiting the sick and burying the dead during a season of pestilence; for the clergy are affirmed to have deserted their official duties, as soon as they became attended with peril. The humane motives and religious practice of the new society caused it to spread throughout Flanders and many parts of Germany, and it was encouraged by the respect of the magistrates and the love of the inhabitants. Its success excited the jealousy, as indeed it reflected on the reputation, of all the clergy; but the Mendicants had perhaps a deeper motive for animosity against it, when they found that their own profits suffered through its gratuitous charity. Accordingly, they raised the customary clamours of impiety and heresy: under the mask of extraordinary holiness, the Lollards concealed forsooth the blackest errors and the most enormous vices! they were denounced at the pontifical throne, and their name has passed into the language of the Church to designate a misbelieving and sanctified hypocrite.

They *may* have held some foolish opinions—among those generally attributed to them the following are the most peculiar: that the mind ought to be called away from the external and sensible parts of religion, and fixed on inward and spiritual worship; that the soul which is wholly absorbed in the love of God is free from the restraint of every law, and may gratify its natural appetites without sin; that perfect virtue and perfect beatitude may be obtained in this world; and that persons so circumstanced are removed above every worldly consideration; so that the moral virtues, as well as the religious ceremonies, might be neglected without offence. Moreover they pretended that there were two Churches, the carnal Church, which was that of Rome; the spiritual, which was confined to their own society ‡ . . . Such were the crimes imputed to

* See Mosheim, Cent. XIII. p. ii. ch. v.

† Mosheim, Cent. XIV. p. ii. ch. ii. The word Lollard means a *singer*—as Beghard means one who *prays*. The former were also called the 'Cellite brethren and sisters—the Alexian brethren'—from the cells in which they lived, and the saint who was their patron. See Semler, *Secl.* XIV. cap. i.

‡ Other charges are instanced by Bzovius (*ann.* 1307, s. ix.) They held that the Mass, Baptism and Extreme Unction were useless ceremonies; that Lucifer was an injured being, and that the angels, as well as all the enemies of their own sect, would be finally condemned; that Mary did not continue a virgin after the nativity; that the body of the Lord in the Eucharist was not real; that marriage was only sanctified whoredom; that God neither punished nor regarded human sins. Besides this, they lay together promiscuously under the pretence of charity; they ate flesh when they would; they observed no festivals and derided the merits and intercession of the saints; and finally they were so obstinate under persecution, that whatever might be their sex or age, they

them by the Churchmen; and this last may really have been the secret of their offence. Yet, though we should believe them to have held almost every tenet with which they are charged, (for the contempt of moral duties was clearly not a tenet, but a consequence calumniously drawn by their enemies,) may we not discern, that the principle from which they departed was excellent and holy? It led them into some extravagances; but were those so gross, or nearly so detestable, as the deliberate absurdities which were committed by the Church itself during the same period?—the insertion into the Liturgy of ‘the words in which the angel Gabriel saluted the Virgin Mary’—the institution of festivals in honour of the lance, the nails, the crown of Christ*—the appointment of a holy day for the solemn celebration of the wounds of Christ, miraculously impressed upon the body of St. Francis! . . . If we should believe all the calumnies that churchmen have ever fabricated in vilification of the Mystics, we shall find among them nothing so irrational, nothing nearly so impious, as those authorized ecclesiastical mummeries.

The Lollards suffered some oppression in Austria and other countries; but a war of extermination does not appear to have been formally proclaimed against them. No doubt, they were confounded by the inquisitors, sometimes erroneously and sometimes wilfully, with the more avowed enemies of the papal government; and thus they shared that vengeance, which was chiefly intended for the Spirituals and Beghards. But whether through their greater obscurity or more manifest harmlessness, they escaped in comparative safety, without any direct attack,—and to this tolerance it may perhaps be attributed, that the sect of the Lollards † (properly so called) never rose into great power and never became dangerous to the Catholic Church.

During the reign of Clement V., a preacher named Dulcinus, attended by a woman called Margaret, his wife or his mistress, presented himself in Lombardy, and erected in the neighbouring mountains the standard of heresy. He was charged with contempt of the Catholic hierarchy, and with censuring the abuses of their immoderate wealth; also with asserting a succession of three theocracies—that those under the Father and the Son were already passed; that the third, under the Holy Spirit, was then in operation ‡. Lastly, to consummate his odium, his followers, who were not very numerous, were assailed with the primitive and accustomed calumny of promiscuous

unanimously preferred death to conversion. . . . In this strange and calumnious catalogue we may observe the malignity, with which some tenets, merely rejecting the innovations of Rome, are mixed up with the most horrible crimes and blasphemies. Yet this was one of the most vulgar among the artifices of the Churchmen of those days.

* Others might be added. For instance, John XXII. re-established with fresh indulgences the festival of ‘the body of Christ’—granting to all Christians a general pardon of forty days for every reverence made, on the name of Jesus Christ being pronounced by the priest. Giovanni Villani, lib. ii. cap. lxxix.

† The name Lollard, as is well known, was afterwards generally applied to various adversaries of the popish establishment; but the real origin both of the name and sect was probably such as has been here described.

‡ His followers called themselves ‘The Spiritual Congregation and the Order of the Apostles.’ ‘We alone (they said) are in the perfection in which the apostles were, and in the liberty which proceeds immediately from Jesus Christ. Wherefore we acknowledge obedience neither to the pope nor any other human being: nor has he any power to excommunicate us . . . The pope can give no absolution from sins unless he be as holy as St. Peter, living in entire poverty and humility . . . so that all the popes and prelates, since St. Sylvester, having deviated from that original holiness, are prevaricators and seducers, with the single exception of Pope Celestine, Pietro di Morone, &c.’ See Fleury, liv. xci. sec. xxiii.

prostitution. A *crusade* was preached by the Church against these miserable enthusiasts, and its enemies were led to the assault by a zealous bishop. Surrounded and pressed among the Alpine passes, many had already perished from cold and want, before the sword was drawn to complete their destruction. It did so most effectually; and Roman Catholic writers record without emotion, that the heretic was torn in pieces limb from limb, after his 'Spiritual Sister' had suffered before his eyes by the same torture. As the massacre is recorded without emotion, so its consequence is told without understanding or reflection—that the disciples of the martyr were multiplied by the deed, and increased beyond number*.

The history and heresies † of Wiclif also belong to this period; but we shall at present leave them unnoticed, as more immediately appertaining to English history, and already familiar to most readers. And if we pass from the name of that great patriarch of the Reformation to the mention of a transient sect of mere fanatics, we shall most faithfully exhibit the character of an age, in which the long reign of ignorance and error was first disturbed by the irregular struggles of reviving reason. The beginnings of those great revolutions, which renovate the whole frame of society, are invariably marked by some transient excesses, occasioned by the first fermentation of new and active principles, in a body not yet qualified to give them full efficacy. And so it befell in the present instance—an age, in which the true principles of Christianity were beginning once more to glimmer through the ecclesiastical system which had so long obscured them, was troubled by some of the wildest absurdities of superstition.

The sect of the Flagellants first betrayed its existence about the middle of the thirteenth century; but it was discouraged by the authorities both spiritual and secular, and seemingly repressed: nevertheless, about the year 1340, it broke out again with additional violence. Its first re-appearance was in Italy, in the neighbourhood of Cremona ‡: suddenly a multitude, amounting to ten thousand persons, issued from the surrounding cities and villages, and paraded the country, flogging themselves and (in the first instance) begging. The contagion spread with a rapidity which will afflict, but cannot surprise, the observer of religious absurdities; and in the course of ten years scarcely a country in Europe was exempt from its visitation. As the Flagellants increased in numbers, they adopted some sort of system and method in their fanaticism; which, though it may have varied under different circumstances, possessed the same general character. Naked from the loins upwards, and marked on their front and back with red crosses, they spread themselves in numerous bands over the face of Europe. Twice every day, in the most public places, they performed their discipline, until blood flowed from the wounds; and they completed their duties by one nocturnal and private flagellation. No one among them begged. No one was admitted into the society who was entirely destitute; no one, unless he had made a full confession of his sins, unless he had received the consent of his wife, unless

* *Supra numerum.* See Vita (4ta) Clementis V. apud Baluzium. Bzovius, ad ann. 1310. sec. xiii.

† Wiclif's Sixty-one Heresies are carefully enumerated by Bzovius, (ann. 1352, s. xv.) and that author expresses very sincere regret at his escape from the bishops, whom the pope had stirred against him. Indeed, notwithstanding his great protectors, the Reformer seems not to have been secure till the grand schism frittered away the power of papacy.

‡ Bzov. ann. 1340, s. xxiv.

he had forgiven his enemies every injury *. Their appearance and character chiefly moved the enthusiasm of the Germans, who opened their doors and entertained them at their tables. But it is affirmed, that they could never be persuaded to partake twice of the same hospitality, nor to prolong their visit beyond a single day: they then departed on their destination. Women were confounded with men in their irregular ranks; and as they advanced in indiscriminate procession, each bearing in his hand a wooden cross, they chaunted in their native language a hymn on the Passion of Christ, and frequently interrupted their song by prostration and prayer. Their eyes were ever downcast, and the aspect which they wore was solemn and sorrowful.

The innocence of their demeanour, the severity of their discipline, the very singularity of their enthusiasm attracted a multitude of proselytes; but as their numbers increased, their conduct no longer escaped reproach, and the offences of individuals threw suspicion and obloquy on the whole body. Moreover, as they presently began to preach to the people, and as their society was not authorised by the pope, many Lollards and schismatics eagerly mingled in their companies, and carried into them the name of heresy, and subjected them to that fatal charge. Accordingly, we read in the Roman Catholic records, that the Flagellants were a sect who slighted the priesthood and the *Gospel*—who had no reverence for the holy ceremonies, or even for the body of the Lord: such was the confidence (says Spondanus) which they placed in their own madness. By thirty-three consecutive days of flagellation, they held themselves absolved from the most heinous sins, to the disregard of the salutary penance and indulgences of the Church. And lastly, they maintained, that stripes were more honourable than martyrdom; that the baptism by water had passed away, and given place to the baptism by blood; and that through this last alone was there any road to salvation †. These charges were partly fabricated, and no doubt partly true; and even the limits of the truth and the falsehood are not difficult to discern; but the agents of persecution, who were presently in motion, were not retarded by any such considerations. They marched onwards in the path of destruction; and the Emperor Charles IV. encouraged and directed their zeal. It appears that, in the year 1351, a number of those pitiable enthusiasts were collected in Lithuania, in the exercise of their absurd practices. Pope Clement VI. proclaimed a holy war ‡; the Master of the Teutonic order marched in person against them; and after a solemn fast and public prayer, that God would aid him in the extirpation of His enemies, for the glory of His Holy Name, he assaulted them, and massacred eight thousand: the remainder, about two thousand more, were carried away captive into Prussia, that they might be restored, by a second baptism, to the bosom of the Church.

When we examine the various denominations of heresy which appeared in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and in the fourteenth most especially, we observe that almost all were directed, wholly or in part, openly or covertly, in tenet or in practice, against the sa-

General Character of these Heresies.

* See Bzov. ann. 1349, s. ii. It is the testimony of an enemy. Spondanus (ann. 1349, sect. ii.) who confirms these particulars, also mentions that the Flagellants professed the authority of a letter, or writing, sent down to them from heaven.

† See Mosheim, Cent. xiii. p. ii. chap. iii., and Cent. xiv. p. ii. ch. v.

‡ Bzov., ann. 1351, s. viii. The pretext alleged for this expedition was, that when two Mendicants, on some occasion, interrupted the devotion of the Flagellants, these had stoned one of them to death. It does not appear that they were armed.

cerdotal government and the system of the Roman Church. It was not so with those of earlier ages. Among the numerous sects which divided the ante-Nicene Christians, it has been already remarked, that not one originated in any disaffection for the ministers of religion, or the ecclesiastical polity. In the times which followed, the Arian and Incarnation controversies, with their numerous names and progeny, were confined to matters of faith. During the prolonged disputes which succeeded about the worship of images, no clamour was raised against the corruptions or undue aggrandizement of the hierarchy. The dissensions of the ninth century regarded the nature of the Eucharist and the doctrine of Fatalism, and the former of those subjects was revived in the eleventh; but no sect had hitherto risen in revolt against the abuses and tyranny of the Church. The standard was first erected in the twelfth age; and from that moment there was never wanting a succession of bold and righteous spirits who rallied round it. The depravity of the church system was indeed, in some respects, more scandalous in the fourteenth, than in any preceding century; yet was there no lack, even in much earlier ages, of such enormities, as might well have offended the reason and provoked the indignation of an evangelical Christian. But the fact was, that the civil institutions were at the same time so defective, and the dearth of knowledge so general, that the sins of the Church were overshadowed or kept in countenance by the secular depravity that surrounded them. Presently, as the social condition improved, the ecclesiastical abuses excited remonstrance and clamour; the foundations were shaken, and the edifice itself assailed; but the clamour was still the clamour of the few—the voice of enlightened individuals or of scattered sects: it did not yet endanger the established hierarchy, because it was not yet supported by the general prevalence of rational principles. The political system of the age still abounded with vices, and the learning in fashion was still perplexed with prejudice and fallacy. It is always with reference to such considerations as these, that we are to estimate the danger of ecclesiastical abuses and the *necessity* of reformation. It is not sufficient to compare existing defects with those which have been tolerated in the same church, or in a different church, in a different age. Such a comparison would only tend to blind and mislead us. They must be examined in relation to the measure of civilization actually abroad—to the prevalence of knowledge, to the authority of reason, to the general principles of human conduct. Thus it will happen, that a much slighter defect, in days of improvement and inquiry, may prove more perilous to the system in which it is suffered to remain, than a much grosser deformity in a darker age:—it is the access of light which renders the stain conspicuous and offensive. And therefore it has ever been among the foremost duties of churchmen, and their surest wisdom, to detect the blemishes in their institution, and having detected, to remove them: since it avails them little to be free from the vices of preceding generations, unless they share the spirit, and adopt, to a great extent, the character and principles of their own.

NOTE ON THE FRANCISCANS AND OTHER MENDICANTS.

(I.) As something has been said in this chapter respecting the intestine divisions of the Franciscans, it is proper here to mention the sect of the *Fratricelli*, or Ultra-Spirituals, who made some figure in the dissensions of the fourteenth age. They arose, in that which preceded, from the stock of St. Francis; and as they disclaimed any right even to the

use* of property, in which they surpassed the self-denial of the Spirituals, they may have deserved the praise which they arrogated, of being the *genuine* disciples of their Master. They professed great personal respect for Celestine V., who had been in some measure the founder of their Order; but they hesitated to acknowledge the legitimacy of his successors: they proclaimed the deep corruption of the Church, and they looked with ardent and almost pious enthusiasm for its immediate reformation.

This notion—that a thorough regeneration of the Church was near at hand, and that the reign of the true gospel was to be restored by the followers of St. Francis—was *The Eternal Gospel*, not the creation of the Fratricelli, nor was it indeed

of very recent origin. As early as the beginning of the thirteenth century, a work was circulated, abounding with such like prophecies, under the name of the *Eternal Gospel*. It was founded on the text †—‘I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the Everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth;’ and it was such, as Mosheim has designated it, the senseless production of an obscure, silly and visionary writer. The perfect scheme of revelation which it propounded was this—as there were three persons in the godhead, so was it necessary that there should be three dispensations. The first was that of the Father, which ended at the coming of Christ—the second was that of the Son, which was now on the point of concluding, to give place to the third, and last. This rhapsody was ascribed, but not with sufficient foundation, to Joachim, abbot of Flora in Calabria, who flourished about the year 1200; who had declaimed against the abuses of the Church, and predicted their extirpation. But in spite of the respectable name, under which it had sought protection, the *Eternal Gospel* would not perhaps have attracted any general notice, had it not been adopted by the Franciscans, who eagerly appropriated the prophecies. Accordingly, about the year 1250, it was again published, with an elaborate Introduction, in which the assertion was advanced, that St. Francis was the angel mentioned in the Revelations; that the gospel of Christ was immediately to give place to this new and everlasting scripture; and that the ministers of this great Reformation were to be humble and barefooted friars, destitute of all earthly possessions ‡.

The Gospel might have passed unnoticed and despised; but the introduction contained a doctrine too daring, if not dangerous, to escape ecclesiastical reprehension; and in the very year following its publication at Paris, the book was suppressed by Alexander IV. Yet such was the tenderness of a Pope for the reputation of the Mendicants, that the censures were lenient, and the edict was issued with reluctance.

The introduction has been commonly ascribed to no less distinguished an ecclesiastic than John of Parma, General of the Franciscans; though the opinion is more probable that it was composed by one Gerard, his friend. It is true, indeed, that writers of that order have entirely disclaimed the work, and imputed it to their rivals, the Dominicans, but without any plausible reason. And as the introduction was manifestly

* In 1279, Nicholas III. published a celebrated Constitution known as the Bull *Exiit*, in which he so interpreted the Franciscan Rule, as to prohibit to its observers every possession; but to permit them the temporary use of houses, books, &c. of which the property, in conformity with the edict of Innocent IV., was to reside in the Church of Rome.

† Revelations, xiv. 6.

‡ This account is chiefly taken from Mosheim (Cent. XIII. p. ii. ch. ii.) who has investigated the subject with great diligence.

a Franciscan fabrication, so is it extremely probable that the Eternal Gospel also proceeded from the same forge.

We should also mention one Pierre Jean d'Olive, a native of Sevignan, in Languedoc, who acquired some reputation towards the end of the same century, by a similar description of merit. He, likewise, was a leader of the Spirituals, a disciple of the Abbot Joachim, and a reformer of ecclesiastical iniquities. He published a work called *Postilla*, a commentary on the Revelations, in which he boldly denounced the Roman Church as the 'Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mistress of Harlots, and abominations of the Earth*.' But he mixed so much wild and senseless superstition with his reforming zeal, that his labours were neither profitable to the Church, nor dangerous to the despotism of the Pope.

(II.) We read from time to time of disputes, which arose in various countries between the Mendicants and the secular clergy, respecting the administration of several Church ceremonies, but most especially of the rite of Confession. It may, therefore, be useful to trace very concisely the history of that contest. A canon of the Fourth Lateran Council (commonly known as *Omnis utriusque Sexûs*) gave the entire power of receiving confessions to the priest; but Gregory IX., by a bull of Sept. 26, 1227, opened that privilege also to the Preachers. The curés resisted; and in 1250 the Faculty of Paris loudly declared in their favour: so that Innocent IV., who in 1244 had shown every disposition to favour the Mendicants, prohibited them, in 1254, from hearing confessions without the permission of the priest. But Alexander IV. immediately revoked this bull, and presently afterwards issued others, to the interest of the Mendicants. Great heats were thus excited, and in the hope to allay them, Martin IV. published, in 1282, a sort of edict of compromise, by which the Mendicants were permitted to receive confessions, yet so that the same persons were still obliged to confess once a year to their own priest, according to the canon of the Lateran.

Thereon arose a fresh question—whether the people were obliged again to confess to their curés the same sins which they had before confided to the Mendicants, and for which they had received absolution; and various appeals were made to the Popes on this point. Nicholas IV. delivered no express response; but Boniface VIII. published a decretal called *Supra Cathedram*, in which he engaged to grant the privilege to the Mendicants by his own plenitude, in case they had previously asked the favour of the Bishops, and it had been refused. Benedict XI. was still more decided; for he gave the Mendicants direct permission to hear confessions, and also decided that the people were not obliged to reconfess the same sins. This decretal, again, was revoked in the Council of Vienne, and replaced by the Clementine *Dudum*, which revived the Constitution of Boniface.

The above account, which is the bare outline of a tedious and angry controversy, is nevertheless sufficient to exhibit, not only the obstinacy with which the contending parties advanced or defended their privileges—not only the value which both of them affixed to the possession of that particular privilege, which contained indeed the grand secret of ecclesiastical influence, but also the vacillating policy of the Vatican, and the little consistency with each other or with themselves, which directed, in their councils, the chiefs of an infallible Church.

The above account, which is the bare outline of a tedious and angry controversy, is nevertheless sufficient to exhibit, not only the obstinacy with which the contending parties advanced or defended their privileges—not only the value which both of them affixed to the possession of that particular privilege, which contained indeed the grand secret of ecclesiastical influence, but also the vacillating policy of the Vatican, and the little consistency with each other or with themselves, which directed, in their councils, the chiefs of an infallible Church.

* Revelations xvii. 5.

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Grand Schism of the Roman Catholic Church.

Remonstrance of the Romans to the College—its reply—The Conclave—Probable extent of popular intimidation—Constitution of the Conclave—various designs of the parties—violence of the people—Election of the Archbishop of Bari, Urban VI.—his character, and general reception—his first acts of harshness, and their effect—The Cardinals retire to Anagni, and annul the election of Urban—they choose Robert, Cardinal of Geneva, Clement VII.—his character—real merits of the question—Retreat of Clement to Avignon—Division of Europe—St. Catharine and other enthusiasts—Conduct of Urban to six Cardinals accused of conspiracy—Death of Urban, and election of Boniface IX.—The Jubilee—its extension—Sale of indulgences—Privileges granted to some German towns—Exertions of the University of Paris for the extinction of the Schism—Address to the King—three methods proposed in it—favourable circumstances—Death of Clement VII.—Election of Pietro di Luna, Benedict XIII.—Grand embassy of the King to Benedict—its failure—Continued exertions of the King and the University—attempts to influence Boniface—his assurance to the Roman deputies—The French withdraw their obedience from Benedict—Blockade of the palace at Avignon—Benedict restored to liberty and office—simoniacal rapacity of Boniface—The Jubilee of 1400—Boniface succeeded by Innocent VII.—Death of Innocent—Solemn engagement of the Conclave—Election of Angelo Corrario, Gregory XII.—Attempt at a conference—Perjury of Gregory—Retirement of Benedict to Perpignan—Convocation of the Council of Pisa—proceedings of that council—deposition of the two competitors—and election of Alexander V.—his birth and character—Conduct of the Antipopes—Intercourse of Alexander with the Roman people—his death—Election of Baltazar Cossa, John XXIII.—Sigismund emperor—Convocation of the Council of Constance—choice of the place—its advantages—numbers of members—its objects—Proposition of John XXII.—Two opinions respecting the course to be followed—Arrival of Sigismund—Question as to the power of the Council over the Pope—division of the Council—it decides on the method of cession—cession of the Pope—suspicions of the Council—Escape of John from Constance—Question *de auferibilitate Papæ*—the Pope betrayed to Sigismund—his deposition, and the charges against him—his sentence—conduct and imprisonment—opinions of the justice of the sentence—Sigismund goes to Perpignan—Conference there—Union of all parties—Obstinaey of Benedict—he retires to Peniscola—is deposed by the Council of Constance—his conduct—the Council proceeds to the election of a new pope—Otho Colonna, Martin V. chosen—Observations—Death of Angelo Corrario—Pertinacity, death, and character of Pietro di Luna—Fate of John XXIII.—his liberation—return to Italy—counsels of his friends—he goes to Florence, and makes his submission to Martin—his treatment, conduct, and character.

THE number of Cardinals at the death of Gregory XI. was twenty-three, of whom six were absent at Avignon, and one was legate in Tuscany. The remaining sixteen, after celebrating the funeral ceremonies of the deceased, and appointing certain officers to secure their deliberations from violence, prepared to enter into conclave. But the rites of sepulture were scarcely performed, when the leading magistrates of Rome presented to them a remonstrance to this effect:—On behalf of the Roman senate and people, they ventured to represent, that the Roman Church had suffered for seventy years a deplorable captivity by the translation of the Holy See to Avignon; that during that period the capital of the Christian world had suffered more, both in its spiritual and temporal interests, than when it was subject to the cruel domination of the barbarians; that tumults, seditions, revolts, and sanguinary wars, had desolated, without interruption, the ecclesiastical states; that its cities and its provinces were in part usurped by domestic tyrants, and occupied in part by the neighbouring republics, or by the Lombard princes; that fire and sword were carried even to the gates of Rome, which had neither power nor authority to repress such fury;—so that the aspect of the Holy City, the head of religion, formerly venerable throughout the whole earth, was no longer to be recognised through its strange and foul disfigurements. That the sacred edifices, those august monuments of ancient piety, were left without honour, or ornament, or reparation, nodding to their ruin; that even the *Titles* of the cardinals, abandoned by those who derived their dignities from them, were left without roof, or gates, or walls, the abode of beasts, which

cropped the grass on their very altars. That the Faithful were no longer attracted to Rome, either by devotion, which the profanation of the churches precluded, or by interest; since the Pope, the source of patronage, had scandalously deserted his church—so that there was danger, lest that unfortunate city should be reduced to a vast and frightful solitude, and become an outcast from the world, of which it was still the spiritual empress, as it once had been the temporal. Lastly, that, as the only remedy for these evils, it was absolutely necessary to elect a Roman, or at least an Italian Pope—especially as there was every appearance that the people, if disappointed in their just expectation, would have recourse to compulsion. . . . The Cardinals replied, that as soon as they should be in conclave they would give to those subjects their solemn deliberation, and direct their choice according to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They repelled the notion, that they could be influenced by any popular menace; and pronounced (according to one account) an express warning, that if they should be compelled to elect under such circumstances, the elected would not be a pope, but an intruder*. They then immediately entered into conclave.

In the meantime the populace, who had already exhibited proofs of impatience, and whom the answer of the cardinals was not well calculated to satisfy, assembled in great crowds about the place of assembly. It may be true (though the circumstances rest for the most part on French and partial authority), that the civil magistrates had previously possessed themselves of the keys of the gates, which were usually confided to ecclesiastical officers, in order to preclude the escape of the cardinals to a more secure place of deliberation; that in the room of the ordinary police they introduced a number of *Montanarii*, the wild and lawless inhabitants of the adjacent mountains, who paraded the streets in arms by day and by night; that a quantity of dry reeds and other combustibles was heaped together under the windows of the conclave, with threats of conflagration; that, at the moment when the College was proceeding to election, the bells of the Capitol and St. Peter's were sounded *to arms* †:—these, and other circumstances of direct constraint and intimidation, are asserted by some writers, and though probably exaggerated, have undoubtedly some foundation in truth. . . . But it is without any dispute, that a vast crowd of people continued in tumultuous assemblage during the whole deliberation of the conclave ‡, and that the debates of the Sacred College were incessantly interrupted by one loud and unanimous shout—'Romano lo volemo lo Papa—Romano lo volemo—o almanco almanco Italiano!'—'We will have a Roman for Pope—a Roman, or at least, at the very least, an Italian!'

Let us now inquire, whether the College was then so constituted, as to make it likely that its free choice would have fallen upon a Roman, or even an Italian. Of the sixteen cardinals in conclave, eleven were French, one, Pietro di Luna, a Spaniard, and four Italians. The unanimity of the French would, of course, at once have decided the question; but it happened that they were divided into two parties. Seven amongst them were Limousins, natives of the same province; and having succeeded

* 'Quam si facerent, eos ex nunc avisaverunt, quod si ex ejus occasione aliquem eligerent ille non esset papa sed intrusus.'—Aut. Vit. Greg. XI. ap. Bosquet. *Maimb., Hist. du Grand Schisme*, liv. i.

† *Ad sturnum*, according to the Roman expression of that time.

‡ Spondanus, ann. 1378, s. viii. et seq.

during the last twenty-nine years, in electing four successive popes from their own country, they were naturally eager to keep possession of so profitable a distinction. But the other four, unwilling to appropriate the pontificate to a single district, even though that district was French, designed that the choice should fall on one of themselves. The Limousins found in their superior numbers their hope of success and their excuse for perseverance; and at length the others, being more keenly excited by provincial than by national jealousy, began to turn their thoughts to a coalition with the Italians. These last were equally bent on the election of one of their own party; and as their only chance of success arose from the division of the French, they very readily joined their forces against the exclusive ambition of the Limousins. Such were the intrigues which commenced immediately after the death of Gregory, and ripened during the eleven * days which followed; and such was probably † the state of parties when the cardinals entered the conclave. There were materials in abundance for long and angry dissension; and though the indignation of the Limousins against their compatriots might finally have forced their consent to the election of an Italian, rather than a native of any other French province, still it was not without a struggle, that they were likely to forego the courtly magnificence of Avignon, to which a French pontiff would surely have restored them, for a remote and tumultuous residence among the citizens of Rome.

But the internal disputes of the College were speedily silenced by the tempest from without. Even after the sacred body had been shut up in deliberation, the Bannerets, or heads of the twelve regions of the city, forced themselves, together with their disorderly followers, in contempt of custom and decency, into the recesses of the conclave. Here they repeated their demands with redoubled insolence, and direct menaces. The cardinals are recorded to have returned their former reply, with the additional declaration, that in case any violence were used, he, whom they should so elect, and whom the people would take for a real pope, would in fact be no pope at all ‡. The people received this answer with indignant clamours §; the disorder round the chapel augmented; the most frightful threats were uttered in case of hesitation or disobedience; and the same shout, which was indeed the burden of the uproar, continued to penetrate the conclave—‘A Roman for our pope! a Roman—or at least, at the very least, an Italian!’

* Gregory XI. died on the 27th of March, and the cardinals entered into conclave on the 7th of April.

† Fleury (liv. xvii. s. xlviii.) seems persuaded that there was some secret understanding in favour of the Archbishop of Bari (who was afterwards elected) even before the cardinals entered into conclave. But the view of Maimbourg is more probable, that so wide a division, with so many opposite interests and passions, was not so easily reconciled.

‡ *Ista verba manifestè sonant minas; et ideo expressè nos dicimus, quod, si per vos aut ipsos aliqua contra nos attententur, et contingat nos talium occasione et timore aliquem eligere, credetis habere papam et non habebitis, quia non erit.*—Vita Greg. XI. ap. Baluzium.

§ One of the cardinals addressed them from the window:—‘State a pace—perchè i Signori Cardinali dicono così, che domani faranno dire una messa dello Spirito Santo, e poi faranno che voi sarete contenti.’ Qui vero Romani maledicti tunc responderunt sic—‘No—mò lo volemo, mò.’ Et interim ridebant inter se, et unus faciebat alteri signum, ut plus clamarent ut supra. In circuitu item Conclavi erant maxima multitudo cum caboris et flautis, et eodem modo clamabant fortiter juxta posse.—Vita (secunda) Greg. XI. apud Baluzium. We should observe, however, that this is not the description of a sanguinary mob.

These were not circumstances for delay or deliberation. If any inclination towards the choice of an Italian had previously existed in the college, it was now confirmed into necessity; and on the very day following their retirement the cardinals were agreed in their election. Howbeit, they studiously passed over the four Italian members of their own body, and casting their eyes beyond the conclave, selected a Neapolitan named Bartolomeo Prignano, the Archbishop of Bari. The announcement was not immediately published, probably through the fear of popular dissatisfaction, because a Roman had not been created; and presently, when the impatience of the people still further increased, the Bishop of Marseilles went to the window, and said to them, 'Go to St. Peter's, and you shall learn the decision.' Whereupon some who heard him, understanding that the Cardinal of St. Peter's, a Roman, had been indeed chosen, rushed to the palace of that prelate, and plundered it—for such was the custom then invariably observed on the election of a pope. Others thronged in great multitudes to offer him their salutations; and then they bore him away to St. Peter's, and placed him, according to ancient usage, upon the altar. It was in vain that the good cardinal, enfeebled by extreme old age and painful disease, disclaimed the title, and trembled at the honours that were forced on him. 'I am not pope,' said he; 'and I will not be antipope. The Archbishop of Bari, who is really chosen, is worthier than I.' They ascribed his resistance to modesty or decent dissimulation, and continued through the whole day to overwhelm him with the most painful proofs of their joy. In the meantime the other cardinals escaped from the conclave in great disorder and trepidation, without dignity or attendants, or even their ordinary habiliments * of office, and sought safety, some in their respective palaces, and others in the Castle of St. Angelo, or even beyond the walls of the city. On the following day, the people were undeceived; and as they showed no strong disinclination for the master who had been really chosen for them, the Archbishop of Bari was solemnly enthroned, and the scattered cardinals reappeared, and rallied round him in confidence and security.

The archbishop's exalted reputation justified the choice of the college, and secured the obedience of the people. Through a long life, devoted to the service of the Church, he had reconciled the most ardent disposition with the most devout humility, and improved by assiduous study a powerful comprehension. He submitted to the utmost severity of ecclesiastical discipline; yet his deep and dangerous enthusiasm did not close his mind against the liberal pursuit of learning, and the patronage of learned men. His zeal for the Church was not stained by the suspicion of bigotry, nor inconsistent with a stern opposition to its abuses; and among many other virtues, he was perhaps chiefly famed for the rigorous exercise of justice. Such was the character to which Rome looked with sanguine hope for the repair of her declining fortunes; nor was it, indeed, without the general approbation of Christendom, that Urban VI. ascended the apostolical chair. The cardinals sent the customary communications to the courts of Europe of the free and canonical election which they had made †, and peaceably assumed their official stations about the person of the pontiff.

* *Recesserunt pedes, unus sine Capa, alter cum Capa, alter sine Capucio, soli, sine sociis scutiferis.*—Vit. Greg. XI. ap. Baluz.

† A similar announcement was made to the six cardinals remaining at Avignon, who immediately recognized the new pope.

The ceremony of coronation was duly performed, and several bishops were assembled on the very following day at vespers in the pontifical chapel, when the Pope, unexpectedly *His harshness*, addressed them in the bitterest language of reprobation. He accused them of having deserted and betrayed the flocks which God had confided to them, in order to revel in luxury at the court of Rome; and he applied to their offence the harsh reproach of perjury. One of them (the Bishop of Pampeluna) repelled the charge, as far as himself was concerned, by reference to the duties which he performed at Rome; the others suppressed in silence their anger and confusion. A few days afterwards, at a public consistory, Urban repeated his complaints and denunciations, and urged them still more generally in the presence of his whole court. In a long and intemperate harangue, he arraigned the various vices of the prelates—their simony, their injustice, their exactions, their scandalous luxury, with a number of other offences—in unmeasured* and uncompromising expressions; and while he spared no menace to give weight to his censure, he directed the sharpest of his shafts against the cardinals themselves. . . . There is not any dispute, that his violence proceeded from an honest zeal for the reformation of the Church; but the end was marred by the passionate indiscretion, with which he pursued it. The consistory broke up; and the members carried away with them no sense of the iniquities imputed, no disposition to correct their habits or their principles, but only indignation, mixed with some degree of fear, against a severe and discourteous censor †.

The cardinals continued, notwithstanding, their attendance at the Vatican for a few weeks longer, and then, as was usual on the approach of the summer heats, they withdrew from the city, with the pope's permission, and retired to Anagni. The four Italians alone remained at Rome. The others were no sooner removed from the immediate inspection of Urban, than they commenced, or at least more boldly pursued, their measures to overthrow him. On the one hand, they opened a direct correspondence with the court of France and university of Paris ‡; on the other, they took into their service a body of mercenaries, commanded by one Bernard de la Sale, a Gascon; and then they no longer hesitated to treat the election of Urban as null, through the violence which had attended it §.

To give consequence to this decision, they assembled with great

* "Nullo reprehensionibus modo imposito."—Ciacconius.

† "Hunc et posteris diebus, cessante jam metu, venerari ut pontificem perseverarunt. Sed fuit in illo homine natura inquieta et dura; et tunc præter spem ad tantæ dignitatis fastigium sublevatus intolerabilis videbatur. Nulla patribus gratia, quod se potissimum delegissent, nulla humanitas, nulla conciliatio animorum. Contumax, et minabundus, et asper malebat videri, et metui potius quam diligì. Ea perversitas Patres coegit metu et indignatione aliorum respicere. Itaque clam inter se de electione conquesti," &c.—Leonardus Aretinus, *Histor. Florent.*, lib. viii. ad finem. Leonardus was himself personally attached to the popes of that succession. By some the character of Urban is compared to that of Boniface VIII. Baluzius, the organ of the French opinion, represents him as a very monster—"Cujus electio facta arte diabolica."

‡ This learned and now influential body was courted with equal assiduity by Urban. In a letter addressed to it on this same occasion, that pontiff compared it to a constellation irradiating every other academy; to a fountain whence the purest doctrine perennially flowed; to a tree bearing excellent fruit. See Spondanus, *Ann.* 1378, s. xviii.

§ There exists a letter written during that crisis by Marsilius d'Inghen, ancient Rector of the University of Paris, who happened to be residing with Urban at that time. His description of affairs is such as we have given. See Fleury, l. 97, s. 52.

solemnity in the principal church, and promulgated, on the 9th of August, a public declaration, in the presence of many prelates and other ecclesiastics, by which the Archbishop of Bari was denounced an intruder into the pontificate, and his election formally cancelled*. They then retired, for greater security, to Fondi, in the kingdom of Naples. Still they did not venture to proceed to a new election in the absence, and it might be against the consent, of their Italian brethren. A negotiation was accordingly opened; and these last immediately fell into the snare, which treachery had prepared for ambition. To each of them separately a secret promise was made in writing, by the whole of their colleagues, that himself should be the object of their choice. Each of them believed what he wished; and concealing from each other their private expectations, they † pressed to Fondi with joy and confidence. The College immediately entered into conclave; and, as the French had, in the meantime, reconciled their provincial jealousies, Robert, the Cardinal of Geneva, was chosen by their unanimous vote. This event took place on the 20th of September (1378); the new pope assumed the name of Clement VII., and was installed with the customary ceremonies.

Robert of Geneva was of noble birth, and even allied to several of the sovereigns of Europe. He possessed talents and eloquence, a courage which was never daunted, and a resolution which was never diverted or wearied. Little scrupulous as to means, in his habits sumptuous and prodigal, he seemed the man most likely to establish his claims to a disputed crown, and to unite the courts of Christendom in his favour. His age, besides, which did not exceed thirty-six, gave promise of a vigorous and decisive policy.

Nevertheless, his first endeavours had very little success. It was in vain, that the sacred college sent forth its addresses to princes and their subjects, detailing all that had occurred at Rome, Anagni, and Fondi, and protesting against the violence, which occasioned the illegal election of Urban. It was argued, on the other hand, that the Cardinals had assisted at the subsequent ceremonies of enthronement and coronation; that they had announced their choice in the usual language to all the courts of Europe; that they had continued their personal attendance on the Pope for some weeks afterwards, and had even allowed four months to elapse, before they withdrew their obedience. Besides which, many, no doubt, were well pleased to see the chief of their church restored to his legitimate residence; they disliked the irregular influence of the French, and were glad to shake off their spiritual usurpation. In truth, the reasons, which were advanced with such ardour and obstinacy on both sides, were not perfectly conclusive for either; and though it is certain that the election was conducted under some degree of intimidation‡, the subsequent acqui-

* In this document, the cardinals, after describing the tumults of the Romans, declared, that they elected the Archbishop of Bari in the persuasion that, seeing the circumstances under which he was chosen, he would in conscience have refused the pontificate; that on the contrary, forgetful of his salvation, and burning with ambition, he consented to the choice; that under the effect of the same intimidation, he was enthroned and crowned, and assumed the name of pope, though he rather merited that of apostate and Antichrist. They then anathematized him as an usurper, and invoked against him all aids and succours, divine and human.

† They were now reduced to three, by the death of the Cardinal of St. Peter's,

‡ Sismondi (Repub. Ital., ch. l.) does not consider the choice of the Cardinals to have been decided by the tumult of the people, because after all they did not elect a Roman, and therefore incurred some danger even by that compromise with their independence.

escence of the Cardinals makes it highly probable, that the legitimacy of Urban would never have been questioned, had he followed the usual course of pontifical misgovernment, or even published his schemes of reformation with less earnestness, or more discretion. The severity of his rebukes rankled in the conscience of those who deserved them; and his menaces persuaded the court, that, to preserve its beloved impurities, it must depose the master who presumed to arraign them. A Pope, so dangerous to the vices* of the powerful clergy, could not hope to maintain without dispute an ambiguous right.

Such was the origin of the schism which divided the Roman Church for about forty years, and accelerated more than any other event the decline of papal authority†. We have related the particulars with some minuteness, not only in justice to the importance of the subject, but also to show, that the great difficulties, which were soon afterwards found, even by impartial judges, in determining the rights of the competitors, were not without foundation; but that both parties had a plausible plea for their respective obedience, though the true policy and interests of the church clearly recommended an undivided adherence to the cause of Urban.

The hopes of Clement were fixed on the court of France; he knew that prejudices in his favour naturally existed in that kingdom, and he knew, too, that the first steps towards *France declares his general acknowledgment must be taken there.* *for Clement.* Charles V., affecting great impartiality, and admitting the deliberation due to so grave a question, convoked at Vincennes a grand Assembly of his clergy, nobles, and council. This august body, after individually abjuring the influence of all personal considerations, expressed an unanimous‡ conviction of the legitimacy of Clement. The

However, the real object of the populace was effected, if they obtained a Pope who would probably *reside* at Rome: *this*, and not the place of his nativity, was the point which touched their interests,—and the election of a Neapolitan secured it almost as certainly, as that of a Roman. Upon the whole, it seems most probable (and the result of the second election confirms this) that, had no external influence been exercised, the Cardinals would have chosen an *Ultramontane*, or, at any rate, not the Archbishop of Bari. Sismondi's eloquent description of this affair is chiefly drawn from the contemporary account of Thomas d'Acerno, Bishop of Lucera, who was present. On the other hand, Baldus, a celebrated lawyer and adherent of Urban, does not dispute the influence of the popular uproar, but rests the legitimacy of that Pope on the subsequent confirmation and obedience of the sacred college.

* He strictly forbade the Cardinals, on pain of excommunication, to accept any presents. He endeavoured to restrain the luxury of all his prelates, and even to reduce their tables to a single dish,—a laudable moderation, of which he set the example himself. Again, he threatened the French, that he would create so many Cardinals as to place them in a minority in the college. "Item Cardinali de Ursinis dixit quod erat unus Sotus." (Thomas d'Acerno, p. 725.) His harsh and offensive manner increased the unpopularity of his proposed reforms.

† The entire number of the schisms, which have disturbed the Roman Catholic Church, is variously estimated by its historians. Johannes Marius, a Belgian, historian of Louis XII., (a Latin translation of whose work is published, together with that of Theodoric of Niem,) makes the *fated* number to be twenty-four,—the last of which, the Schism of Anti-Christ, the most deadly of all, had not yet in his time befallen. The first in his catalogue is that of the Novatians; the sixteenth was that occasioned by Gregory VII.; the twentieth by Frederick Barbarossa; the twenty-second was that, which we are now describing. His Book is divided into three parts, of which the second, "De Conciliis Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ," contains some useful information.

‡ In a Council previously held (on Sept. 8), to examine the rights of the dispute between Urban and the French Cardinals, before the election of Robert of Geneva, the majority declared for the Cardinals, though they advised the king still to suspend his de-

king was guided by their voice, and declared on the 13th of November in his favour. The Queen of Naples, the city of Avignon, and the six Cardinals who resided there, had already come to the same determination. In the mean time, a passionate warfare of bulls and anathemas commenced on both sides; but happily the thunders must on this occasion have fallen harmless, even in the judgment of a moderate Catholic, since it was impossible certainly to decide which were the genuine bolts; and the ambiguous election of the rivals placed them both in the situation of Antipopes, rather than of Popes.

But they were not contented with those innocuous conflicts; the rights which were ineffectually asserted by ecclesiastical censures, appealed for protection to the sword: a succession of combats desolated the South of Italy, and ended in the discomfiture of Clement. His first refuge was Naples; but at length, finding it impossible to maintain himself in Italy against an Italian rival, he retired to the residence most suited to his fortunes and his prospects, Avignon. From a city which was already consecrated by the tombs of so many Popes, supported by the court and nourished by the clergy of France, he bade defiance to his Transalpine adversary; and since he could not command, he was contented to divide, the spiritual obedience of Europe.

It does not enter into the plan of this History to pursue the affairs of the Church into all their connexions with political matters; to attend the march of papal armies, hateful alike in their reverses and their triumphs; or to trace the flimsy threads of intrigue, by which the momentary interests of Popes and kings have been suspended. It is enough to say, that, notwithstanding an intemperate ambition and some acts of singular imprudence, Urban continued to retain the greater part of his adherents. The

Division of Europe. Kings of Scotland and Cyprus, the Counts of Savoy and Geneva, the Duke of Austria, and some other

German princes, and even the Kings of Castille and Arragon, were finally united with France in allegiance to Clement. But the other states of Europe remained faithful to the vows, which they had earliest taken; and it was no unreasonable reply to the Antipope, Robert of Avignon, that he should be the last to reject that Pontiff, whom the Cardinal, Robert of Geneva, had officially recommended to universal obedience. The doctors and learned men of the age were similarly divided, and their division produced the most voluminous controversies. And lastly, as is observed by some Roman Catholic writers, many pious and gifted persons, who are now numbered among the saints of the Church, were to be found indifferently in either obedience; which sufficiently proved (they assert) that the eternal salvation of the faithful was not in this case endangered by their error. In this holy society, Catharine of Sienna was again conspicuous, as the advocate and adviser of the *Roman* Pope. She declared herself (says Maimbourg) loudly for Urban, and employed whatever talents, and eloquence, and force she possessed, in writing and exhorting all the world to acknowledge him. At the same time, in six epistles, which she addressed to himself, she discreetly recommended him to relax somewhat from that extreme austerity, which had made him so many enemies. To what extent Urban profited by that counsel we are scarcely able to decide, though some assert, that he held his holy monitress in much veneration. But we are credibly informed, that his predecessor, who had certainly been influenced by her

cision. Gibbon remarks, that it was the vanity, rather than the interest of the nation, which determined the court and clergy of France.

persuasions, when at length, on his death-bed, his stronger reason prevailed, called around him his friends and assistants, and solemnly cautioned them against all pretenders of either sex, who should propound their private revelations as rules of conduct and policy. ‘Since I, (he said,) having been seduced by such as these, and having rejected the rational counsel of my friends, have dragged myself and the Church into the perils of a schism, which is now near at hand, unless Jesus, her Spouse, shall interpose in his mercy to avert it*.’

Such persons, notwithstanding, were found in abundance on both sides; and their wild visions were interpreted by the devotees of the day, and recorded by the grave historians of after times; and it was this, among other circumstances, which has seduced Roman Catholic writers to the very consoling conclusion, that, though a schism did unquestionably exist, yet there were none who could properly be termed schismatics; that the adherents of Urban and of Clement were equally the children of the church; and that, while the faithful differed as to the name of the bishop, they were united in unshaken allegiance and attachment to the See †.

Certainly the character of Urban was not permanently softened by the admonitions of his inspired instructress; and to many reported acts of harshness and rigour he presently added one of positive barbarity. The following story rests on satisfactory evidence. A plot for his deposition had been set on foot, originating, as it would seem, with the King of Naples; and a paper, which had been circulated with that object, was placed in the hands of some of his Cardinals—for Urban had immediately supplied the defection of his original court by a large and, for the most part, respectable creation. How far they countenanced the propositions contained in it does not certainly appear ‡; but as by one of those the provisional government of the church was vested in the hands of the sacred college, it is not improbable that some may have assented to them. Urban discovered the conspiracy; he immediately seized six, the most suspected of the body, and after subjecting them to the utmost severity of torture, cast them into a narrow and noisome dungeon. This affair took place at Nocera, in the kingdom of Naples; but some reverses presently obliged the Pope to take refuge at Genoa. He carried his prisoners along with him in chains, and afflicted with severe hardships; and, during a year of sojourn in that civilised city, he could never be moved by the counsels of his friends, or the prayers of the republic which protected him, to re-

* “Ille positus in extremis, habens in manibus sacrum Christi Corpus, protestatus est coram omnibus, ut caverent ab hominibus, sive viris sive mulieribus sub specie religionis loquentibus visiones sui capitis; quia per tales ipse seductus, dimisso suorum rationabili consilio, se traxerat et ecclesiam in discrimen schismatis imminentis, nisi misericors provideret sponus Jesus.” See Gerson, *De Examinatione Doctrinarum*, Pars ii., consid. iii.

† Never, says Maimbourg, was the unity of the See better preserved, than during this schism.

‡ Respecting some of the particulars of this affair we have the directly opposite evidence of two contemporaries, who had both excellent means of information. Gobellinus was attached to the house of Urban, and he relates, as the report which had reached him, that the Cardinals not only assented to the plan proposed to them, but actually suborned false witnesses to convict the Pope of heresy, and intended to burn him on the day of his condemnation,—and that this appeared from their own confessions. Theodoric of Niem, who was on the spot, and one of the judges appointed by the Pope to try the Cardinals, attests that all of them constantly asserted their innocence, excepting one only, who confessed, in the agony of the torture, anything that was asked him. Though neither author is free from the charge of partiality, we must here give our credence to the latter account, recollecting, that even that does not necessarily acquit the accused. Fleury (*l. xviii.*, s. xx., xxi., &c.), who relates the particulars of the torture from Theod. de Niem with painful minuteness, certainly believes the conspiracy.

lease his captives. At length, when on the point of departure, as he feared the inconvenience or the scandal of dragging them after him through a second journey, and as he could not exalt his resolution to the performance of an act of clemency, if, indeed, it were not justice, he consigned five of them to sudden and secret* execution. The other, an Englishman named Adam Eston, Bishop of London, owed his preservation only to the frequent and pressing remonstrances of the English King. This affair took place in the December of 1386.

In the October of 1389, Urban died at Rome; and as soon as the glad intelligence reached Avignon and Paris, great wishes were expressed and some hopes entertained in both places, that the schism would thus terminate; that the Cardinals of Rome, wearied by the labours, the vicissitudes, and the dangers of the conflict, would voluntarily unite themselves with the college at Avignon, and acknowledge Clement for Pope, on the condition of his residence at Rome. In the

Election and character of Boniface IX.

university especially the public lectures were suspended, and no subject was discussed, except the probable determination of the Roman Cardinals. In the mean time, that body, on whose resolution at that moment so much depended, appear not to have been embarrassed by any hesitation as to the course before them. The members immediately assembled, to the number of fourteen; they entered into conclave, and elected, within a fortnight from Urban's decease, another Neapolitan for his successor. Pietro or Perrino Tomacelli, Cardinal of Naples, assumed, on the second of November, the name of Boniface IX., and was placed on the throne for which his ignorance† alone was sufficient to disqualify him. But the scandal of his ignorance was enhanced by his avarice. On the year following his accession, a Jubilee‡ was held at Rome, and the devout were exhorted to present themselves from every quarter.

The Jubilee. Unmoved by distance and expense, and even by the personal dangers which awaited them from the partizans of Clement or the *neutral* bandits of the mountains, great multitudes undertook, and many accomplished, the pilgrimage. The altars of the Roman churches were again enriched by the contributions of superstition; and if some part of the offerings was expended in the repair of the sacred edifices, by far the larger proportion flowed directly into the coffers of the Pope. But Boniface was not contented with that partial stream, which had found its way to his capital; and being desirous, no doubt, that even those of his children, who had not listened to his call, should still participate in the spiritual consolation, he sent his emissaries among all the nations by whom he was acknowledged, with commissions to sell the plenary indulgence to all indiscriminately, for the same sum

* Most assert that he threw them into the sea in sacks; others affirm that they were strangled in prison, and their bodies consumed by quick-lime. It is certain that they disappeared.

† Theodoric of Niem, lib. ii., cap. vi., 'scribendi atque canendi imperitus. . . Nemo prosperatur in illo quod ignorat; unde inscitia ferè venalis facta fuit in ipsa Curia, tempore suo. Fuit tamen satis edoctus grammaticæ ac disertus, sed non habuit in aliqua scientia præminentiam sive gradum.'

‡ The indication of this jubilee was the act of his predecessor. Urban VI., moved by the gradual abbreviation of human life, determined to reduce the interval (already reduced from 100 to 50) from 50 to 33 years,—this last space being the probable duration of Christ's sojourn on earth. See Spondanus, ann. 1389, s. ii. and iii. The new institution was to begin afresh from the year 1390; but it was not intended, as we shall presently observe, to supersede the secular celebration.

which the journey to Rome would have cost them. This absolution extended to every sort of offence, and appears not to have been preceded even by the ordinary formalities of confession or penance,—it was purely and undisguisedly venal. The necessary consequences of this measure were sufficiently demoralizing; but the evil was multiplied by the impostures of certain mendicants and others, who traversed the country with forged indulgences, which they bartered for their private profit.

Still dissatisfied, and determined to carry this lucrative mummery of the jubilee to its utmost depth, and, as it were, to fathom the superstition of his age, Boniface communicated the privileges of the holy city to two towns of Germany—Cologne and Magdebourg; and permitted them also to hold their year of Jubilee, after the fashion and example of Rome. By this rash act he disparaged the supereminent sanctity of the see of St. Peter, of the tombs of the apostles, and the relics of so many martyrs! He called in question the exclusiveness of that glory, which was thought to encircle the throne of the Vicars of Christ! He sacrificed—that which he least intended to sacrifice—even the temporal interests, even the pecuniary profits, which were ever closely connected with the peculiar holiness of the apostolical city. But his immediate greediness was gratified; his collectors were present in both places to share the offerings of the faithful; and when he perceived that their fatuity was not yet exhausted, he extended the licence still further, and accorded it to several insignificant places. At length, says Fleury, that Pope became so prodigal of his indulgences, that he refused them to no one, provided he was paid for them; the effect of which was, that they grew into contempt*.

In the mean time, the necessity of restoring the union of the church became more evident, and the expressions of that opinion more loud and general. Boniface himself professed an ardent though, as it proved, an insincere desire for the same consummation, and even addressed a letter to Charles of France (in April, 1393), in which he exhorted him seriously to undertake the sacred office of conciliation†. The king consented; the University of Paris eagerly caught at any hope of removing the scandal and the daily growing evils which attended it, and applied itself to discover the most efficient means. After mature deliberation, a public harangue was delivered before that body (in the June of 1394), by a doctor‡ appointed to the office, and after receiving their approbation, was presented to the king. It contained in substance, that there were three methods of healing the schism, any one of which might be adopted with reasonable hope of success:—the method of cession,—the method of compromise,—the method of a General Council. By the first the voluntary resignation of both competitors was recommended, in the presence of both colleges; these were then to proceed in conjunction to another election. By the second, the opposite claims might

*Projects of the
University of Paris.*

* The indulgence-mongers of Boniface IX., when they arrived in any city, suspended at their windows a flag, with the arms of the Pope and the keys of the Church. Then they prepared tables in the cathedral church, by the side of the altar, covered with rich cloths, like bankers', to receive the purchase-money. They then informed the people of the absolute power, with which the Pope had invested them, to deliver souls from purgatory, and give complete remission to all who bought their wares. If the German clergy exclaimed against this base traffic of spiritual favours, they were excommunicated. See Sismondi, *Repub. Ital.*, ch. lxii.

† It appeared, on subsequent explanation, that Boniface saw only one solution of the difficulty,—the expulsion of his rival, and the universal acknowledgment of himself,

‡ Nicholas de Clemangis.

be referred to certain arbitrators appointed by both parties, with the power of final decision. As to the third, it was suggested, in case of its adoption, that the Assembly should no longer consist of prelates only, many of whom were ignorant or passionately partial, but also of several doctors in theology and law, members of the most celebrated universities. Of the above methods, the University pronounced its own decided opinion in favour of the first,—as being the most prompt and expedient, the most proper to prevent expense and other difficulties, the most agreeable to the consciences of the faithful in both obediences, the most respectful to the honour of the princes, who had declared for the opposite parties. Yet was there an objection to this method, which, to many, as human nature is constituted, might have seemed at once conclusive against it:—was it probable, that, for the attainment of a public good, two men, in the enjoyment of very great power, dignity, and wealth, could both be persuaded to make a voluntary cession of those personal advantages, and to withdraw to a private, and perhaps insecure, retirement, from the loftiest eminence of ambition? Yet this difficulty does not appear to have been much considered in the outset, though it became manifest, even to the most sanguine, long before the termination of the contest.

In the same exposition, in which the remedies were thus pointed out, some of the monstrous evils which then afflicted the church were exhibited with little exaggeration; while all were naturally ascribed to the prevalent disease of the moment—the schism. It was forgotten that the greater number were rooted in the system itself, and only flourished somewhat more rankly on account of its accidental derangement. The church, it was declared, had fallen into servitude, poverty, and contempt. Unworthy and corrupt men, without the sense of justice or honesty, the servants of their intemperate passions, were commonly exalted to the prelacy; these plundered indifferently churches and monasteries, whatever was profane and whatever was sacred; and oppressed the inferior ministers of religion with intolerable exactions. The dominion of simony was universal; benefices and cures were conferred only on those, who had means to buy them; while the poor and learned candidate was hated the more for that very learning, which made him dangerous to corruption. And not only were the dignities of the church publicly bartered; not only were relics and crosses and the sacred vessels commonly exposed to sale; but the very sacraments themselves, those especially of ordination and penance, had their price in gold.

A political circumstance occurred at this moment which was favourable to the hopes of union. A truce for four years was signed between the kings of England and France—the most zealous supporters of the opposite parties. At the same time, the University of Cologne, though it acknowledged Boniface, and had probably profited by his patronage, entered into correspondence with that of Paris for the extinction of the schism;—and lastly, as if to place the result within the immediate reach of the pacificators, Clement VII. was so violently* affected by the proceedings at Paris, that he was struck with apoplexy, and died.

As soon as this intelligence reached Paris, the deputation from the

* When the earnest and reasonable exhortations of the University were pressed upon him—when he was assured that the evil had gone so far, that some began almost to advocate a *plurality* of popes, and the appointment of one to every kingdom—the infatuated bigot only started from his seat in anger, and declared that ‘the letters were poisoned, and tended to bring the Holy See into discredit.’

university instantly petitioned the king, that he would cause the cardinals to suspend the election, until some general measures should be taken to ensure the union; also, that he would assemble his prelates and nobles, and order processions and public prayers to the same end throughout his kingdom. Accordingly, a royal messenger was dispatched to Avignon, to prevent the meeting of the College, and prepare it for a special embassy; and on the success of this mission hung the hopes of Christendom. The envoy arrived at Avignon only ten days after the decease of Clement; but he found the cardinals already in conclave! Still, as the election was not yet made, he transmitted to them the letter of the king; but the College, suspecting its contents, and determined at any risk to have a pope of their own creation, deferred the opening of the letter, till their actual business should be completed. They then hastened to a decision; and Peter of Luna, Cardinal of Arragon, was raised by their unanimous voice to the divided throne.

Howbeit, they previously took a precaution, which was certainly necessary for their own credit, though there were few, probably, who expected any real advantage from *Election of Peter of Luna, Benedict XIII.* Before the election they drew up an act, by which they solemnly engaged to labour for the extinction of the schism, and to give every aid to the future pope for that purpose. It was moreover specified, that, if any one among themselves should be raised to the pontificate, this act should be equally binding upon him; and that he should even be prepared to cede his dignity, if his cardinals should judge it expedient for the concord of the Church. They then took oaths on the altar to observe this engagement.

Peter of Luna had long been distinguished for ability and address; he had discharged with vigour the offices entrusted to him; but there was also an opinion respecting him, which seems more than any other to have procured his elevation, and even at first to have reconciled all parties to it,—this was, that he ardently desired the union of the Church. This zeal he had been forward, while cardinal, to proclaim upon all occasions—even so far as to censure Clement for the want of it; and many hoped that it would burn with equal fervour under the pontifical robes. The University addressed to him congratulations, which were seemingly sincere, and Benedict XIII. (the name assumed by him) repaid them with the strongest protestations of good intention.

A grand council was then held at Paris, in which the method of cession again received the approbation of the great majority; and it was agreed, that an embassy should be sent to Avignon to treat with the Pope. The king added his authority, to give weight to this measure; and the more certainly to secure its success, he sent his brother and both his uncles (the Dukes of Burgundy and Berri) to conduct the negociation. Benedict received them with respect and deference; but when they opened the subject of their mission, and pressed the necessity of the cession, as the only road to concord, he found many reasons to urge against that particular method, as indeed against the other two, which had also occurred to the university. In the place of them, he proposed a conference with his rival, at which he affected to believe that matters might be accommodated. The ambassadors persevered in their proposal; and even the cardinals, on their strong solicitation, declared, with one exception*, for the method of cession. Nevertheless Benedict, during several weeks of repeated conferences and

* The Cardinal Bishop of Pampeluna, a Spaniard and compatriot of the Pope.

debates, inflexibly persisted in his refusal. At length the illustrious mission returned to Paris, without any other result than, the discovery of Benedict's insincerity.

Notwithstanding this failure, the king addressed himself very warmly, to unite the different courts and learned bodies of Europe in favour of the method, which still seemed to promise the greatest hopes. Messengers traversed the country in all directions, and every state and every city in Europe was agitated by the same momentous question. The speculations of the learned and the projects of the powerful were equally engrossed by it; and it seemed as if the fate of all governments, and the welfare of all subjects, depended on its solution. At this time the University of Paris, which took the foremost part in these discussions, and possessed much more influence than any other learned body, openly expressed dissatisfaction with Benedict, and even threw out some menaces of a general council, in case of his further contumacy.

Benedict watched these proceedings with anxiety; but the variety and discordance of the materials, which it was necessary to combine for his destruction, gave him the confidence to persist;—upon which the Doctors of Paris advanced one degree towards more efficient measures. And as Luna had unreservedly sworn to adopt the method of cession, in case his cardinals should hereafter recommend it, and as his cardinals had strongly recommended it, and as he had then unequivocally rejected it, little sympathy could be expected from any quarter with a prelate, whose selfish opposition to the interests of religion was made more detestable by an act of deliberate perjury. The measure was, to draw up a strong exposition of Benedict's general delinquency, and of the particular grievances of the complainants, and to appeal from his censures, whether past or future, to the future pope*: a step which very temperately opened the path for more vigorous proceedings.

In the meantime, the courts which acknowledged the rival pope made great exertions to bring him to the arrangement—
Conduct of Boniface. which to them seemed so reasonable, and to him so unjust and extravagant. From Sicily to the extremities of Germany assemblies were held and resolutions adopted; and the vows, and talents, and energies of all men were directed to the same object; consequently, deputations and embassies were sent to Rome from all quarters. Boniface at first was contented to reply, that he was the true and only Pope, and that universal obedience was due to him; but presently, in the year 1398, when the emperor at length interfered more directly, and pressed the method of cession, he found it expedient to dissemble; and, by the advice of his cardinals, he promised submission, provided (a very safe proviso) that the Antipope of Avignon should also resign his claims†. Yet, even so guarded a concession alarmed the avaricious fears of the citizens of Rome. They trembled lest their bishop and his prodigal court, and the train of his dependents, and expectants, and sycophants, should again be seduced to some foreign residence. That event, too, at that moment, would have been peculiarly afflicting, since in two years (in 1400) the second grand and general Jubilee was to take place; and the inhabitants had already begun to make provision for the season of spoliation. Accordingly, a body of the notables of the city waited upon the Pope, and professed towards him the most sincere and

* On this occasion numbers of polemical tracts and pamphlets were published on both sides, containing, as Fleury has observed, many words but few reasons.

† Spondanus, ann. 1398, s. ii.

unprecedented * affection: they declared that they would never desert him, but sustain, with their very lives and property, his just and holy cause. 'My children,' replied Boniface, 'take courage! rest assured that I will continue to be pope; and whatever I may say, or however I may play off the King of France and the Emperor against each other, I will never submit to their will.'

While such was the disposition of the Roman competitor, during the July of the same year the Court and University of Paris at length perceiving that a *Subtraction of obedience*. mere contest of acts and declarations would never weary the Pontiff of Avignon, proceeded to a measure of greater efficacy—one which no Catholic nation had hitherto, on any occasion, dared to adopt against any pope:—'By the aid and advice of the princes and other nobles, and of the Church of our kingdom, as well clergy as people, we entirely withdraw our obedience from Pope Benedict XIII., as well as from his adversary, whom indeed we have never acknowledged. And we ordain, that no one henceforward make any payment to Pope Benedict, his collectors, or agents, from the ecclesiastical revenues or emoluments. We also strictly prohibit all our subjects from offering to him any manner of obedience.' Such was the substance of the royal proclamation; and arrangements were at the same time made to deprive the pope of the presentation to all benefices, for as long a time as it should remain in force. This edict was received with such general respect and submission, that the very domestics and chaplains of Benedict retired from their offices; and what was still more important, the cardinals themselves withdrew in a body from his court. But he, nothing moved by that unanimity, was the more forward on repeated occasions to assert, that he was the true and genuine pope; that he would remain so, in despite of king, duke, or count—and that he was prepared to renounce his life, rather than his dignity.

Recourse was then had to the only method which gave any just hope of success. A military force was sent against Avignon; and as the inhabitants of that city also declared their adhesion to the king and the cardinals, nothing now remained in opposition to the royal will and the force of the nation, except the pontifical palace. But Benedict had secured some faithful mercenaries for its defence; and an effective blockade was thought sufficient for the objects of his enemies. Thus for the space of four years he continued a close prisoner in his own residence, without any strength to resist the means employed against him, or any disposition to yield to them. But at length, the vigour of that powerful confederacy was dissipated by the persevering intrigues of one feeble individual, and the variety of interests and principles in the mass opposed to Benedict led by slow degrees to a disunion, which preserved him. The first, who betrayed his party was a Norman officer, Robinet de Braquemont,—who, through the confidence reposed in him, and his constant access to the palace, found easy means of liberating the pope. It was on March 12, 1403, that the successor of St. Peter concealed his apostolical sanctity under the disguise of a menial; and, having thus eluded the penetration of his guards, took refuge in a small town near Avignon. As a pope was never wont to travel, unless preceded by the

* Fleury, liv. xcix. s. 18. Boniface artfully availed himself of this unusual display of loyalty on the part of his subjects to secure an extent of temporal authority over them, such as no former pope is said to have possessed. See Ægidius Card. Viterb. apud Pagi. Vit. Bonif. IX. s. xliii.

Holy Sacrament, Benedict carried out with him a little box, containing the consecrated element; and even, for the literal observance of that custom, he placed the box upon his breast.

As soon as he found himself in safety, he caused his beard, which he had nourished during the persecution of his captivity, to be shaved off; and recovering with his freedom the consciousness of his dignity, he resumed the habits and authority of a pope. No sooner was the circumstance of his liberation made known, than several noble individuals rendered to him the accustomed homage. Immediately the College of Cardinals passed over to him and sought a reconciliation. The citizens of Avignon eagerly tendered their offers of service. Benedict forgave the truancy, and accepted the repentance of all. At the same time, the party in France, which for some time had been opposed to the *subtraction** of obedience, and which had lately gained strength, now boldly declared its adhesion. The king was privately induced to join it; and, notwithstanding the resistance of the more consistent promoters of ecclesiastical concord, it prevailed. By an edict of May 30, an entire and unequivocal restitution of obedience was enjoined: thus after a partial interruption of about five years, the tide of papacy resumed for a season, even in France itself, its prescribed and customary † course.

The reason which was advanced by the king, to justify so complete a change in his policy, was, that the example of France had not been followed by other nations ‡; and that, while the pontiff of Avignon was confined to his palace walls, the intruder at Rome was acquiring new strength and confidence. We shall, therefore, now recur very briefly to the system of government which Boniface had adopted. It appears to have been directed by one principle only—to extract the largest possible sums from the superstition of the people and the ambition of the clergy, and the folly and credulity of both. During the first seven years of his pontificate, his proceedings were veiled by some show of decency, through a reluctant respect which he paid to the virtues of some of the ancient cardinals. But as these successively died, and were replaced by others of his own creation and character, he broke out into the undisguised practice of simony §. This was the most copious and constant source of his

* It is the word used by ecclesiastical writers—Subtractio, soustraction.

† The first proof of moderation and gratitude which Benedict gave after the Act of Restitution was, to appoint afresh to certain benefices, which had been filled up during the subtraction. The king then sent an embassy to *pray* him to confirm such provisions, as had been then made. *He returned a direct refusal.* On this, Charles published his commands, that those who had been so appointed should, at any rate and without any fees to the Pope, remain in possession. This was conclusive.

‡ In 1399, King Richard expressly consulted the University of Oxford on the grand question of the age. The answer of that body was very decided against any refusal of obedience to Boniface, *because he was indeed the true Pope.* On the same ground, they objected to the method of cession, and insisted in preference on that of a General Council—to be convoked of course by their own genuine Pope. Thus they assumed at once the point at issue—if Boniface had power to convoke a council of universal authority, Boniface was truly Pope—and the schism was at an end.

§ See Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismat.*, lib. ii., cap. vii., viii., ix., x., xi., xii., &c. This author, a native of Westphalia, was attached as Secretary to the Roman Court during the whole of the Schism; and besides the History of this Event, in four books, (the last of which is entitled *Nemus Unionis*) he composed the *Life of John XXIII.* He exposed pontifical depravity with freedom, it may be with raucour. Spondanus (ann. 1404, s. xvi.) especially ascribes his account of the simony of Boniface to an *ulcerosus stomachus*, and of course other Roman Catholic writers are scandalized by his little reserve. But we doubt not, that his narrative is essentially true.

gains; but when the simple and honest sale of benefices proved insufficient for his demands, he had recourse, besides, to direct acts of fraud and robbery. In the distribution of graces and expectatives, the poorest candidates were invariably placed at the bottom of the list; but this was not sufficient—even the promises, that had been made them, were frequently cancelled in favour of some wealthier competitor, to whose more recent patent an earlier date was affixed, with a clause of preference. The fluctuating health and approaching decease of an opulent incumbent were watched with impatient anxiety, and appointed couriers hurried to Rome with the welcome intelligence. Immediately the benefice was in the market; and it not uncommonly happened, that the same was sold as vacant to several rivals, even under the same date. The ravages of a frightful pestilence only contributed to fill the pontifical coffers: and a benefice was sometimes sold in the course of a few weeks to several successive candidates, of whom none survived to take possession. At length, in the year 1401, the pontiff proceeded so far, as to cancel by a single act nearly all the graces, dispensations and expectatives which he had previously granted, and to declare them wholly void—that he might enter afresh and without any restraints upon the task, which seemed almost to be terminated, and reap from the same exhausted soil a second harvest of shame and iniquity. By such methods* Boniface enriched himself, and impoverished his clergy; and however we may abominate his rapacity, we have little cause to feel any compassion for the sufferers; who were possibly influenced by the same passion, and who were certainly involved in the same simoniacal scandal with himself.

The superstition of the laity was also taxed to the utmost point of endurance; the excessive abuse of the Jubilee has been mentioned as the favourite resource of Boniface, and the circumstances of the time combined to sharpen his appetite for that feast. The year 1400 was that destined, according to the original institution of Boniface VIII., for the celebration of the *secular* solemnity; and it appears that, though the innovations of later popes had met with very general reverence, there were still several rigid devotees who, holding them in inferior estimation, looked forward with pious impatience to the approach of the legitimate festival. Neither was this impression confined to the nations in the obedience of the Roman competitor; the followers of Benedict acknowledged by their respect for the apostolical city the authority of the See, though they rejected the usurper who occupied it; and the French especially pressed in great multitudes to obtain the plenary indulgence at Rome. Charles published an ordonnance to restrain the emigration of his subjects; he saw with sorrow, not perhaps their slavish superstition, but the exportation of their wealth to a foreign and even hostile treasury. Still in many, the religious zeal overpowered the sense of civil duty, and these proceeded on their pilgrimage. But several were intercepted and pillaged on their road by partisans at enmity with the Pope; and those, who escaped

Spondanus excuses the rapacity of Boniface by his necessities, and brings some authority for the assertion, *that he died poor*.

* The system of Annates, or the payment of a year's first fruits to the Apostolical Chamber, was brought to perfection by Boniface IX. It did not, however, originate with him; Clement V. having learnt that some bishops in England exacted such claims from their diocesan clergy, felt justified in transferring the right to the See of Rome. This took place in 1306; thirteen years afterwards, John XXII., when he reserved for *three years* the first fruits of all vacant benefices, excepted the bishoprics and abbeys. Boniface IX. extended the usurpation to the prelacies, and *made it perpetual*. Fleury, l. xcix. s. xxvii. Spondanus, ann. 1339, s. ii.

this danger, were exposed, on the termination of their journey, to the pestilence which was laying waste the holy city. Some perished miserably; and others, whose resources were exhausted through their devotion and their sufferings, when they applied for aid to the apostolical coffers, were dismissed with a cold and contemptuous refusal.

Four years afterwards Boniface died; his cardinals immediately entered into conclave, and elected a successor, nearly under the same conditions which had been accepted and violated by Benedict. He assumed the name of Innocent VII.; but the

Innocent VII. succeeds Boniface. two years of his imbecile government produced no other change, than the secession of Genoa and Pisa to the obedience of his rival. Both parties expressed equal desire for the extinction of the schism; both were equally insincere; and the attention of the courts of Christendom and the feelings of the pious friends of the Church, were insulted by the verbose correspondence and recriminations of two aged hypocrites. Innocent died in 1406; and the Roman cardinals then seriously deliberated on the expediency of deferring the new election, until some measures could be taken in concert with the college at Avignon.

But their fears of an interested populace contended with their wisdom and their virtue; they likewise dreaded the risks, which the temporal sovereignty of the See must incur during the interregnum—their indecision terminated in a half-measure. They bound themselves by oath, that whichever of them should be chosen, should hold himself in perpetual readiness to resign, in case the concord of the Church and the union of the two Colleges should require

Election of Angelo Corrario, or Gregory XII. it; and that he should immediately make public, that such was the condition of his election. This act having been assented

to with great solemnity, they threw their eyes upon a prelate, whose advanced age, whose holy reputation*, whose habitual integrity, whose ardent love of the Church and regard for its best interests, placed him beyond all suspicion, almost beyond the possibility, of perfidy. Angelo Corrario, a Venetian, the titular patriarch of Constantinople, was the character which they sought. Seventy years of immaculate piety, by which he was endeared to the whole Church, were a pledge for the extinction of any selfish passions, which at any time might have lurked in his bosom; and the austerity of his devotion, which emulated the holiness of the antient pontiffs, guaranteed the strict observance of his engagement. Accordingly, on the instant of his election, he eagerly ratified his covenant †, and proclaimed his intention to restore union to the

* They sought not (says Aretinus) for a man of business or address, but for one of honour and integrity; and at length they unanimously fixed their choice upon Angelo Corrario, “virum prisca severitate et sanctimonia reverendum.”

† The short account of Leonardus Aretinus, the attendant and faithful adherent of Angelo, should be cited. “Is conclavi egressus promissionem, votum, et juramentum, quæ privatus fecerat, tunc in potestate constitutus iterato novavit. Atque ita loquebatur de Unione primo illo tempore, ut, si cætera deessent, *pedibus et baculo se iturum* ad eam conficiendam asseveraret. Statimque adversario scripsit benigne illum ad pacem invitans et abdicationem mutuam offerens. Adversarius autem *tantisdem ferme syllabis* ad eum rescripsit; eadem invitatio fuit, eademque cohortatio. . . Locus deinde necessarius visus est in quo et Pontifices ipsi et collegia convenirent. Ad hoc Savona pari consensu recepta est. . . Prosperè huc usque et plane ex sententia. Deinde paulatim res labascere cœpit et cuncta indies deteriora fieri. Voluntas autem illa Pontificis recta nequaquam satis habere firmitatis reperta est ad pontificatum deponendum; cujus rei culpam multi in

Church by any risk or sacrifice. Should it be necessary to perform the journey on foot with his staff in his hand, or to encounter the sea in the most wretched bark, he vowed that he would still present himself at the place of conference. His declarations were received with joy and confidence, and it was thought that the flock of Christ had at length obtained a faithful shepherd.

After his restoration to liberty, the policy of Benedict had entirely changed—all his original desire for the extinction of the schism appeared to be revived; he had made overtures to that effect both to Boniface and Innocent; and when the new Pope (Gregory XII.) addressed him on the subject, he renewed his usual protestations. But they were no longer able to deceive either the court or the doctors of Paris: it was found that, however profuse in general professions, he invariably evaded the cession, whenever it was strongly recommended to him; and he was not the better loved for the frequent exactions of tenths and annates, to which his necessities even more than his avarice obliged him.

At length it was arranged, at a meeting of certain deputies of both parties, that the long-promised conference should be brought about; and the place selected for the purpose was Savona. Some hopes were entertained from this project, and it was pressed with earnestness both at Rome and Avignon. The time was fixed for the Michaelmas of 1407; and when it arrived, Benedict was found at the appointed city, full of his customary declarations. But where was Angelo Corrario, the sworn advocate of concord, the model of ancient holiness? Every solicitation, to observe the direct obligation of his oath, had been urged upon him in vain. To the most overpowering arguments he opposed the most contemptible pretexts. He was secretly determined to evade the conference; and he did finally absent himself. Then followed another interchange of accusations and protestations, which had no other effect than to persuade men, that an understanding secretly subsisted between the two Pretenders, and that they had conspired to cajole the world and retain their offices by their common perjury*.

We shall not pursue the tedious details of their elaborate duplicity; nor is it important to notice the multifarious correspondence which perplexed the dispute, nor even closely to trace the circumstances, which led to its conclusion †. It is enough to mention the leading facts. In the first place, in contempt of one important clause ‡ of the oath taken in

propinquos ejus referebant, &c. . . Erat in altero Pontifice non melior sane mens, sed occulebat callidius malam voluntatem, et quia noster fugiebat, ipse obviam ire videbatur. . . . Sed cum de congressu eorum per internuntios ageretur, noster tanquam terrestre animal ad litus accedere, ille tanquam aquaticum a mari discedere recusabat . . . Cum per hunc modum desideria Christianorum qui pacem unitatemque optabant in longum ducerentur, non tulerunt Cardinales nostri, sed deserto Pontifice Pisas abiere," &c. Leonard Aretin. in Rer. Italicar. Historia. "Ego (the historian presently continues) Pontificem secutus sum potius familiaritatis gratia, quam quod ejus causam probarem. Quanquam fuit in Gregorio permagna vitæ morumque honestas et prisca quædam, ut ita dixerim, bonitas, scripturarum quoque scientia et indagatio subtilis et recta" . . . Denique in cunctis fermè rebus mihi satisfacibat, præterquam in Unionis negotio . . . Id. loc. cit. Gibbon has referred to this passage in his 70th Chapter.

* Spondanus, ann. 1408, s. v.

† The celebrated embassy sent from France both to Rome and Avignon, just before the Council of Pisa, is described by Gibbon, chap. lxx.

‡ "That both parties shall promise to make no new cardinals during the treaty of union." Gregory probably considered this part of the obligation as conditional. And, as it is not likely that Benedict should have made any such promise, he might feel that the engagement was not binding upon himself. . . . Had he been more scrupulous, when

conclave, Gregory created four new cardinals; on which the others, in just indignation, deserted his court and retired to Pisa, where they fixed their residence. Presently afterwards (in 1408) the King of France took measures to seize the person of Benedict; but that accomplished politician, having constantly retained a small fleet in his service on the plea of personal security, set sail on the rumour of this danger, and, after a short cruise on the coast of Italy, found a safer refuge at Perpignan in Spain,—for the Spaniards continued to adhere to their countryman through all his vicissitudes, and through all his perfidy. At Perpignan he assembled his bishops, and held his councils, and awaited the termination of the tempest.

But his cardinals remained in France; and now perceiving that they were abandoned by their master, they turned their attention more zealously than before to the extinction of the schism. To that end, they negotiated in perfect sincerity with the rival college at Pisa; and the consequence was an immediate coalition. By this event, the first substantial ground towards the closing of the schism was gained. It was now clearly ascertained, that the voluntary cession of the pretenders, under any conceivable circumstances, was hopeless. The latest proof of that truth was the strongest; since Angelo di Corrario, the most unblemished of mankind, had chosen to stain his grey hairs with deliberate perjury, rather than resign the possession—the very short possession—of a disturbed and disputed dignity. No resource henceforward remained, except compulsion; and the union of the colleges afforded the only prospect of that result. Some difficulties were still to be overcome, but the convocation of a General Council promised to remove them. Accordingly the Council was summoned to assemble at Pisa in the March of 1409.

The Council of Pisa met under circumstances wholly different from any other similar assembly. In the division of churchmen it represented the unity of the Church. Disregarding the opposite pretensions to individual legitimacy, it asserted the undivided authority of the See; and thus, since there might be many antipopes, but not possibly more than one pope, the object to which its proceedings necessarily tended, was to reject the two actual claimants, and substitute one true and catholic pontiff. It was summoned by the cardinals, twenty-four of whom were present, and it was attended by a great number of prelates*, as well as by the generals of the Mendicant orders, and the deputies of several universities. Ambassadors from the courts of Germany, France, England, and others, were likewise present; though the object of the first was rather to question the legitimacy, than to sanction the deliberations, of the council. The scruples of these envoys gave rise to an important discussion, which was occasionally renewed afterwards; and which, as far as the principles of the disputants were concerned, divided the High Papist party from the moderate Catholics. It was argued on the one side, from the language of the canons and the unvarying practice of the Church, that a general Council could not legally assemble, unless by the authority and express summons of the Pope, whereas the meeting at

the obligation was direct and unequivocal, we might have given him the benefit of this supposition.

* Besides the three patriarchs, 180 archbishops and bishops, and about 300 abbots, were present in person or by representatives, and 282 doctors in theology.—Spondanus, ann. 1409, s. ii.

Pisa had received the sanction of no pontiff. On the other hand, it was maintained, that no pope did then in fact exist; that both pretenders, by their long-continued perfidy and contumacy, had involved themselves in the guilt of schism and heresy,*; and that, under such circumstances, if the necessities of the Church demanded it, the cardinals had full power to call a council †. Recollecting, as we do, the false foundation on which the claims of the pope really rested, we can scarcely pretend to doubt on which side the reason lay. But among the controversialists of that time, the spuriousness of the Decretals was still unknown, and almost unsuspected; and pretensions directly derived from them were acknowledged with respectful acquiescence.

The Council then proceeded to fulfil its object. The first step was, to summon the pretenders to appear in person or by deputy, and on their non-appearance, to pronounce them contumacious. The next, to trace the proofs of their insincerity and collusion, and to expose their perjury. The next, to command the Christian world to withdraw its obedience from the one and from *and elect Alexander V.* the other. Then followed the sentence of condemnation;—and here we may pause to remark, that the prelate, who pronounced it, was the titular Patriarch of Alexandria, supported on either hand by those of Antioch and Jerusalem. The two schismatics, after a long enumeration of their crimes, were cut off from the Church; and the Holy See was declared vacant. Then the cardinals, after binding themselves by oath to continue the Council after the election, for the general purposes of church reform, entered into conclave. They remained six days in deliberation; and their choice fell upon the Cardinal of Milan, Peter of Candia, who took the name of Alexander V.

Peter, native of Candia, a Venetian subject, had risen from so low an origin, that he professed to retain no recollection of his parentage—a circumstance (he boasted) which gave him a great advantage over his predecessors, since it exempted him from all temptation to nepotism ‡. One day, as he was begging alms, while yet extremely young, an Italian monk took compassion on him, and introduced him into his convent. From Candia, as he gave great promise of intellectual attainment, he was carried into Italy; and thence, for the gradual completion of his studies, to the universities, first of Oxford, and afterwards of Paris. There he acquired great theological reputation, and retained along with it a mild, liberal, and convivial disposition. He was already advanced in age when raised to the pontificate. . . . After a few more sessions, in which a commission was appointed for the investigation of ecclesiastical abuses, and some unimportant regulations enacted, the Council was adjourned for an interval of three years, till the April of 1412.

The authority of the Council of Pisa was recognised by all the national churches of Europe, excepting Arragon, Castille, Bavaria, and Scotland; and Rome itself, by placing Alexander in the list of its genuine bishops, has offered it the same acknowledgment. Its proceedings were conducted without any reproach of irregularity or dissension, and it dis-

* This last assertion does not appear, at first sight, so obvious—but the word heresy was now used in a much more comprehensive sense, than in the early church:—perseverance in schism was at this time sufficient to constitute heresy.

† That there were cases, in which they possessed that right, does not appear to have been disputed—that, for instance, of the insanity of a pope.

‡ It was the boast of his friends, that, from being a rich archbishop, he had become a poor cardinal; and that the popedom had reduced him to beggary.

persed under the auspices of a legitimate pope. It remains to inquire, what was the effect produced upon the antipopes by decisions so solemnly delivered. On the determination of an assembly, which expressed the power and united the vows of almost every nation of Europe, what course did the repudiated schismatics adopt? Did they endeavour to conciliate the party, which they were too weak to resist, and too infamous longer to cajole? Did they resign those claims, by which they might still indeed disturb the peace of Christendom, but which could scarcely promise any substantial dignity to themselves?—No;—they clung to the fragments of their fortunes with the same attachment, which had bound them to prosperity; and the more generally it was admitted, that *both* were pretenders and antipopes, the more violently each proclaimed himself to be the genuine pope. Benedict could still boast of the obedience of Spain; but this was a narrow field to content the ambition of the successor of the Gregories and the Innocents. But the reverses of his rival were even more remarkable. He only escaped captivity by traversing the ambush of his enemies in the disguise of a merchant; while his chamberlain, who resembled him in person, and had assumed his robes, was taken in his place, and subjected to some severity of treatment. Having in such guise escaped to two galleys which awaited him, and which conveyed him to Gaïeta, he then reclaimed his dignity, and imitated, with his scanty train of courtiers, the pomp of the imperial city. He was protected, indeed, by Ladislaus, and neither Germany nor Hungary had yet nominally withdrawn from his obedience. But he was poor, and as he had no patronage, he had no resources; and his few followers continued to adhere to him through fear of the King of Naples, rather than from any attachment either to his person, or his cause.

Alexander V., the feebleness of whose character made him liable to the influence of any more vigorous spirit, fell almost entirely under the guidance of a Neapolitan, named Baltazar Cossa, Legate at Bologna. This extraordinary person, by birth a nobleman, by habit and inclination a soldier, by profession a churchman, and in rank a cardinal, was one of the boldest champions of the Council of Pisa. And when it appeared that the possession of Rome could only be recovered from Ladislaus by military measures, Baltazar undertook to conduct an expedition for that purpose. The Roman people acknowledged the authority of Alexander, and sent to him a deputation with the keys of the city. The Pope was then at Bologna. He received the envoys with magnificence; he expressed his pleasure at their emancipation from the seductions of Angelo Corrarïo; and in respect to the desire, which they testified, to have their Pope among them, and to receive the Jubilee*, (for these vows were united in their petition,) he appointed the year 1413 for that solemnity. This circumstance is worthy of thus much attention, as it shows how unblushingly the Romans at that time avowed the real motive of their attachment to the Vicar of Christ; and also, how basely a Pope, who could not plead either weakness or poverty, pandered to their cupidity. But Alexander V. was not destined to witness the execution of his decree, nor even to receive the venal applauses of his people. He died at Bologna the year after his election (May 3d, 1410), and the cardinals, after a very short deliberation, appointed Baltasar Cossa in his place.

The world was surprised at this election; for though he possessed good natural talents, and a rapid decision in matters of business and other tem-

* Fleury, l. c. sec. xliii.

poral concerns, Baltazar was of a violent temper, and remarkable for the licentiousness of his morals; his demeanour and manners corresponded with his reputation; and the military air, which so little became the habit of the cardinal, seemed wholly to disqualify him for the chair of St. Peter. On the other hand, his fearless character gave promise of that vigour, which was now required for the restoration of the Church; and it was hoped, that, if he did not awaken to the spiritual duties of his station, he would at least consent to observe its decencies.

John XXIII. (Baltazar assumed that name) did not at first deceive either of those expectations; his manners were softened on his elevation, and his morals ostensibly amended; and he framed his political arrangements so well, that the king of Naples declared in his favour. Then Gregory, for the second time an exile, embarked his person and his suite in two trading vessels, and sought almost the only spot in Europe which continued to obey him. Charles Malatesta opened to him the gates of Rimini; and there, together with three cardinals who still followed him, he had space to deplore the passion or the weakness, through which he had exchanged a holy reputation and dignified independence for banishment, insecurity, and infamy.

The death of the emperor at this moment opened an occasion to the Pope to recommend Sigismond as successor; and as Sigismond was actually chosen, a friendly inter- *and of Sigismond*
course was immediately established between the two *to the Empire,*
parties. The still disturbed condition of the Church, and the abuses which universally prevailed, demanded indeed their cordial and honest co-operation; and in this at least they agreed, that a General Council was the only remaining remedy, and that no time should be lost in convoking it. On the dissolution of that of Pisa, it had been arranged that another should be called after three years. Accordingly, John had summoned the prelates to Rome at the appointed time; but so few presented themselves, that it was not judged expedient to proceed to any important enactments.

The place, which was now selected for a more efficient meeting, was the city of Constance, in Switzerland. Much depended on that selection. Much depended on the local influence which might probably be exercised, and which would certainly affect the deliberations of the body. Constance was under the direct control of Sigismond; and it is well known *

* Leonardus Aretinus relates a curious anecdote on this subject, which throws light on the still disputed character of John. "The pontiff privately communicated to me his design. The whole matter (said he) depends on the place of the council, and I will not have it where the emperor is the stronger. I shall therefore give to the legates, whom I send to decide this matter, credentials of full power and discretion for public appearance's sake, but I shall privately restrict them to certain specified places—and then he mentioned those places. Afterwards, when the legates came to take leave, having dismissed all excepting myself, he secretly addressed them and showed of what weight the matter was, on which they were sent. Then, speaking kindly to them, he praised their prudence and fidelity, and said that they knew what ought to be done better than himself. While he was thus talking and repeating those civil things to them, he was himself overpowered by a feeling of kindness, and in an instant changed the design so long determined by him. I had meant, he said, to give you a list of certain places, from which list you should on no account depart; but at this very instant I change my mind, and commit every thing to your prudence. It is for you to think, what may be safe and what dangerous for me. And thus he tore in pieces the paper, on which he had written the names of the places. The legates therefore going to Sigismond chose Constance—a transalpine city and subject to the emperor. When John heard this, he was incredibly afflicted, and lamented his

that the Pope foresaw some of the consequences of that arrangement, and consented to it with extreme reluctance. It is known too, that he felt a much stronger inclination to march in arms for the recovery of his capital, which the death of Ladislaus had again opened to him, than to conduct the peaceful procession of his cardinals towards the appointed city. Nevertheless, his outward conduct betrayed no disposition to recede, whatever may have been his private wishes or his secret intrigues; and having fixed the first of November, 1414, for the opening of the Council, he was present for the performance of his duties on that day.

The situation of Constance in many particulars justified the preference, which the emperor had obtained for it. Its pleasant and healthful situation on the shores of an extensive lake; its central position with respect to France, Germany and Italy; and not least, the circumstance, that it was at that time the grand depôt of all commercial intercourse between the two last countries, made it favourable for the access and accommodation of a numerous and opulent assembly. As the council lasted for nearly four years, the number of its members and their attendants must have greatly fluctuated; but if it be true, that at certain times not less than thirty thousand horses* were maintained for its use, we may conceive the splendour as well as the multitude of the assemblage. It was divided into four sections, following the grand national division of Europe; and all the members were arranged under the banners of Italy, of France, of Germany, or of England. Most of the leading ecclesiastics † of Europe were present; but the greater proportion of eminent laymen, who thronged to Constance, distinguished that council, more than any other circumstance, from all that had preceded it.

Its professed objects were the extinction of the schism and the Reformation of the Church. The persecutions of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, which formed a part of its labours, will be described and traced to their true motives in a following chapter. Even the subject of the Reformation must for the moment be deferred; since we must confine our present attention to the thread which we have pursued through so many windings, and trace the history of the Schism to its conclusion. And to some indeed it might appear, and not without specious reason, that the schism was virtually extinct already; and that the feeble antipopes of Perpignan and of Rimini might have been safely left to waste their complaints and anathemas unnoticed. And so it might possibly have proved. But, on the other hand, the politics of Europe were at that time so fluctuating and faithless, that the slightest circumstance of national interest, or even of personal caprice or jealousy, might at any moment have transferred the obedience of a kingdom, and restored to Gregory or to Benedict the adhesion of a powerful party. So that there seemed no positive security for the concord of the Church, until the two schismatics should be deprived of the faintest shadow of authority.

evil stars, that he had so lightly deviated from his former mind and counsel." Leonard Aretin., In Rerum Italic. Historia.

* Apprehensions being entertained about the means of providing for so many quadrupeds, it was ordered, that the Pope should be limited to twenty horses, the cardinals and princes to ten each, the bishops to five, and the abbots to four only. Raynald. ann. 1414, s. xiii.

† Nine and twenty cardinals and three hundred bishops and archbishops were present at the second session, on March 2, when the Pope made his abdication.

Hence it was, that all parties were chiefly anxious to attend to this subject, and to complete the work which had been so far advanced at Pisa*.

But here, at the very outset, a difference arose of the most essential importance, as to the manner of attaining that end. It will be observed, that the present assembly approached that question under circumstances dissimilar from those which guided the former. At Pisa, the impossibility of deciding between the two claimants having been admitted, neither of them was recognised by the council. The fathers were indeed personally divided in their obedience; but as a single legislative body they acknowledged neither Peter of Luna nor Angelo Corrario. Thus their course was obvious—to declare the See vacant, and to proceed to a canonical election. But the council of Constance, being held in continuation of that of Pisa, being bound by its decisions and resting on its validity, admitted of necessity the rights of John XXIII. And thus, whatsoever course its deliberations might take, it had to deal with a Pope of undisputed legitimacy. For though some feeble murmurs would be raised at Rimini and Perpignan, Constance at least was not the place where they could find an echo.

Under these circumstances the council met together, and soon afterwards John caused his own proposition to be laid before it. It was simply this—that the fathers should first of all things confirm all the acts of the council of Pisa; that they should next deliberate on the best means of carrying them into effect; and lastly enter upon their labours for the Reformation of the Church. In this paper the pope merely called upon the fathers publicly to declare, what they never for a moment disputed, the legality of that council, from which he derived his authority; and if that declaration were once made, he felt assured, that there could be no other method of proceeding against two denounced anti-popes, than by arming the real pope with additional authority to crush them. It was very natural, that John should take this view of the subject; indeed, as far as the strict justice of the question was concerned, it was the correct view; and assuredly the distinction between a pope and a schismatic was sufficiently broad, to be made ground for decided action with an assembly of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics.

Nevertheless there were many, and some of the most celebrated doctors of the age were among them, who considered the subject in a widely different light. These loudly maintained, that as the council of Constance was a continuation of that of Pisa, it was bound steadily to pursue the same object; that this object had been the extinction of the schism, and that it was still so; and that a solemn obligation rested on all the prelates present, even on the pope himself, to adopt whatsoever means should appear most efficacious for that purpose. It was immediately obvious to what end this opinion tended—that the method of cession, which had been attempted with such imperfect success at Pisa, would be again brought forward as the only healing measure; and that the true and recognized Pope would be called upon for the same humiliation, and

* The bare circumstance, that there were three competitors for the chair after the council of Pisa, and only two before it, has led many historians to consider that assembly as having increased the schism. But to us it seems otherwise. It reduced the anti-popes to an insignificance, from which they never recovered, and it united the great body of Christendom in the same views, and with a common principle. If it was not immediately successful, neither was the council of Constance perfectly so. But the proceedings of Pisa were the foundation of the re-union, and it was by building on them, that the work was finally completed.

probably subjected to the same compulsion, with two anathematized pretenders.

The subject was warmly debated; but without any approach to a decision, because the emperor was not yet arrived; and as much certainly depended on his views, so the attention and even the hopes of both parties were earnestly fixed upon him. Sigismund possessed considerable talents and accomplishments; he spoke several languages with fluency and even eloquence, and was the patron of learning, in an age when it still needed powerful protection. The dignity of his personal appearance has attracted the commendations of history*; and if his moral character was not free from stain, and if his military enterprises generally ended in disgrace, he has been abundantly honoured for his zeal in the service of the Church, and his exertions against heresy and schism.

His previous intercourse with John, and the obligations which he certainly owed to him, led many to believe, that he would throw his weight into the pontifical scale—nor was reason wanting to incline him to that side. But it proved otherwise. He probably reflected, that, should he determine unequivocally to support and enforce the rights of John, no other method remained to reduce the antipopes, except violence—the princes of Arragon and Rimini would not otherwise renounce their obedience. The disposition of Sigismund was known; but matters had not yet proceeded to any determination, when legates presented themselves both from Gregory and Benedict. The latter, indeed, merely insulted the council by the usual vague and faithless offers of conference and compromise. But the former declared their authority to make a formal cession on behalf of their master, in case that *both* his rivals should abdicate also. From that moment the exertions of the great majority of the fathers were directed to one object—to accomplish by some means or other the abdication of John.

Now, as they never affected on any occasion to throw the slightest doubts on his legitimacy, it became them to take their measures with deference and caution; and when they pressed upon him the general obligations of his office, and argued, that he was bound, as chief of the Church of Christ, willingly to lay down, not his dignity only, but life itself, if the interests of that Church required it, we shall not wonder, that the Pope was unmoved by so indeterminate an appeal. But the council felt its strength; and the above appeal was accompanied by the new and bold proposition, that a General Council possessed the power, in a peculiar exigency, to *compel* the Pope to abdication. This assertion gave rise to long and warm discussions; the Italian prelates maintained the papal cause, but with less vigour and ability, than the circumstances required, and even than the merits of the question admitted. The superiority of learning and genius was on the side of the French; and the powerful harangues of Pierre d'Ailly and the celebrated Gerson, Chancellor of the University, added weight to a doubtful cause. It seemed clear that the party of John must yield.

In the meantime, the Archbishop of Mayence, the Primate of the German Church and Elector of the empire, arrived with great pomp at Constance, and immediately declared his adherence to the cause of the Pope. Frederick of Austria and the Duke of Burgundy were likewise enlisted on the

* Leonardus Aretinus (Rer. Italicar. Historia) speaks of him thus:—"Fuit proculdubio vir inclutus, præclara facie, corpore tum specioso, tum robusto; magnitudine animi sive pace sive bello eximia; liberalitate vero tanta, ut hoc unum illi vitio daretur, quod largiendo et erogando sibi ipsi facultates detraheret ad negotia bellaque obeunda."

same side. But Sigismond had now decidedly espoused the opposite principles ; and thus the French and Italian, which first divided the Council, now really became the imperial and papal parties. This was the crisis of the contest ; and the great majority of three of the nations was manifestly on the side of the Emperor. Still, before they proceeded to the question, it was feared that, as the Italian prelates were the most numerous and under the most direct influence, and would, probably, be unanimous for the Pope, they might be able to outvote the majorities of the other nations. It was, therefore, advanced as a fair proposal, and finally arranged, that each nation should separately ascertain its own sense, and that then, on the general meeting, the majority of nations, not the numerical majority of votes, should prevail. On the day appointed, they met together, and it then appeared that the decision in favour of the method of cession was unanimous—to the astonishment of the whole council, the greater portion even of the Italians themselves had adopted that opinion.

*The Council declares
for the cession,*

During the progress of these deliberations, there were some who judged, from the customary tenacity of other Popes, that still further measures might afterwards be called for. And in that apprehension, a long list of personal charges against John XXIII., some of which involved the most abominable offences, was handed about among the fathers ; and a copy came under the inspection of the Pope himself. John then saw the real nature of the tempest that was hanging over him, and immediately determined to avert it by timely submission. He expressed that intention amidst the acclamations of the whole assembly ; and after some unimportant disputes respecting the formula of cession, he publicly pronounced (on the 2d of March) his solemn and voluntary abdication*.

*and the Pope
abdicates.*

The cession of John was, of course, conditional on that of the antipopes ; and as no difficulties were any longer offered by Gregory, the accomplishment of the union rested wholly with Peter of Luna. To this end a conference was proposed at Nice, between Sigismond and the King of Arragon ; and as it seemed that Benedict was to be one of the parties, John claimed his right to be also present on the occasion. This demand excited some suspicions of his sincerity ; and these were confirmed by a proposal, which he soon afterwards made, to transfer the Council from Constance to Nice. It was difficult, after the instances of pontifical duplicity which had disgraced the last forty years, to put trust in the honesty of any Pope ; and the character of John was not such as to command any peculiar confidence. Consequently, the Council required of him a formal deed or procuracy of cession ; and he, without hesitation, refused it. Guards were then placed about the gates of the city ; but, on the urgent remonstrance of the Pope, removed. Howbeit, whether he had previously meditated an escape from

* The formula finally agreed on was to the following effect: "We, John XXIII., for the repose of the people of Christ, profess, promise, vow, and swear, before God, the Church, and this sacred Council, freely and with our entire good will, to give peace to the Church by the method of a simple and pure cession to be made by us of the Sovereign Pontificate, and to accomplish it effectually through the wisdom of the present Council,—whensoever Peter of Luna and Angelo Corrario shall similarly renounce, in person or by their delegates, the Popedom to which they pretend. And we also promise to do the same thing, howsoever that may occur, whether by cession or by death, or by any other way, so that it shall become possible to unite the Church of God through our cession, and thus to extirpate the present schism."

the power of the Council, as soon as it proved too great for him, or whether he was driven to that resolution (as may also have been) by the distrust and even harshness with which he was treated; it is certain that, on the morning of March 21, the Emperor and the Fathers learnt with dismay and astonishment, that the Pope was no longer at Constance. He had quitted the city, in the night, in a military disguise; and, having instantly embarked, had descended the Rhine as far as Schaffhausen, a city of his protector, Frederic.

The consternation of the Council was somewhat abated by a communication received from John on the following day, in which he renewed his assurances of sincerity, and justified his retreat from Constance by the argument, that his personal security was necessary to give obligation to the promise of cession; and hereupon he was joined by several Cardinals and other prelates. But the great majority remained behind, in close co-operation with the Emperor; and both they and he immediately engaged in the most vigorous measures. For, on the one hand, Sigismond put in motion the temporal forces of the Assembly, and directed a powerful army against the States of Frederic; and on the other, the Fathers of the Council and the doctors of Paris, with Gerson at their head, advanced in mighty spiritual array against the pontifical deserter. And while the imperial soldiers approached the walls of Schaffhausen, the bulwarks of Popery were assaulted from the pulpits of Constance.

The momentous question was now publicly argued, whether a Council General of the Church did not possess an authority superior to the Pope. The rights of the Council were advocated by the eloquence of Gerson*, and asserted by the general consent of the Fathers of Constance. The opposite opinion was maintained by the seceders at Schaffhausen; and these even ventured to assert, that the Council itself was virtually dissolved by the absence of the Pope. It has generally been the error of high churchmen to advance the loftiest pretensions at the most unseasonable moments; and instead of receding at a crisis of violence and danger, to rush with a sort of effeminate rashness into perils, which would not otherwise have reached them. A decided breach now took place between the two parties; but after some vain replications and negotiations, it became perfectly clear on which side the real strength lay. The Court of Schaffhausen daily diminished, and the Council proceeded by vigorous acts to give efficacy to the principle of its own superiority. Nevertheless, the Pope would not acknowledge his defeat, but rather determined to risk the experiment by a second flight; intending, as it would seem, to throw himself on the protection of the Duke of Burgundy, and establish his residence at Avignon. He halted at Brisac, and a deputation from the Council found him there; he fixed the following morning to give them audience, but on the following morning John XXIII. was no longer at Brisac. We shall not trace the fruitless negotiations which followed: it is sufficient to add, that during their progress the Duke of Austria prevailed upon the Pope to take refuge at Fribourg, under his own sacred protection—for the Duke, being severely pressed in his contest with the Emperor, and foreseeing his entire discomfiture, was desirous to possess the means of reconciliation. Having succeeded in this desire, he hastened to violate his vows, and to sacrifice his virtue and reputation, by surrendering the person of his guest. And thus, says Maimbourg, the unfortunate Pope, who, disorderly and licentious as

* De Auferibilitate Papæ ab Ecclesia.

he was, failed not to be an object of great compassion through the treachery practised against him by his protector, was betrayed; and found himself a prisoner in the Castle of Fribourg, the very place where he had thought to find an asylum. *He is betrayed,*

The Council then turned to the affair of his deposition, observing in this matter the same forms which had been followed at Pisa in the process against Gregory and Benedict. The list of accusations presented against John XXIII. consisted of fifty articles; but the whole weight of his offences might be comprised under five or six heads. He was charged with all the various modifications of simony; with squandering and alienating the property of the Church; and with oppressing the people by unjust acts and exorbitant imposts. His escape from Constance, and his subsequent endeavours to elude the demands of the Council, were urged against him with the greater minuteness, as they were the most recent and the least pardonable of his offences. Another class of charges related to his official, another to his private delinquencies. It was asserted that, as Pope, he had disregarded the divine offices, neglected to repeat his breviary, and rarely assisted at the celebration of mass; and that, even when he did so, he recited the service rapidly and carelessly, like a sportsman or a soldier*. It was added, that he had wholly disregarded the fasts and abstinences of the Church. As to the scandals of his private life, they were traced with minute diligence, even from his childhood to his flight from Constance. In his earliest youth the intemperance of his disposition betrayed itself: his most innocent years were charged with falsehood, impudence, disobedience to his parents, a tendency to every vice. His progress in life was a progress in iniquity. Murder by violence and by poison, adultery, incest, the most abominable impurities were imputed to him, as unquestioned and notorious. Such is the substance of the allegations recorded by Roman Catholic writers against their spiritual Father; but it must not be forgotten, that, in the list formally presented to the Council and to the Pope, these last charges were suppressed. This might be with a view to spare the Catholic Church so monstrous a scandal; or through consideration to the conscience and character of the Cardinals, who had so lately elected such a Pope; but it might also be, because they rested on slight foundations, and proceeded from that popular licence, which so eagerly calumniates the fallen fortunes of the great.

It is not disputed, that the paper, which received the approbation of the Council, contained many heinous charges, expressed in very unequivocal language, and confirmed by numerous *accused*, testimonies. But the Pope, when it was presented to him for inspection and refutation, calmly replied, with the most submissive respect for the Council, that he had little curiosity to read either the charges or the depositions; but that of this the Fathers might rest assured, that he should receive their decision, whatever it might be, with perfect deference; in the meantime, that his best defence was in their justice. This was politic, for from the moment in which the Council determined upon the method of cession, John very clearly perceived that the Pontificate had passed from his hands. For a time, indeed, he probably hoped, through the support of the Dukes of Austria and Burgundy, to retain a partial obedience and wear a divided mitre; but no sooner did he

* Et si aliquoties celebravit, hoc fuit currenter, more venatorum et armigerorum. Act. Concil. Const.

become the prisoner of the Council, than even that hope abandoned him; and his only remaining object was to secure, in a private station, his personal freedom and security. Accordingly, he addressed a respectful and even pathetic letter to Sigismond, in which he reminded him of services formerly conferred, and supplicated in return his friendship, or at least his clemency. This appeal was written in a tone of deep humiliation, and with an affectation of attachment, which could scarcely be sincere. But neither Emperor nor Council was softened by this tardy display of obsequiousness. At a full Session, held on the 29th of May, *and deposed.* John XXIII. was solemnly deposed from the Pontificate.

By the same sentence he was condemned to imprisonment during the pleasure of the Council, which reserved to itself the power of imposing such other penalties as should, in due season, be declared.

This sentence was communicated to John in his confinement at Cell; he perused it without any emotion, and requested a short interval of solitude. After two hours, he ordered the deputies again into his presence; and then, after reading all the articles in succession, with a firm voice and unruffled manner, he declared to them that there was no particular, which did not receive his complete approbation; and that, as far as in him lay, he cordially confirmed and ratified the sentence. To this assurance he added a voluntary vow, that he would never at any time protest against that sentence, nor make any attempt to recover the Pontificate—that, on the contrary, he renounced purely and simply, and from the bottom of his heart, any right which he ever had, or might still have, to that dignity; that, in proof of this, he had already removed from his chamber the pontifical cross, and would throw off the pontifical garments as willingly, if he had any others to put on in their place; that he wished with all his soul, that he had never been Pope at all, since he had not enjoyed one single happy day since his exaltation; and so far was he from wishing to be restored to that dignity, that should any desire his re-election, he would never at any time consent to it. He then threw himself, with his former humility, on the mercy of the Council and the Emperor—not, however, without reminding them, that he possessed legitimate means of defence, of which he had not yet availed himself, but to which he should certainly appeal, should they drive him, by more rigorous measures, to further extremities.

This conduct, which was not only politic, but generous, succeeded not in obtaining for him any mitigation of his sentence. He was led away in close confinement, first to Heidelberg, and afterwards to Manheim, where he was imprisoned for three years. Neither did it avail him anything to have once possessed the friendship of Sigismond. Nay, so far was the severity of the sentence enforced, that he was deprived of the services of his Italian attendants, and surrounded by Germans, with whom his ignorance of the language permitted no other intercourse, than by signs*. Such rigour, exercised against a fallen Pope, awakened sympathy and swelled the ranks of his advocates; and there were many who maintained, both then and afterwards, that his deposition was illegal and compulsory, since the charge of heresy, on which alone a Pope could be canonically deposed,

* Platina and Nauclerus assert the severity with which John was treated. Theodoric of Niem gives a different account, on the authority, as he says, of well-informed persons. There are differences, too, on some other particulars, which we have not thought it necessary to specify. The historians who have been principally consulted for the contents of this chapter (besides the original authorities) are Maimbourg, the Continuator of Fleury, Lenfant (*Hist. du Conc. de Constance*), Pagi (*Breviar. Gest. Pontif. Roman.*), and Spoudanus;

was not that, which occasioned the degradation of John XXIII. The Court of France openly professed this opinion; and the offence, which Charles VI. on that occasion took at the exceeding zeal of the University, repressed the ardour and diminished the credit of that illustrious body.

In the meantime, the Council advanced onwards in the course which it had chosen. It had now assumed the despotic* control of the Church; and in its first exercise of that power, it published a declaration that the Cardinals could not proceed to a new election without its consent. By its next decision the formalities attending the cession of Gregory were duly completed, and the old man was permitted to *resign* that which no one acknowledged that he possessed. The attention of the Council and the whole Catholic world was then turned entirely towards the determination of Peter of Luna.

His determination was simply this,—to cling to the ruins of his fortunes—to clasp the name and shadow of the Pontificate—to persevere in his pretensions and his *Conduct of Benedict.* perjury to the end of his life. Nevertheless, it saw necessary to treat him with temper and deference, as long as he was supported even by a single Prince. The method of conference was that which he still proposed, and the Council now assented to it; and as the King of Arragon was prevented by sickness from travelling to Nice, Sigismond professed his willingness to undertake in person the journey to Perpignan. It was in vain, that Benedict exhausted the resources of his ingenuity to retard, at least, if he could not impede, the advance of the Emperor: his artifices were foiled by the firmness of a candid mind resolutely bent on a noble object; and on the 18th of September Sigismond arrived, with a small number of attendants, at the place of conference.

An extraordinary scene was then enacted. Ferdinand of Arragon sincerely desired the extinction of the schism; ambassadors from the courts of Castille and Navarre, and others who were present, united their vows for the same object. The Emperor pressed it with all his talents and all his power—Benedict alone opposed himself to the unanimity of Christendom. Whatever was most convincing in argument or persuasive in rhetoric was repeatedly urged upon him by the Princes and their deputies. If any pretext for his resistance had hitherto been furnished by the pertinacity of his competitors, this, they maintained, was now removed by the cession and deposition of Gregory and John. The condition, on which he had sworn to abdicate, was at length accomplished beyond dispute; and his honour, his conscience, his promises, his oaths unequivocally obliged him to fulfil his part. Henceforward the concord of Christendom depended wholly upon him. After eight-and-thirty years of schism, disorder, and desolation, Benedict was the only remaining obstacle to the union, repose, and welfare of the Christian world. The Church herself, if she was indeed entrusted by the Almighty to his care and guidance, now stretched forth her arms to him, from the abyss of misery in which she was sunk, and sadly supplicated, that he would raise her from her degradation; that he would voluntarily sacrifice that dignity, which he could not possibly retain

* Hence it proceeded, *papaliter*, to interfere with the State also. Previously to Sigismond's departure for Perpignan, through France, it published an edict—"Quicumque, cujuscunque status aut conditionis existat, *etiamsi regalis* . . . euntes aut redeuntes impediverit, perturbaverit—sententia excommunicationis percettitur—et ulterius omni honore et dignitate ipso facto est privatus." Act. Concil. Constan., Sess. xvii. This sudden assumption of the power of deposition astonished all sovereigns, but especially insulted the King of France.

much longer; and that he would invest his few remaining years with the gratitude and blessings of mankind, rather than adhere, amid universal detestation, to a mere name, which an early death, followed by eternal infamy, was now at hand to tear away from him.

These arguments, urged by the highest secular powers, were confirmed by other authority, which may have given them additional value in the eyes of a churchman and a Pope. There were two holy brothers named Vincent and Boniface Ferrier*, who had hitherto faithfully adhered to the cause of Benedict, and whose acknowledged piety and supposed inspiration seemed to lend it some sort of sanctity. These venerable persons now joined their friendly eloquence to turn the heart of Benedict; and they fortified their appeal by declaring, that, as the reproach of schism must henceforward rest on his party, they should be compelled, in case of his further opposition, to desert him†.

Benedict was not moved by any of these considerations. Whether it was, that in the conscientious belief that he was the true Pope, he considered it a religious, or (what might be equally sacred in his mind) an ecclesiastical duty, to preserve his office to the end of his life; or whether (as is more probable), the love of power grew with the progress of his years, and the decay of his vigour, so as finally to close his heart against any representations of reason or decency,—he maintained his constant resolution inflexibly. As he had always been the legitimate, so was he now, forsooth, the only, Pontiff: the deposition of both his adversaries confirmed him, without competition, in the possession of the See. So that, if the schism were still permitted to subsist (he continued), the scandal must rest with the Council of Constance, not with him. For his own part, he was determined never to abandon the bark of St. Peter, of which the helm had been confided to him by God; and the older he became, and the nearer he approached to death and the judgment, the stronger was his obligation to resist the tempest, and avert the anger of Heaven by persevering in the course assigned to him. In conclusion, he enforced the necessity of at once uniting all the faithful in universal obedience to himself. Benedict was now in his seventy-eighth year; nevertheless, he argued his own cause before a public assembly for seven entire hours, with such courage, fervour, and impetuosity, as to leave it uncertain whether his extraordinary energy was derived from ambition, or from fanaticism, or from a strange combination of both.

The result of this singular contest was not yet perfectly manifest. On the one side was the secular and spiritual power of Europe, the authority of kings, the prayers of the people, the consent of the Catholic Church—reason, and justice, and every wise, and every good principle, arrayed against the infatuated obstinacy of one crafty, faithless, old man. Yet the thoughtful were still in some suspense, and many had greater fears from the inveterate subtilty of Benedict, than hopes from the union of so many Princes. . . . But it proved otherwise; the parties engaged in the Conference had no personal interest in favour of that pretender; and his

* This same Vincent Ferrier is addressed by Gerson from Constance, as a patron of the sect of the Flagellants, whom the chancellor earnestly exhorts him to abandon. Nevertheless he is designated as "Theologus et Orator toto orbe inclutus." The documents are given by Von der Hardt, tom. iii., pars vii.

† Theodoric of Niem mentions that Vincent Ferrier did then, in fact, take so decided a part against his former master, as to declare it a merit to persecute or kill him. "Quod sit vir pravus et fallax et fictus, decipiendo populum Dei, quodque justè persequendus sit usque ad mortem ab omnibus Christianis, &c." . . . Vit. Johann. XXIII. p. 63. This holy zealot had as little charity in his enmity, as discretion in his friendship.

perversity was so remote from reason, that it served rather to cement the confederacy against him. It was resolved, however, to make one final attempt at persuasion. But here Benedict, perceiving the firmness of his adversaries, and fearing their ultimate design, withdrew his person from their power, and quitted Perpignan. He retired, after some hesitation, to a place called Paniscola,—a fortress situated near Tortosa and the mouth of the Ebro, an ancient possession of the House of Luna. Four cardinals, and a small body of soldiers, followed him.

Any hopes which he may have derived from this proceeding, beyond that of mere personal security, were disappointed. The Assembly at Perpignan, being now relieved from the constraint which his presence still occasioned to those, who still acknowledged him, immediately, and by a formal act, renounced its obedience. Not long afterwards, Scotland, which had taken no part in these measures, but continued to adhere without scruple to its first decision, being now persuaded that Benedict was the only remaining obstacle to the general concord, followed the example of the Conference. And then, at length,* the Council of Constance felt itself empowered to inflict the final blow. The sentence of deposition was pronounced against Peter of Luna, according to the prescribed forms; and the bolt, which had fallen almost harmless from the Assembly of Pisa, descended on this occasion with greater efficacy, because its object was already virtually deposed, through the secession of his royal adherents. . . . In the mean time, the aged Ecclesiastic, against whom the storm which himself had raised was now in justice directed, was not moved to any act of concession, or any show of humiliation. Twice deposed by two General Councils—twice anathematized by the great and almost unanimous consent of the Catholic Church—deserted by the secular powers, who had so long countenanced his perfidy and protected his adversity—abandoned by the most venerable, even among his spiritual followers—and confined to a narrow and solitary residence—the Pope of Paniscola still preserved the mockery of a court, and presided in his empty council-hall. And thence, in the magnanimity of disappointment and despair, he launched his daily anathema against Ferdinand of Arragon, and retorted, with ludicrous earnestness, the excommunications of the Christian world.

The Council of Constance, having thus at length, through the perseverance of its Imperial Director, removed the three competitors whose rent the Church, proceeded to provide for its future integrity; and, that no pretext might possibly be left for subsequent dissension, it was determined, for this occasion only, to make an addition to the Elective Assembly. The entire College of the united Cardinals consisted, at that time, of thirty members; and to this body a second, consisting of six ecclesiastics from each of the *five*† nations, was associated. It was further regulated, that the consent of two-thirds both of the sacred college and of the deputies of each nation should be required for the validity of the election,—so many were the interests which it was necessary to reconcile, so severe were the precautions required, to secure for the future Pontiff the

Election of Martin V. by the Council, and termination of the schism.

* On July 26th, 1417.

† As soon as the fate of Benedict was decided, the Spanish nation was added to the four, which had hitherto constituted the Assembly.

undivided obedience of Europe. Accordingly, on the 8th of November, 1417, the electors entered into conclave, and after a deliberation of three days, they agreed in the choice of Otho Colonna (Martin V.), a noble and virtuous Roman.

The character of Martin pointed him out as the man destined to repair the ruins of the Church. The announcement was received with enthusiastic expressions of delight; the Emperor was the first to prostrate himself at the holy Prelate's feet, in a transport of rapture, which was shared, or affected, by the vast assembly present. And it was not without reasonable ground of confidence—it was not without many motives for self-satisfaction, and many just claims on the gratitude of that age and that Church, that Sigismond and the Council at length approached the termination of their labours. To us, indeed, looking back from our brighter elevation upon the means of the disputants and the subject of the strife, it will, perhaps, appear, that so powerful a combination of temporal and spiritual authority might have accomplished in a much shorter space the destruction of a profligate Pope and two denounced pretenders—that the force employed was disproportionate to the end—that the methods were indirect and dilatory, marked by too much ceremony and too little vigour. But we should thus determine inconsiderately, and without due regard to the maxims and prejudices of those days. When we reflect, that a century had scarcely yet elapsed since Boniface VIII. was exulting in the plenitude of spiritual despotism; that, even to the end of the Avignon succession, the lofty attributes of Papacy remained, as heretofore, unviolated and almost unquestioned; when we recollect, too, how slow and difficult are the triumphs of reason over prescriptive absurdities, we shall rather admire the firmness exhibited at Constance, and the courage with which some Papal principles were overthrown, than censure that assembly for not having more hastily accomplished, what it did at length accomplish effectually.

The Council continued its sessions* for a few months after the election of Martin, and was then dismissed, or rather adjourned, for the space of five years. Pavia was the place appointed for the next meeting; and the Pope proceeded towards Rome, to occupy and refit his shattered vessel. Nevertheless, with whatever security he may have approached his See, he must sometimes have reflected, that there still lived three men, who had enjoyed in their turns the dignity which he now held, and who had clung to it with extreme pertinacity. It was fair to presume that their ambition would not depart from them, except with life; and that any casual circumstance, which might offer to any one of them the means of recovering any portion of his power, would find him eager to embrace it. So long as they breathed, the concord of the Church could scarcely be deemed secure; let us then follow their history to its termination. Gregory did not long survive the act of his cession; he lived long enough to emerge from the condition of dishonour and guilt, into which his weakness had thrown him, and little longer; and if his last act had been less obviously the effect of compulsion, we might have admitted it as some atonement for his previous delinquency.

Peter of Luna continued for about six years to proclaim his legitimacy, and exult in his martyrdom. Every day the walls of Paniscola were

* These were forty-five in number; lasting, at various intervals, from November 16th, 1414, to August 9th, 1418.

astonished by the repetition of his anathemas; but the bolts were innocuous: but for the temporary departure of Alfonso of Arragon from the principles of his predecessor, they would scarcely have been heard beyond the fortress gates; nor did they disturb, in any degree, the repose of Christendom. He died suddenly, in the year 1424*, in extreme old age; but his vigour, which was still fresh and unabated, gave some colour to the suspicion of poison, which attends his death. It is at least certain, that, as soon as he perceived his final hour approaching, he commanded the attendance of his *two* Cardinals, the faithful remnant of his court, and addressed them with his wonted intrepidity. And then, even at this last crisis, when ambition and interest could not possibly sway him longer, he asserted with his parting breath, that he was the true and only Pope, and that it was absolutely essential for the purity of the Church to continue the succession. On this he adjured his two hearers, on pain of his pontifical malediction, to elect a successor. Having secured their obedience, he died; and it is related in ecclesiastical records, that six years afterwards his body was found entire, and without symptom of decay; and that, being then transported to Igluera, a town of Arragon, the property of his family, it long continued, and perchance may still continue, to resist the visitation of corruption.

His character has not escaped equally inviolate; and the censures by which it is perpetually assailed, cannot in justice be suppressed or softened. His talents were unquestionably vivid and active; but they were of a mean description,—the mere machines of intrigue and subtilty,—the energies of a contemptible and contracted soul. He was eminent in sanctity, and the integrity of private life. But what manner of integrity or sanctity is that, which is found consistent with ambition, and selfishness, and perjury; which can wrap itself in duplicity at any call of interest, and pursue a seeming expediency through fraud, and faithlessness, and falsehood? But at least (it is said) Benedict was sincere in believing, that he was the true Pope, and that through his perseverance alone the succession could be preserved uninterrupted. . . . Was he so sincere? When he advocated so warmly the necessity of mutual concession, during the reign of his predecessor, then, at least, he was not persuaded, that the purity of the Catholic Church was identical with obedience to the pretenders of Avignon. Had he been so persuaded, he could not himself have accepted the pontificate as a conditional boon; nor bound himself by oath to cede, on specific terms, that trust, which afterwards he proclaimed it his religious duty to maintain, under every circumstance. Assuredly, if his sincerity in this respect must be admitted, we must, at the same time, acknowledge, that he was not impressed with it till *after* his elevation; and that it was then so closely connected with his ambition, as to make it impossible for the historian, as it might be difficult even for himself, to distinguish between them.

The two Cardinals obeyed the parting injunction of their master, and chose for his successor one Gilles Mugnos, who called himself Clement VIII. But, not long afterwards, Alphonso finally withdrew his protection from his creature; Mugnos retired, without a struggle, to his former obscurity; and the succession of pretenders, which had been imposed upon the Church by the Conclave at Anagni, was at length at an end.

* The year is disputed. We follow Spondanus, ann. 1424, s. iii. The circumstance that he held, at least, the name of Pope for thirty years—a space longer than any predecessor—has been seriously urged as an argument *against* his legitimacy. ‘Non videbis dies Petri,’ the prophetic address to the successors of the apostle, had not been accomplished in the case of Luna, therefore he could not be a genuine successor.

One other object of our curiosity still remains, Baltazar Cossa, the President, the adversary, and the victim of the Council of Constance. Very soon after the dissolution of that assembly, the Republic of Florence, which had been unceasingly attached to the cause, or at least to the person and sufferings, of the captive, earnestly solicited his liberation from Martin V. ; and it appears that, presently afterwards, whether through the imprudence*, the policy, or the generosity of that Pope, Baltazar was restored to liberty. He returned to Italy, and presented himself as a simple ecclesiastic among his former associates and dependents. His popular qualities had secured him many adherents, and their affection was not shaken by his adversity. In some places he was welcomed with cordial salutations, but Parma was the principal scene of his triumph and temptation; for there he found a powerful party prepared to revive and support his abrogated claims to the chair. These warmly pressed him to resume his dignity, and their solicitations were seconded by several individuals who had tasted his former bounty, or had hopes from his future gratitude; all joined in protesting against the violence which he had suffered at Constance, and conjured him once more to array himself in the pontifical vestments, which were rightfully his own. This was not all: even in the calculations of success there seemed some ground for hope. The independent states of Italy would probably declare in his favour, and the numerous petty tyrants, who had usurped the patrimony of the Church, would assuredly unite against the acknowledged Pope. These circumstances were represented to Baltazar, and he fully comprehended their importance. Some wrongs, too, some unnecessary hardships, he had unquestionably endured at the hands of the emperor and council. Baltazar patiently listened to the seductions of his friends; and then, without returning them any answer, he suddenly took his resolution. He departed from the city hastily, and without any attendants; and proceeded to Florence, where the Pope then resided, in the garb of a fugitive and a suppliant. Immediately, without requiring any formal security for his person, he sought for Martin, and in the presence of a full assembly cast himself humbly at his feet; and while he recognized him with due reverence as the legitimate Vicar of Christ, he repeated his solemn ratification of the acts of the Council, and of his own deposition.

Most of those, who witnessed this spectacle, were affected to tears; for

* The account of Leonardus Aretinus (in *Rerum Italic. Historia*), who had the means of knowing the truth, is not so favourable to the motives of either party, as that which we would more willingly adopt. "John, after his captivity and abdication, was imprisoned in Bavaria. But many had a scruple, whether his deposition and abdication, being forcible, was legitimate. And if that was doubtful, the legitimacy of Martin also came into dispute. With this apprehension, and, at the same time, lest the Princes of Germany, possessing this image (idolum) of a Pope, should some day take some advantage of it, Martin engaged in measures for his redemption and restoration to Italy. Therefore, when on his liberation he arrived in France, and then learnt the counsel of Martin (which was to confine him for life at Mantua), before he arrived at Mantua, he turned off towards Genoa; and there being free, and his own master, whether induced by conscience, or by despair of success in any hostile enterprise, he voluntarily came to Florence, and throwing himself at the feet of Martin, recognized him as the true and only Pontiff. In adventu ejus tota civitas obviam profusa multis lacrimis et incredibili commiseratione respexit hominem de tantæ dignitatis fastigio in tantas calamitates prolapsam. Ipse quoque miserabili prope habitu incedebat, &c." . . . The Florentines, on the other hand, were not very fond of Pope Martin; and he is related, by the same historian, to have been almost childishly affected by a song then popular among the rabble, of which the burden was—

Papa Martino non val un quattrino.

they beheld the man, in whose presence all had once been prostrate, now voluntarily humbling himself before the throne, which he had so lately occupied, and before an individual, who had honoured him, for nearly five years, as his lord and pontiff. Martin V. shared the general emotion; and the reciprocal conduct of these two prelates furnishes an instance of magnanimous generosity, which too rarely illustrates the annals of the Church. The Pope resolved to exalt his predecessor as near to his former dignity, as was consistent with his own supremacy. Baltazar Cossa was appointed cardinal and dean of the Sacred College; in all public ceremonies, whether of chapels, consistories, or other assemblies, Baltazar was placed by the side of the Pontiff, on a loftier seat than any other ecclesiastic; he was honoured by the confidence of his master, and he repaid it by undeviating fidelity.

That fidelity may, indeed, have cost him no struggle; and if we should believe his former declaration, that from the moment of his elevation to the chair he had never enjoyed one day of happiness, the most enviable portion of his life may really have been that, in which he was followed by general commiseration. But whether he passed his remaining days in successful conflict with a bad and powerful passion, or whether (as seems to us more probable) he surveyed with philosophical disdain the dignity of which he had felt the cares, and had not valued the vanities,—in either case, he exhibited a vigour and expanse of mind, which is rarely found in man. . . . It is true, that the usual portraits of John XXIII. would not prepare us to expect such virtue in him. But that Pope has been, in truth, too hardly treated by historians. His enemies, in all ages, have been the powerful party; and the monstrous imputations, which originated at Constance, have been too eagerly repeated both by Protestant and other writers. Baltazar Cossa was a mere soldier*,—deeply stained, no doubt, with the loose immorality which then commonly attached to that profession, but not destitute of candid and manly resolution, nor of those worldly principles, which make men honourable. It is entirely unquestionable, that he was never actuated, even in appearance, by any sense of religion; that he was wholly disqualified even for the lowest ministry in God's Church; but he lived in an age in which the ecclesiastical and military characters were still deemed consistent, and in a Church, which had long permitted the most dissolute demeanour to its directors. As grand master of a military order, Baltazar Cossa might have descended to posterity with untarnished celebrity; and even the apostolical chair, had he possessed it some fifty years later, would have pardoned, under the protection of his warlike enterprise, the pollution and scandal of his vices.

* He is said to have exercised in his youth the trade of a pirate. . . . "Dum simplex Clericus ac in adolescentia constitutus existeret, cum quibusdam fratribus suis piraticam in mari Neapolitano, *ut fertur*, exercuit, &c." . . . To the habits thus acquired, is attributed a peculiarity which followed him even to the Popedom, of devoting the night to business, and the day to sleep. Theod. of Niem, Vit. Johann. XXIII. His character is fairly discussed by Sismondi (Rep. Ital. chap. lxii.), who truly remarks, that, had he been as abandoned as he is sometimes described, he would scarcely have been *twice* raised to the pontificate (for he was really chosen when Alexander V. was made Pope), nor retained so many valuable friends to the end of his life. Leonardus Aretinus describes him to have been "Vir in temporalibus quidem magnus; in spiritualibus vero nullus omnino et ineptus." . . . *Rep. Ital. Historia.*

NOTE ON THE WHITE PENITENTS AND OTHER ENTHUSIASTS.

(I.) Giovanni Villani (lib. xi. cap. xxiii.) relates, that in 1334 one Venturius of Bergamo, a mendicant preacher, a man of no eminence or family distinction, created a strong, though temporary, sensation in Lombardy and Tuscany. The object of his preaching was to *bring sinners to repentance*; and so great was the success, and so visible were the fruits of his eloquence, that more than ten thousand Lombards, of whom many were of the higher ranks, set out to pass the season of Lent at Rome. They were clad in the habit of St. Dominic; they travelled in troops of twenty-five or thirty, preceded by a cross; and their incessant cry was 'Peace and mercy.' During fifteen successive days, the time of their passage through Florence, they were entertained by that enlightened people with respect and charity; and so great became the renown and influence of the preacher, that they came to the knowledge of the court of Avignon, and awakened the jealousy of Pope Benedict. Venturius was arrested, and summoned before the Inquisition on the charge of heresy; and though acquitted by that tribunal, he was still retained in confinement by papal authority. 'Such,' says Villani, 'are the rewards which holy persons receive from the prelates of the Church—unless, indeed, the above was inflicted as a just chastisement upon the overbearing ambition of that friar, though doubtless his intentions were excellent.'

(II.) We read in Spondanus, that in the year 1374 there arose in Belgium a sect of Dancers, who paraded the streets, entered houses and churches half naked, crowned with garlands, dancing and singing, uttering unknown names, falling senseless on the ground, and exhibiting other marks of demoniacal agitation. Many were found to imitate them; and thus much (says the historian) appears certain, that this effect was produced through the visitation of an evil spirit; for they were healed by the charms of the exorcists, and by the reading of St. John's gospel, or of the expressions by which Christ is recorded to have cast out devils, as also of the Apostle's Creed. The same writer proceeds more reasonably to attribute their disease to the want of religious instruction. But it was needless to seek particular causes for the appearance of one of those distempers, which have disfigured the best ages of the Church, at a time when the disorders of the ecclesiastical government were so generally felt and confessed; when the people were beginning to exercise in so many quarters a freedom of opinion, yet feebly moderated by reason or knowledge; and when religion was the subject, to which the greater portion of this irregular independence was directed.

(III.) We shall, therefore, content ourselves with mentioning one other eruption of enthusiasm, which was more violent, indeed, and more celebrated, than the last, but apparently even more transient. In the year 1399, when the Christian world was astounded by the triumphs of the Turks and the Tartars from without, and shocked by the schism and the vices which it exposed and occasioned within, a body of devotees descended the Alps into Italy, and began to preach Peace and Repentance. They were entirely clothed in white, and carried crosses or crucifixes, whence blood appeared to exude like sweat. They were headed by a priest, a foreigner, whom some affirm to have been a Spaniard, others a Provençal, others a Scotsman, and who affirmed himself to be Elias the Prophet, recently returned from Paradise. The awful announcement, which he was commissioned to make, was the immediate destruction

of the world by an earthquake; and his tale and his prophecy were eagerly received by a generation, educated in habits of religious credulity. Lombardy was the scene of his first exhortations; he traversed its cities and villages, followed by multitudes, who assumed at his bidding the cross, the raiment, and at least the show of repentance. From Lombardy he proceeded to the Ligurian Alps, and entered Genoa at the head of five thousand enthusiasts, natives of an adjacent town. They sang various new hymns in the form of litanies, and among them the celebrated *Stabat Mater dolorosa*, the reputed composition of St. Gregory: they passed several days in that city preaching peace, and then returned to their homes. The Genoese caught the contagion, and transmitted it onwards to Lucca and Pisa. Those of Lucca immediately proceeded, four thousand in number, to Florence, and, after being entertained by the public hospitality, departed. Then the Florentines adopted that new religion (as ecclesiastical writers designate it) with equal fervour; and thus was it propagated from one end of Italy to the other, till its course was at length arrested by the sea.

This pious frenzy was not confined to the lower classes, nor to the laity, nor even to the inferior orders of the clergy. Prelates and even cardinals are recorded to have followed, if they did not guide, the current; and the numerous procession from Florence was conducted by the Archbishop. And if, indeed, we are to believe the wonderful effects which are ascribed to the preaching of these fanatics, we shall scarcely censure the compliance which countenanced, or at least which tolerated them. All who joined in those pilgrimages made confession and testified sincere repentance. Every one pardoned his neighbour, and dismissed the recollection of past offences; so that the work of charity was multiplied with zeal and emulation, and enmities, which no ordinary means could have reconciled, were put asleep. It was a festivity of general reconciliation. Ambuscades, assassinations, and all other crimes were for the season suspended; nor was any violence committed nor any treason meditated, so long as the "religion" of the White Penitents continued in honour. But this was not long; the imposture of the prophet was presently discovered and exposed, and within a very few months from the time of its appearance, the order fell into disregard, and wholly disappeared*.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Attempts of the Church at Self-Reformation.

General clamour for Reformation—with different objects—first appearance of a Reform party in the Church—exposure of Church abuses by individual Ecclesiastics—Pierre d'Ailli—Nicholas Clemangis—John Gerson—German and English Reformers—Zabarella—the real views and objects of those Ecclesiastics—how limited—position, exertions, and disappointment of the *Council of Pisa*—good really effected by it—*Council of Constance*—language of Gerson—The Committee of Reform—its labours—the question as to the priority of the Reformation or of the election of the new Pope—division of the Council—arguments on both sides—calumnies against the Germans—death of the Bishop of Salisbury—Address to the Emperor—defection of two Cardinals and of the English—final effort of the Germans—triumph of the Papal party—and election of Martin V.—necessary result of this—the principles and motives of the Italian clergy—The fortieth Session—object of the Reformers—the Eighteen Articles—remarks—other projects of the Committee—respecting the Court of Rome—their general character—respecting the secular Clergy—ecclesiastical jurisdiction—the

* The authors who have mentioned these enthusiasts, are Theodoric of Niem, an eyewitness, Poggio, in his History of Florence, Sigonius, Platina, Muratori.

monastic establishments—the real difference in principle between the two parties—first proceedings of Martin V.—fresh remonstrances of the nations—Sigismond's reply to the French—the Pope negotiates with the nations separately—publishes in the 43rd Session his Articles of Reformation—and soon afterwards dissolves the Council—the Concordats—character of the Pope's Articles—Annates—exertions of the French—the principle of the superiority of a General Council to the Pope established at Constance—decree for the periodical convocation of General Councils—assemblies of Pavia and Sienna—meeting of the *Council of Basle*—death of Martin V.—crisis of the Church—Accession of Eugenius IV.—his character—determines on opposition to the Council of Basle—the objects of that assembly—Cardinal Julian Cesarini—Contest between the Council and the Pope—two epistles of Cardinal Julian to the Pope—citations from them, on the corruption of the German clergy, on the popular discontent, on the transfer or prorogation of the Council, on the danger to the temporalities of the Church, on Eugenius' efforts to destroy the Council—political circumstances interrupt the dispute—the Pope sanctions the Council, and they proceed to the reformation of the Church—Substance of the chief enactments on that subject—against concubinage, fees paid at Rome—on papal election, &c.—some subsequent canons—Industry of the Pope's party in the Council—his successful negotiations at Constantinople—the quarrel renewed—the Pope assembles the Council of Ferrara—Secession of Cardinal Julian—his example not imitated—Differences about the legitimacy of the Council of Basle—the Cardinal of Arles—the eight propositions against Eugenius—strong opposition in favour of the Pope—he is deposed—Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, (Felix V.) appointed successor—dissolution of the Council—Nicholas V. succeeds Eugenius, and Felix abdicates—Diet of Mayence—The *Council of Bourges*—Pragmatic Sanction—its two fundamental principles—character of its leading provisions—its real permanence—The intended periodical meeting of General Councils—its probable effects on the condition of the Church—Ecclesiastical principles of the Councils of Constance and Basle—treatment of Huss and Jerome of Prague—Spiritual legislation of the Council of Basle—intolerance of those assemblies—Discovery of the art of printing.

THOUGH Churchmen are usually slow to perceive the corruptions of their own system, and unwisely dilatory and apprehensive in correcting them, still the abuses of the Roman Catholic Church were now become so flagrant—they had so commonly thrown off decency and shame—they were so wholly indefensible by reason or even by sophistry—and at the same time so oppressive and so unpopular, that a cry for Reformation began to be raised by the acknowledged friends, the ministers, and even the dignitaries of the communion. We intend no reference at this moment to the murmurs of those discontented spirits, who saw deeper into the iniquities of the system, and aimed their yet ineffectual resistance at its root—those faithful messengers of the Gospel, who prepared the way for Luther and Cranmer, but whose warnings were lost upon a selfish and short-sighted hierarchy. The exertions of Wickliffe and Huss, the real reformers of the Church, will be noticed hereafter: at present, we shall confine our attention to the endeavours, by which the wiser and more virtuous among her obedient children strove, through a considerable period, to remove her most repulsive deformities, and restore at least the semblance of health and dignity. We shall observe with curiosity and advantage the particular evils, to which the zeal of those reformers was directed, and the perverse and narrow and fatal policy which thwarted it. It is not that any effectual remedies could have been applied by those hands—nor any perfect renovation of their Communion accomplished by men, who were ignorant of the actual seat and character of the disease. The restoration of an Evangelical Church was not the object, nor could it have been the result, of their efforts; but the permanence of their own system was the matter really at stake—for it is very clear that the dominion of Rome would have been greatly strengthened by seasonable self-correction; and that an authority, so deeply fixed in the firmest prejudices of mankind, might have been preserved somewhat longer, had it been exercised with more discretion, and modified according to the changing principles of the times.

In our progress through the earlier annals of the Church, the shadow of reformation is continually before our eyes, and its name presents itself in every page—not only in the records of the monastic establishments, which

could not otherwise have been perpetuated, than by an unceasing process of regeneration, but also in the general regulations of Popes and of Councils. The necessity of new enactments, the pressure of existing abuses, the excellence of the ancient discipline were admitted in all ages, and the admission was sometimes followed by salutary legislation. Indeed, it is unquestionable, that those among the chiefs of the Church, who have best secured the gratitude of their own communion, as well as the commemoration of history, have deserved that distinction, not by a timid acquiescence in the defects of the existing institutions, but by a generous endeavour to correct them: so that the word at least was familiar and respectable in the eyes of Prelates and of Popes, and the principle might be avowed, under certain restrictions, without any suspicion, or even insinuation, of heresy.

The first occasion, however, on which the advocates of reform can be said to have appeared as a party in the Church, was the first assembly for the extinction of the schism. Among the Fathers of Pisa a powerful spirit of independence prevailed, and the circumstances of the preceding century had given it a direction and an object. There are, indeed, many earlier instances of the boldness of ecclesiastics in individually denouncing the imperfections of the Church, and in synodically legislating for their removal; but it was not till the secession to Avignon had lowered the majesty of Rome and impaired the resources of her Pontiffs; it was not till the division which followed had filled the world with proofs of their weakness and baseness, of their necessities, their vices, and their extortions—that a principle very hostile to papal despotism established itself, not only among princes and enlightened laymen, but even among the Prelates of the Catholic Church. Indeed, when

General Complaints against the abuses of the Church.

we observe the language in which certain eminent ecclesiastical writers, during the conclusion of the 14th and the beginning of the following century, have exposed and stigmatized ecclesiastical disorders, our wonder will rather be, that the system, which they so boldly denounced, did not sink beneath the burden of its own sinfulness, than that persons, who were interested in its preservation should have combined to amend and restore it. Among these were men of the noblest character and most extended learning; men of all nations, and, during the schism, of all obediences; at the same time, they were persons attached to Popery and patronized by Popes. Among the *French*, Pierre d'Ailli, Cardinal of Cambrai, was a moderate, but earnest, advocate for reform; in his treatise* on that subject, written about 1410, he censured with great severity the luxurious insolence of his own order; and it was he who has retailed a proverb current in those days, 'that the Church had arrived at such a condition, as to deserve to be governed only by the reprobate†.' Nicholas of Clemangis, a native of Champagne, who had been secretary to Benedict XIII., in an address to the Council of Constance, ascribed the schism

* 'De difficultate Reformationis in Concilio Universali.' It was addressed to Gerson, in reply to the Treatise of the latter on the same subject. His more celebrated work was that 'De Ecclesiastica Potestate,' in which he gave his views of the origin of ecclesiastical, as well as of papal power, and of their relation to each other. It may be found in the 6th volume of Von der Hardt. He was born in Picardy in 1350, and both Gerson and Clemangis were his pupils. Bayle, Vie de Pierre d'Ailly.

† "Adeo ut jam horrendum quorundam proverbium sit, ad hunc statum venisse Ecclesiam, ut non sit digna regi nisi per reprobos." The passage is cited by Lenfant, Hist. Conc. Const., l. vii. s. 1.

and desolation of the Church to the frightful ungodliness of its pastors. 'The earliest ministers of the Gospel were devout, humble, charitable, liberal, disinterested, and they despised the good things of this world. But as riches increased, piety diminished; luxury, ambition, and insolence took the place of religion, humility, and charity: poverty became a disgrace, and economy a vice; avarice came to the aid and support of ambition; and the property of ecclesiastics being no longer sufficient for their desires, it grew into practice to seize that of others, to pillage, assault, and oppress the inferiors, and to plunder every one under every pretext.' Such being the substance of his general* censures, he did not hesitate more particularly to ascribe the first rank in vice and scandal to the Popes, 'When they saw, that the revenues of Rome and the patrimony of St. Peter were inadequate to their designs of aggrandisement, it became necessary to discover new resources for the support of that project of universal monarchy. And nothing could be conceived more lucrative, than to deprive metropolitans, bishops, and other ordinaries, of the right of election to benefices, and to reserve the nomination and collation to themselves: and these they never conferred, except for large sums of money; which they often obtained in advance, by granting expectative graces to all sorts of persons indiscriminately, or at least without any distinction in regard to capacity or morals.' Such was, in truth, the origin of the *Apostolic Chamber*; and the mysteries of that fiscal inquisition had, no doubt, been intimately revealed to the secretary of Benedict XIII. The last whom we shall mention, and the greatest among the reformers of France, was the Chancellor of the University of Paris, John Gerson. In a sermon delivered before the Council of Rheims in 1408, that eloquent Doctor exposed the vices of the clergy, with the same freedom which he afterwards† employed at Constance in defining the legitimate limits of Papal authority. From the exposure of the evil he proceeded to investigate its origin; and as the general degeneracy of every rank in the priesthood was commonly traced by the writers of that age to the licentiousness of the Roman Court, so any effort to purify the descending stream was reasonably directed to its supposed source.

If the most distinguished among the reforming party were natives of France, the *Germans* engaged in greater numbers, and with greater consistency, in the same project. They appear, moreover, to have been the

* Not that his censures were confined to the avarice and rapacity of the clergy; a considerable share of them is directed to their incontinence—for instance, 'Quid illud, obsecro, quale est? quod *plerisque* in Diocesibus rectores parochiarum ex *certo* et conducto *cum suis Prælati*s pretio passim et publicè Concubinas tenent? Quod subditorum excessus et vitia, omniaque officia, quæ judiciis præesse sunt solita, publicè venundant? Sed adhuc levia hæc sunt.' Nor was he more merciful to the canons and monks; he was even particularly severe on the insolence and vanity of the latter, whom he considered as the Pharisees of their age. Respecting the abominations committed in the nunneries, his expressions are strong and exaggerated. 'Nam quid, obsecro, aliud sunt hoc tempore puellarum monasteria, nisi quædam, non dico Dei sanctuaria, sed Veneris execranda prostibula, sed lascivorum et impudicorum Juvenum ad libidinis explendas receptacula. *Ut idem hodie sit puellam velare, quod ad publicè scortandum exponere.*' (Nicol. de Clemangiis, de Ruina Ecclesie. cap. xxxvi. Apud Von der Hardt, tom. i. Conc. Constan.) Gerson, also, in his sermon at Rheims, used these words: 'Et utinam nulla sint Monasteria mulierum, quæ facta sunt prostibula meretricum, et prohibeat adhuc deteriora Deus.' Ser. factus in Concil. Remensi. Op. Gers., vol. ii., p. 625. Edit. Paris. See Lenfant, Conc. Const., l. vii., c. 13.

† In 1410 he addressed to Pierre d'Ailly his treatise 'De Modis Uniendi et Reformandi Ecclesiam in Concilio Universali.' His more celebrated work, 'De Simonia abolenda Constantiensis Concilii Ope,' was written during the Council. Both may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. i.

earliest in the field; for we observe, that Henry de Langenstein, of Hesse, a German, published in 1381 a vigorous treatise on 'the Union and Reformation of the Church*.' The five last chapters of his work were employed in depicting the universal profligacy of the clergy. After denouncing the simonies and other iniquities of the Popes, the Cardinals, and Prelates, he descended to expose the concubinage of the priests and the debaucheries of the monks; he represented the cathedrals as no better than dens of robbers, and the monasteries as taverns and brothels†. From *England* the voice of remonstrance proceeded with not less energy. 'The Golden Mirror of the Pope, his Court, the Prelates, and the rest of the Clergy‡,' was composed during the pontificate of Boniface IX., the most triumphant era of schism and simony; and the Treatise of Richard Ullerston, an Oxford Doctor, is said to have guided the views of the Bishop of Salisbury, who effectually served the cause by his personal zeal, both at Pisa and Constance. The *Italians*, as they were the only people who profited by pontifical corruption, so were they more commonly found to defend and uphold it. But even among them were a few splendid exceptions; Pileus§, Archbishop of Genoa, and Zabarella||, Cardinal of Florence, acknowledged and deplored the general unworthiness of the order to which they belonged. Lastly, even the *Spaniards* themselves, the perverse adherents of Benedict XIII., vented at Constance, in some satirical compositions, the indignation, which it was not yet politic to express openly.

We have thus seen how generally¶ it was admitted at that period, even by the friends and ministers of the Church, that great abuses existed

* 'Consilium Pacis de Unione ac Reformatione Ecclesiæ in Concilio Universali quærenda.' It occupies sixty columns in the beginning of Von der Hardt's second volume.

† This reformer seems also to have looked somewhat more deeply into the question; for he beheld with dissatisfaction the great multitude of images, which he held to be so many incentives to idolatry; and he was offended by the multiplication of festivals, and the frivolous nature of the controversies which divided the Church.

‡ 'Aureum Speculum Papæ, ejus Curia, Prælatorum, aliorumque Spiritualium.' The work gained great celebrity on the Continent.

§ See his *Ingenua Parænesis* ad Sigismund. Imper. De *Reformatione Ecclesiæ in Conc. Const. prosequenda*, apud Von der Hardt, tom. i., part 15.

|| There still exists a long and elaborate Treatise, published by Zabarella, 'De Schismate Innocentii et Benedicti Pontificis,' either before the meeting of the Council of Pisa, or during its earliest deliberations.

¶ In the 'History of the Council of Constance,' by Theodoric Vrie, written at the time and dedicated to Sigismund, the Church herself is made to speak the following lines, more remarkable for the bold truths which they contain, than for delicacy of expression, or metrical correctness. (Lib. i. Metrum Secundum.)

Heu Simon regnat; per munera quæque reguntur,
 Judiciumque pium gaza nefanda vetat.
 Curia Papalis fovet omnia scandala mundi,
 Delubra sacra facit perfiditate forum.
 Ordo sacer, baptisma sacrum cum Chrismate Sancto
 Venduntur, turpi conditione foro.
 Dives honoratur, pauper contemnitur, atque
 Qui dare plura valet munera gratus erat.
 Aurea quæ quondam fuit, hinc argentea Papæ
 Curia procedit deteriore modo.
 Ferrea dehinc facta, dura cervice quievit
 Tempore non modico; sed modo facta lutum.
 Postque lutum quid deterius solet esse? Recordor—
 Stercus. Et in tali Curia tota sedet.

Semler, in Cap. ii. Secul. xv., 'De Publico Ecclesiæ Statu,' enumerates a great multitude of compositions produced by the discontented spirits of the 14th and 15th centuries. Several are given at length by Herman Von der Hardt, Hist. Concil. Constant.

therein, that they demanded immediate and effectual correction, and that such could only be administered by removing the cause of the evil. Let us examine then, for one moment, the view which they took of their own imperfections. . . We may observe that the lamentations and censures, so abundantly poured forth by those writers, were confined almost wholly to one subject—the degeneracy and corruption of *the clergy*. This, indeed, was acknowledged to extend to the lowest rank from the very highest—this was admitted to comprise every form of sin and degradation—but this, according to their notions, was the limit of the evil. Under this one head was comprehended (or very nearly so) the sum and substance of the ecclesiastical derangement. The purity of the *system* was seldom or never questioned; the perfect integrity and infallible wisdom of the Church, and the divine obligation to believe and obey, without thought or question, all that it had enjoined or should enjoin, in practice, or precept, or ceremony, or discipline, was as strongly inculcated by the most eminent reformers, as by the most perverse upholders of the avowed abuses; only, it was maintained by the former, that the men, who administered this heaven-descended system, were sunk in a depravity from which it was necessary to raise them, and that no measures could effect this benefit, which did not first provide for the re-organization of the highest ranks. After all, it was but the surface of the subject which they surveyed; and thus the remedies proposed could not be other than ineffectual.

At the same time it must be admitted, that those remedies were properly adapted to the end which they were intended to attain. The demoralization of the inferior clergy was undoubtedly occasioned, in a very great measure, by the non-residence, the avarice, and the venality of their more elevated brethren; and these views were communicated almost necessarily by the contagion of the Court of Rome. And since it was become the practice of that Court to attract all aspiring ecclesiastics by the undisguised sale of the most honourable dignities, its malignant influence spread like a pestilence through the Church. Those, therefore, who maintained that no reform could have any effect unless it commenced at the head, and whose first endeavours were turned to extirpate the scandals of the Vatican, pursued their own views with boldness and sagacity, and aimed well to uproot the evil which they saw—only, their views were too narrow, and the evil lay deeper than they were able to discover, or than they dared to avow.

One professed object of the Council of Pisa was ‘to reform the Church in its head and in its members;’ and many of the *The Council of Pisa*. fathers there assembled were earnest in that intention. We have seen, indeed, to what insufficient limits their project was confined: still was it no inconsiderable design in that age, nor unworthy of a bold and generous character, especially in ministers and prelates of the Roman Church, to repress the licentiousness, and to moderate the power, of the successor of St. Peter. The boldness of the enterprise may be measured by its difficulty; for, if it was little that the reformers attempted, it was much more than they had the means of accomplishing. The moment, however, was exceedingly favourable; and when, after the deposition of the two pretenders, the See was vacant, and the election about to be made under the very eyes of the Council, an oath was imposed upon the Cardinals, that he among them who should be raised to the Pontificate, should not dissolve the Council, until after the reformation of the Church had been completed. The choice of the College, directed by the counsels of Baltazar Cossa, fell upon Alexander V. Gerson pre-

sently preached before him, and did not omit to press the paramount duty of correcting many abuses. A great number of the fathers held the same expectation. But Alexander, who was a Greek and a Pope, had no design to diminish his own profitable privileges, nor any scruple in evading his solemn obligation. In the 22nd and 23rd Sessions he published certain declarations, that out of regard for the necessities of the Churches, he remitted all arrears due to the Apostolical Chamber; that he resigned henceforward his claim on the property of deceased Prelates, and the revenues of vacant bishoprics; that he would make no more transfers of benefices, without previously hearing the parties concerned; and that provincial councils should be more frequently assembled for the salutary regulation of the Church. The consideration of any extensive plan of reform he thought expedient to defer, until the next general Council; but this was to be assembled in three years.

With these unsubstantial concessions—and even from these there was one dissentient Cardinal,—the Prelates of Pisa were dismissed; and if they returned to their several Sees with the consciousness, that they had not fully accomplished any one of the objects for which they were convoked, yet were they not without consolation, nor were their labours without fruit. They had not, indeed, healed the divisions of the Church; they had not restrained the abuses of papal power; they had not checked the profligacy of the Cardinals; they had not imposed any limit on the spreading domination of simony. Nevertheless, they had fulfilled an important destiny in the declining history of their Church; they had proclaimed the supremacy of a general Council, and deposed the two disputants who divided the papacy; they had freely censured the vices of the Apostolical See, and had demanded its reformation; they had secured the early convocation of another Council for the remedy of their grievances; and lastly, and most especially, they had opposed to pontifical despotism that independent constitutional spirit, which was the safeguard of the ancient Church; and which spreading from Pisa to Constance, from Constance to Basle, and striking deeply, though latently, during the times of iniquity which succeeded, at length achieved, under happier auspices and in a bolder spirit, its great and effectual triumph.

A much more numerous congregation of prelates and ecclesiastics of every rank, of ambassadors, of doctors of law, and other distinguished laymen, constituted the august assembly of Constance. The place was favourable to the hopes of reform; for the German soil was more auspicious to that cause than the irreligious and interested cities of Italy. Accordingly, we observe that its necessity was more loudly proclaimed, and its principles defined with greater boldness and exactitude. Gerson once more led the assault against papal delinquency. He attacked the Decretals, the Clementines, and most of the constitutions of the Popes; he overthrew many of the pretensions thence derived, and he exposed, in a strain now familiar to his audience, their simony, their avarice, and anti-Christian usurpations*. ‘All the bulls of John begin with a falsehood;

* ‘Non Christi, sed mores gerunt Antichristi;’ and again, ‘Non legimus Christum illi contulisse potestatem beneficia, dignitates, episcopatus, villas, terras dispensandi aut distribuendi, sed nec unquam legimus Petrum hæc fecisse. Sed solum hanc potestatem ei tribuit specialem, scriptam *Matt. xvi.*, quam etiam minimo mundi episcopo concessit.’ Such expressions might be flattering to the dignity of the surrounding prelates. But he was an injudicious friend to the Roman Catholic Church, who appealed to the Bible as the test of its purity. John Huss, had he been present at this discourse, might have pressed that argument somewhat farther.

for, if he was truly the *servant of the servants of God*,* he would employ himself in rendering service to the faithful, and assisting the poor, who are the members of Christ Jesus. But so far is he from calling the poor about him, or persons distinguished for their learning or their virtue, that he surrounds himself with lords, and tyrants, and soldiers. Let him, then, rather assume the title of Lord of Lords; since he dares to boast, that he possesses the same power which Christ possessed in his divine and human nature*. It was well, indeed, for Gregory the Great to call himself the Servant of the Servants of God. He nourished the poor, and was poor himself; he conferred benefices only on men of virtue and capacity; he preached the Gospel himself to his clergy and his people; he composed works to confirm believers in their faith; he held a rein over the luxury of the Roman people, and rescued them by his prayer to God from a pernicious pestilence. . . . Accustomed to the bitterness of such taunts, the Pope and his luxurious court may have been insensible to their shamefulfulness, or even questioned their justice; but, among the mitred multitudes who were present, some were doubtless awakened by the eloquence of Gerson to a better sense of their faith, their duties, and their obedience.

The Council had not been many months in existence before it entered seriously into this department of its duties; and a Committee of Reform (*Collège Reformatoire*) was appointed to examine into particular abuses, and prepare a general project for the approbation of the whole assembly. This College, named on the 15th of June, 1415, was composed of nineteen persons, viz. four deputies from each of the four nations, and *three Cardinals*. The deputies were chosen indifferently from bishops, doctors in theology, and doctors in law. There had been some previous contest, whether or not the Cardinals should be at all admitted as members of this body; since it was now well understood by all parties, that the question of a general reform practically resolved itself into a reform of the Court of Rome: not only because any other measures would have been wholly useless, unless attended by that, but also because the whole opposition to the removal of abuses proceeded from that quarter. Of the three

* 'Quia præsumat dicere esse tantam suam potestatem, quantum Christus habuit, secundum quod Deus et secundum quod homo.' Opera Gersoni, Apud Lenfant, Hist. Conc. Const. l. vii. s. xiv. The same doctor, in his sermon, 'De Signis Ruinæ Ecclesiæ,' mentions eight such indications: (1.) *Rebellio et inobediencia*; (2.) *Inverecundia*; (3.) *Immoderata inæqualitas, qua alius et sæpe dignior esurit*; alius et frequenter indignior præ multitudinè et magnitudine beneficiorum ebruius est; (4.) *Fastus et superbia prælatorum et aliorum ecclesiasticorum*—tantus fastus in Dei Ecclesia, præcipuè in temporibus istis, non tam multos movet ad reverentiam quam multos ad indignationem; et plures invitât ad prædam, qui se reputant fortasse Deo sacrificium offerre, si possent quosdam divites ecclesiasticos spoliare; (5.) *Signum sumitur ex tyrannide præsentium*—tales sunt pastores qui non pascunt gregem Domini sed semetipsos; (6.) *Conturbatio principum et commotio populorum*; (7.) *Recusatio correctionis in principibus ecclesiæ*; (8.) *Novitas opinionum*. Moderno quidem tempore unusquisque interpretari et trahere non veretur sacram scripturam, jura, sanctorumque patrum instituta ad libitum suæ voluntatis, prout amor, odium, invidia, spes promotionis, aut vindicta eum inclinât. . . . Præter hæc sunt alia signa, videlicet recessus justitiæ, distinctio studiorum, prælatio puerorum, et ignorantium et pravorum, et hæc erit destructio Latinorum. Plura alia sunt descripta in Prophetis de dejectione sacerdotalis honoris, ex quibus et prædictis, sapiens potest concludere ruinam temporalium de propinquo imminere. A multis annis non fuerunt tot malevoli, tanti corde rebelles et animo accensi contra ecclesiam sicut his diebus. Quos in longum compescere nequaquam valebimus, nisi signis virtutum manifestis ad benevolentiam eos inclinaverimus.' Gersoni Opera, vol. i. p. 199, Ed. Paris, 1606. This sermon was preached before the Council of Constance.

interested parties who were at length admitted into the committee, Pierre d'Ailli, the Cardinal of Cambrai, was one.

The College appears to have held its first deliberations on the 20th of August; and the subject to which they were directed was the translation of bishops. Other important matters were discussed by it during the autumn following; but whether it was paralyzed by the pontifical intrigues, or whether some of its members were deficient in zeal, its exertions did not keep pace with the eagerness of the reformers without. The German 'Nation' published, about the end of the year, a remonstrance against the tediousness of its proceedings; the pulpits of Constance resounded with expressions of exhortation and reproof; and elegies, and squibs, and satires were circulated to the same effect in the social, and even in the public, meetings of the fathers.

The labours of the committee were continued through the whole of 1416 till late in the succeeding year; and by that time, as we shall see presently, they had produced many wise and salutary resolutions. But in the course of 1417 a new subject of controversy arose, which deeply affected the success of those measures. As soon as the See, through the cession or deposition of its three claimants, was declared vacant, a very important question was moved—whether it were not wise to defer the new election, until after the work of reformation should have been accomplished. Whatever was honest and intelligent and dispassionate in the party of the reformers maintained the necessity of that expedient. They knew the ambitious and selfish spirit of papacy; they knew how the elevation to the apostolical chair could blight the best principles; and contract the noblest heart; they knew that disinterested integrity in *that* situation was beyond the magnanimity of man. They determined not to

Divisions, ending in the election of Martin V.

create with their own hands a destroyer of their own works. The nations, which took this side in the dispute, were the Germans and the English, and they were supported with the utmost sincerity and firmness by the Emperor. The Cardinals conducted the opposite party with equal constancy and greater craft: they were warmly supported by the Italians; the Spaniards, who on the deposition of Luna had been admitted to the deliberations, were on the same side; and even the French, hitherto the most enlightened advocates of reform*, for the most part, threw themselves into the ranks of its opponents. The contest continued during the whole summer—numerous harangues were delivered, and much violence and much sophistry was wasted on both sides. On the one hand, the universal deformity and prostitution of the Church were exhibited and exaggerated in the most furious invectives; on the other, it was argued that the Church without the Pope was a headless trunk, which was indeed the most frightful of all deformities; and that it became, in consequence, the first duty of every reformer to supply that deficiency (such was the nonsense seriously propounded by the friends of corruption) and thus restore the spiritual body to its integrity.

This was indeed the last ground of hope which remained to the cardinals; and it was really firm and tenable, because the majority of the nations had declared in their favour. They contested it with every weapon, and with the uncompromising, unscrupulous activity of men, whose personal interests were concerned in the result. On one occasion

* This sudden change is ascribed to their national jealousy of the English, the victors of Agincourt.

they presented a memorial to Sigismond, in which they urged, on the plea of their majority, their right to proceed to immediate election: at the same time they affected to repel, with some loftiness, the imperial interference in matters strictly ecclesiastical. On another, they published an offensive libel upon the Germans, in which they accused that nation of a disposition to favour the opinions of the Hussites—to defer the election of a Pope, in order to reform, without his co-operation, his office and his court, savoured strongly (so the cardinals argued) of the anti-papal perversion of those heretics! The stigma of heresy—a weapon which the defenders of ecclesiastical abuses have managed with great address in every age of the Church—exasperated those honest and orthodox Christians, and they repelled it with great, and (as they thought) virtuous indignation. About the same time Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, died. He was among the stoutest of the Reformers of Constance, and had exercised very considerable influence, not only over the councils of his compatriots, but over the mind of the Emperor himself*.

On the 9th of September, five days after his decease, an assembly was held on the same subject; and the result was a remonstrance, in the name of the cardinals, to Sigismond, on the extreme danger impending over the Church from any delay in the election of a Pope. It is remarkable, that the language of this document expressed a sense of the necessity of reform, and great readiness to undertake it; but it was urged, that the question ought to be deferred, until a head had been given to the Church. But the Emperor rose ere the Address was finished, and indignantly quitted the Assembly. Howbeit, the cardinals persisted, without any fear or compromise; two days afterwards, a second † memorial, more explicit and decided than the former, was presented and read; and so firm was the attitude of that party, that the only two members of the sacred college, who had hitherto supported the opposite opinions, now joined their colleagues. A still more important defection immediately followed this; the English also passed over to the papal party.

From the moment that the decision of the majority of the Council was contravened by Sigismond, it was very easy to persuade even the most honest reformers, that the dignity and authority of the whole assembly was at stake, and that it was the duty of all parties to combine, in order to repel the presumptuous interference of the Emperor—and many were probably influenced in their change by that motive. But the Germans still maintained their former resolution; and though many of them also may have been guided by considerations (of nationality, or loyalty) foreign to the original question of reform, a fresh memorial, which they immediately presented to the Council, pressed very forcibly the real argument on which the contest now turned. In this paper they maintained, with great boldness and reason, 'that the General Council stood in the place of the Church and completely represented it; that the schism had arisen from the general corruption of that body, and that such corruption could only be remedied during the vacancy of the See; that if a Pope were once elected—however virtuous and upright the individual exalted might be, however proved and old in integrity and piety—he would speedily be stained by the vices which infected the Chair, and debased the ecclesiastics surrounding it; that he would grope in the darkness and

* Von der Hardt calls him Cæsar's *fidus Achates*.

† They may both be found in the first volume of Von der Hardt's *Hist. Cons. Constat. Præfat.* in part. xx. p. 916 et seq.

solitude of his own honesty, till his private excellence would give way before the overwhelming depravities of a system, which no man could possibly administer, and be virtuous,—while, on the other hand, a substantial reform, previously effected, would shelter him from the pressure of unjust and wicked solicitations.’ The wisdom and truth contained in these positions inflamed still further the perversity of the cardinals; and what they could not hope to effect by reason, or even by menace, they prepared to accomplish by more certain means. Among the German prelates there were two, who possessed, more completely than their brethren, the confidence both of the Emperor and the ‘Nation’—the Archbishop of Riga and the Bishop of Coire. Each of these respectable persons had private reasons (which were not concealed from the cardinals) for being discontented with his own See. A negotiation was opened. To the former they promised the bishopric of Liege, which he coveted; to the latter, the archbishopric of Riga—both were converted. Their compatriots followed them; and the tumults, which had shaken the Council for so many months, were appeased by the translation of two venal prelates*.

The Emperor, thus deserted by the entire Church, still offered an ineffectual show of resistance; and at length, to throw at least some dignity over his defeat, he stipulated as the conditions of his consent, that the Pope should enter, without any delay, even before his coronation, upon the work of reform; that he should conduct it in concert with the Council; and that he should not depart from Constance, until his task was accomplished. The cardinals, with their coadjutors †, soon afterwards assembled in conclave, and on the 11th of November following, Martin V., an Italian and a Roman, was raised to the pontifical throne.

The historian cannot fail to perceive, what was indeed obvious at the time to the most intelligent men of both parties, that the battle of reform had in fact been fought on other ground, and that the field, for which so many efforts had been made, and were still to be made, was already lost. Some nominal improvements might yet, perhaps, be extorted from the reluctant pontiff—some trifling abuses he might be brought to sacrifice, in order to save and perpetuate the rest—with some unmeaning shadow he might consent to amuse and delude the world—but the hope of any substantial measure of renovation was gone. Notwithstanding the strong sense of the Church’s degradation and danger, with which so many of the fathers were deeply penetrated—notwithstanding the security and even applause, with which their complaints and invectives were uttered and heard—notwithstanding the learning, the virtue, and the powerful talents which were united in the same cause,—it was no difficult matter for a small body of very crafty ecclesiastical politicians, closely bound together by common and personal interests, and wholly unscrupulous as to means, to neutralize the exertions of a much more numerous party, which, though earnestly bent on one general purpose, might be divided as to a thousand particulars. For a space of nearly three years numberless causes of discord, personal, professional, national, might spring up, while the watchful cardinals were ever at hand to encourage and mature them. Every change of circumstance presented a new field of action; and in so harassing and protracted a contest, superior discipline, and a keener sense of interest, might finally supplant or wear away the adverse majority.

Moreover, the College could always count, with perfect confidence, on

* Von der Hardt, tom. iv. p. 1426.

† See the preceding chapter, page 533.

the zeal and fidelity of its Italian allies. The whole multitude of the Transalpine clergy conspired, with scarcely an individual exception, in opposition to reform. Yet this combination did not, probably, arise, either because they were very rich, or very powerful, or very generally demoralized. *The Italian Clergy.* *In riches*, the bishops and abbots of Italy could bear no comparison with the lordly hierarchy of Germany or England; partly, because their disproportionate numbers diminished the share of each in the common fund, and partly, because the private devotion of antient days had there been less munificent than among the younger and ruder proselytes of the north. *In power*, and popular influence, they were precluded from any extravagant progress by the wider diffusion of intelligence, and the free and daring spirit of the prevalent republicanism. In truth, among the Italian *people*, the last sparks of religious fervor were at this time nearly extinct; and whatever attachment they still retained for their Church was without enthusiasm, and not uncommonly without faith. The venerable family of Saints, once so fruitful in every province, was now rarely and languidly propagated. The din of polemical controversy, the surest indication of theological zeal, was seldom heard; and even *heresy* itself, which was building its indestructible temples in the north and west of Europe, gave little occupation or solicitude to the Churchmen of Italy. Many of the causes which tend generally to swell sacerdotal authority (we are not now speaking of the peculiar dominion of the Pope) had ceased to operate in that country. *In morality*, the Italian clergy were upon the whole less dissolute than those to the North of the Alps; and for that reason they were less deeply impressed with the necessity of reform. To this praise the Court of Rome did, indeed, present an infamous exception. But the pontifical palace may seem to have attracted to its own precincts most of the noxious vapours, which else would have spread more general infection; and the prelates of Italy found their profit in the very vices of Rome. Besides, they had been so long habituated to consider the authority of that See as national property, and shared with such selfish exultation the glory of its foreign triumphs and the sense of its imposing majesty, that they rallied round it with ardour, on the first rumour of hostility. They saw that some of its dearest prerogatives were threatened—they saw that some of its most profitable usurpations were assailed: but they did not see the FRIENDLINESS of the design—they did not perceive that an increase of vigour and stability would assuredly follow the immediate sacrifice:—they snatched at the short-sighted policy of the moment, and, by defending the abuses of their Church, ensured its downfall.

On the 30th of October, in the interval between the triumph of the cardinals and the election of the Pope, the fortieth, one of the most important sessions of the Council, took place. Then was made a very seasonable effort, on the part of the reformers, to impose some specific obligation upon the future Pope; and on this occasion the scheme, which the Committee of Reform had been so long engaged in preparing, was formally approved, and recommended to the immediate adoption of the pontiff and Council—for the majority were *of Reformation.* still sincere in their intentions, though they had blindly cast away the means of effecting them. To do justice to this subject, we must shortly mention the heads of this project; since it may be considered as embracing the utmost extent of change which it was thought expedient, or found possible, under

any circumstances to introduce. The Articles, to which the future reformation was to be directed, were eighteen :—(1) The number, the quality, and the nation of the cardinals; (2) The Reservations of the Holy See; (3) Annates; (4) Collations of benefices and expectative graces; (5) What causes ought to be treated in the Court of Rome; (6) Appeals to the same Court; (7) The offices of the Chancery and Penitentiary; (8) Exemptions granted, and unions made, during the schism; (9) Commendams; (10) The confirmation of elections; (11) Intermediates, *i. e.* revenues during vacancy; (12) Alienation of the property of the Roman and other Churches; (13) In what cases a Pope may be corrected and deposed, and by what means; (14) The extirpation of Simony; (15) Dispensations; (16) Provision for the Pope and the Cardinals; (17) Indulgences; (18) Tenths. To these it should be added, that, in the session preceding, a Decree had passed to regulate, and secure, as far as possible, the periodical meeting of General Councils.

In the resolutions, which the Committee published respecting the above Articles, a sort of principle is discernible, of throwing aside the new canon law, and reviving in its place the more discreet and venerable institutions of more antient days. Thus they resolved, that the Popes should judge no important cause without the counsel of his Cardinals—and even, in some instances, without the approbation of a General Council. And again, that there were certain cases in which a Pope might be judged and deposed—decisions wholly at variance with the canons of the Vatican, which committed to the Pope alone all judgment of major causes, and gave authority to Bulls, originating with himself; and which also laid it down, that a Pope could not be judged or deposed on any other charge, than that of heresy.

The Committee of Reform also prohibited the Popes from reserving* the *spoils* of the bishops, the revenues of vacant benefices, and the *procurations*, or provisions made for bishops during their visitations. *Regarding the Pope.*

It imposed some restraint on pluralities and dispensations. The Pope was forbidden to permit the same person to hold more than one bishopric or abbey at the same time, unless with the consent of the sacred college, and for important reasons—though even this restriction appears to have been liable to exceptions, in countries especially where the benefices were poor †. Another resolution enforced the residence of the higher clergy, on pain of deprivation in case of six months of absence, unless with special permission from the Pope. Another forbade the Pope to impose tenths on his clergy, without the consent of a General Council. Another revoked, with some trifling exceptions, all the exemptions which had been granted during the schism. The abuse of exemptions had,

* On the subject of reservations, Lenfant remarks, that *Mental Reservations* of benefices were not yet introduced. These differed from others in that they were not published. If a benefice was vacant, and either the ordinary had conferred it, or any one went to Rome to obtain it, the datary would answer, that the Pope had made a mental reservation to present it to whom he thought proper.

† In Apulia, for example, and in some parts of Spain, the reformers allowed the Pope to give dispensation for four benefices. In England, on the other hand, they would not permit it, on any account, to be granted for more than two. Clemangis asserts (*De Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu*, cap. xi.) ‘that there were at that time ecclesiastics who held as many as five hundred ample benefices.’ And the same writer further affirms, ‘that the monks of his day were at the same time monks, canons, regular, secular; that, under the same habit, they possessed the rights, offices, and benefices of all orders and of all professions.’ Lenf. *Hist. Conc. Const.*, l. vii. s. xxxii.

indeed, proceeded so far as to awaken the conscience even of the Pope himself, who subsequently ratified this Article.

The popes had usurped the power of translating from see to see, without consulting the inclination of the prelates affected by the change. These *forcible* translations were prohibited by the committee; but it does not appear that Martin V. consented even to so slight an encroachment upon his despotism. It had also been a custom, probably established by Innocent III., for the Popes to reserve to the Holy See the power of giving absolution for certain offences (called reserved cases), which were thought to be placed above episcopal cognizance. The pretext for this innovation was, to invest those crimes with additional terrors, and to repel men from their commission by the difficulty of obtaining absolution. The common effect was this; that many, unable or indisposed to undertake so long a pilgrimage, disregarded entirely both confession and penance; while others, whose easier circumstances permitted the journey, poured forth their penitential gold with great profusion into the apostolical coffers. This subject was for some time debated in the committee; but it was at length unanimously decided, that the established usage should remain.

As those, here mentioned, composed the most important restrictions, which it was designed to impose upon the Pope's authority, so the meditated reform of his cardinals and his court *The Court of Rome*, would have introduced changes still less considerable. Four resolutions were passed respecting the number of the sacred college, and the qualifications necessary for admission; as also, that every new nomination should receive the approbation of the majority of the college. Others were enacted for the better administration of the apostolical chancery and chamber, respecting protonotaries and participants; the auditors, or judges *della rota* (the parliament of the Pope); scribes of the penitentiary; abbreviators of Bulls; clerks of the chamber; correctors of the apostolical letters; *auditores contradictariorum*, and auditors of the chamber; acoluthes, subdeacons, chaplains, referendaries, penitentiaries, and registrars—not for the abolition of any of those offices*, or of others which might have been added to the list, but only for their more judicious regulation. Thus we observe, that it did not then enter into the views of any party to diminish the state and dignity of the see, nor to curtail any of the consequence which it might derive from those circumstances; but that the Reformers of those days would have been well satisfied in that matter, had the Pope consented to part with the most obvious and superficial abuses.

The resolutions of the committee respecting the secular clergy, while they proclaimed the general corruption, were more especially levelled against two crimes, the same which, from the days of Gregory VII., had been the constant mark for the shafts of Reform—simony and concubinage. The enactments which were made, particularly against the former of these offences, were reasonable and salutary. But there could be little prospect of their execution, so long as the court of Rome was left in possession of so much pomp and splendour, without any fixed and sufficient funds for its support. Even had it been possible by a single act of the

* The only office, as far as we can observe, which the reformers abolished, was the 'Auditorship of the Chamber of Avignon,' which, since the return of the Pope's to Rome, had become an obvious sinecure.

council, at once to extirpate simony from the Church, Rome was the hot-bed where it would of necessity have sprung up again, and thence spread its pestiferous branches over the whole surface of Christendom. Other ecclesiastical abuses were likewise assailed. It had frequently happened*, to the great scandal of the people, that bishops held sees, and incumbents parishes, without having taken priest's orders. The College of Reform had already regulated, that the pope should grant no dispensation to bishops, on this point, for longer than one year: it extended the same limit to the inferior clergy. Another, and very important task it also undertook,—to draw the limits which were hereafter to divide civil from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to specify the causes which appertained to either. The want of some definite arrangement on this subject had, for some time, disturbed the course of justice, and led to perpetual broils between the clergy and the laity. Nevertheless, as it was through that very indistinctness, that the former had been enabled to push their claims so far, it might be uncertain whether its removal, though finally advantageous to both parties, would be very popular among them. Several useful regulations were likewise devised for the purification of the various religious bodies, and especially of the Mendicants. It seems, indeed, to have been generally admitted by the leading reformers, that in the universal degeneracy of the Church, the most conspicuous instances of profligacy and profaneness were exhibited by the monastic establishments.

Such are the outlines of the project by which the reformers of Constance proposed to restrain the abuses of papacy, and to restore, correct, and consolidate the Catholic Church. And here we should again remark, that the authors of that project were themselves zealous, and even bigoted churchmen. Respecting the divine authority, the power, the infallibility ‡ of the Church, they professed opinions as lofty, as the loftiest notions of their adversaries. Still the space which divided the two parties was broad and clear, and it was included in one question—In what does this infallible Church consist? In what is it fully and faithfully represented? Does a council-general, without the Pope, possess the mighty attributes in question? Or a council-general with the Pope? or the Pope without a council-general? The last opinion, the extreme of high papacy, had not perhaps very many advocates; at least the second was that on which the Italians took their stand, as being the more tenable; the first was the rallying principle of the reformers, who may be designated the low papists. It cannot be too carefully impressed, that the mighty struggles at Constance respected, in as far as *principles* were concerned, not the character of the Church, on which all were agreed, but the extent to which the Pope possessed the attributes of the Church. And this distinction being rightly understood, we shall find no difficulty in accounting—when we shall arrive at that subject—for the seeming inconsistency, with which the council of Constance deposed a legitimate Pope with one hand, while it consigned the heretics, Huss and Jerome, to barbarous execution with the other.

We have observed, that at the Fortieth Session eighteen articles, which

* Lenfant, Hist. Conc. Const., liv. vii., s. 46.

† The above account is founded on four authentic documents published by M. Von der Hardt, from the MSS. of the library of Vienna, and recognized by Lenfant as "containing all the resolutions of the committee of reform."—Hist. Conc. Constan., liv. vii., s. xxvii. See Von der Hardt, tom. i., partes x. xi. xii. *Collegii Reformatorum Constant. statuta*, sive *Geminum Reformatorii Constant. Protocolum*, &c. &c.

‡ It is only necessary to refer to the writings of leading reformers, Gerson, Pierre d'Ailli, &c., and the acts of the councils both of Constance and Basle.

were the heads of the resolutions of the committee, were submitted, by the approbation of the council, to the future Pope, and that Martin V. was elected a few days afterwards. Again, on the very day following his coronation, the nations assembled and pressed the observance of his obligation. The Pope appears to have promised with great facility; but at the same time he appointed six cardinals to co-operate with the deputies of the nations in revising their former labours. Divisions presently arose; the cardinals were indefatigable in creating difficulties; so that the patience of the Germans being once more wearied, they addressed (about the end of 1417) a fresh memorial to the new committee. The subjects urged on this occasion principally regarded reservations, appointment to benefices, expectative graces, and other papal usurpations, and abuses of the Church patronage. Very soon afterwards, the French remonstrated with equal warmth against the procrastinations of the committee, and even presented a petition to Sigismond, in which they exhorted him to employ his powerful influence with the Pope. But Sigismond had not forgotten their late opposition, nor was he unmindful of the fatal wound, which they had inflicted on the cause. He dismissed their deputies without honour; and while he bade them reflect, how steadily they had thwarted his wish to accomplish the reformation *before* the Pope should be elected, he recommended them, now that they had obtained their Pope, to apply to *him* for their reform. At the same time, the Spaniards raised a clamour against simony and other abuses, and went so far as to throw out some menaces against the Pontiff himself; indeed some of them were suspected of still harbouring a secret attachment towards their perverse compatriot, the Pope of Paniscola. Martin was somewhat moved by this show of unanimity; and thinking to gain better terms by dividing his adversaries, he contrived to open a separate negotiation with each nation, on the plea that he could thus more intimately consult their several interests. The scheme succeeded; and as all parties were wearied alike with dispute and delay, matters were now hurried to a conclusion. On the 21st of March, 1418, the Pope, no longer disguising his eagerness to dissolve the council, held the 43d session, and published his own articles of reformation; and they should be recorded for their very insignificance. The first revoked (with a large field for exceptions) such exemptions as had been granted *during the schism*; the second commanded a fresh examination of such unions of benefices as had taken place during the same period. The third prohibited the appropriation of the revenues of vacant benefices to the apostolical chamber. The fourth was a general edict against simony. The fifth respected papal dispensations to hold benefices without being in orders. The sixth forbade the imposition of tenths and other taxes on ecclesiastics, unless for some great advantage to the Church, and with the consent of the cardinals and local prelates. The seventh regulated the dress of ecclesiastics, according to the modesty of the antient laws; and the last, and the most shameless of all, declared that, by the above articles, and by the concordats granted to the nations, the Pope had satisfied the demands of the Committee of reform, as expressed in the fortieth session of the council, and discharged his own obligations.

The Concordats were as delusive as the articles*; and Martin, con-

* That granted to the Germans contained twelve articles, which are enumerated by Semler, *Secul. xv., cap. ii., p. 38.* Since they did not go to the effectual removal of any grand abuse, it is unnecessary to cite them here.

scious of this, had not yet made them public; but continued to press the immediate dissolution of the council. It was in vain objected, that many matters of great importance still remained unsettled: it was replied, that the patrimony of the Holy See was in the hands of depredators; that Rome itself was exposed to the scourges of famine and pestilence, of foreign and intestine war; that it was the paramount duty of him, whom the whole world now acknowledged as the successor of St. Peter, to place himself on the throne of the apostle. Accordingly, on the 22d of April, the council assembled for the forty-fifth and last session; and the Bull which released the fathers from their unsuccessful labours, showered upon them and their domestics a profusion of indulgences, as if to complete, by an additional mockery, the insult with which their hopes had been destroyed*. On the 2d of May the concordats were published; and that which was granted to the French was immediately rejected by them, as contrary to the liberties of the Gallican Church. But the object of Martin was already accomplished; *the Council of Constance had ceased to exist*; and in defiance of the urgent remonstrances of the emperor, the pontiff turned his footsteps towards Italy. He turned towards the soil, where papacy was national and indigenuous, and where, amidst all the turbulence of contending cities and factions, the spiritual despotism of the Vicar of Christ had never yet been contested.

Dissolution of the Council.

We should here observe that, while very lofty language was employed at Constance on both sides respecting the principle on which the government of the Church rested; while some maintained that it was a pure monarchy, others that it was a monarchy tempered by a mixture of the aristocratical and even republican character; other disputes were less publicly, though not less passionately, agitated between those parties, respecting much more vulgar considerations. The reader cannot fail to have remarked, that of the concessions made by Martin, those which were not absolutely nugatory regarded the temporalities of the Church, and the power of the Pope to levy contributions upon the clergy. The reforming prelates had pressed these from the beginning among other grievances; but it proved at last, that the subject, on which those pecuniary discussions had chiefly turned, was entirely unnoticed in the Pope's decree. The exaction of *Annates*, or the first year's income of vacant benefices, seems to have

Disputes on Annates.

* As this memorable Bull happens to be short, it will be well to record it. 'We Martin, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, ad perpetuam rei memoriam, by the requisition of the holy council, do hereby dismiss and declare it terminated, giving to every one liberty to return home. Besides, by the authority of God the omnipotent, and of his blessed apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and by our own, we accord to all the members of the council plenary absolution from all their sins, "semel in vita;" so that each among them may obtain this absolution in form, within two months after the gift shall be made known to him. We also give them the same privilege *in articulo mortis*; and we extend it to servants as well as their masters, on condition that, after the day of notification, both the one and the other shall fast every Friday during one year, for the absolution for life, and another year for the absolution in articulo mortis; unless there be some legitimate hinderance, in which case they shall perform other pious works. And after the second year, they shall be held to fast every Friday during life, or to do other works of piety, on pain of incurring the indignation of the omnipotent God, and of his blessed apostles St. Peter and St. Paul.' Such were the consolations which were offered to the most enlightened body which had ever yet assembled in the name of the Church, in return for their disappointed expectations, by the very man whom they had raised to power, and whose first use of it was to betray them. They demanded a substantial reform, and he paid the debt in indulgences.

been that, among all the resources of the apostolical chancery, which was most profitable to the receivers, and most unpopular among all other ecclesiastics. The claim was of a very modern date; it could not be traced higher than Clement V.; and it scarcely assumed the shape of a right till the pontificate of Boniface IX. The French 'nation' urged the abolition of this tax with especial zeal from the very opening of the council; and the ambassador of Charles VI. was instructed at all events to carry this measure. The fathers, in a general assembly, even passed a resolution to that effect; but the cardinals still exclaimed and remonstrated, and protested; and, as their last resource, they ventured to appeal from the council to the future Pope. The French replied to this appeal with much spirit and reason*; and had the reformation preceded the election, there can be no doubt that the imposition would have been removed. But the cardinals finally prevailed, and the odious exaction, under some slight and indefinite restrictions, was re-established.

But though the reforming party, which really constituted the great majority of the Council, was finally defrauded of all the substance of its project, and dismissed with a very thin veil to cover its defeat, yet the recollection of one great triumph might supply substantial ground of consolation. The superiority of a General Council to the Pope was unequivocally decreed at Constance. The prelates of Pisa had done little more than overthrow two claimants to the See, neither of whom was universally acknowledged, or rightfully established. But the legitimacy of John XXIII. was never questioned even by his bitterest enemies; and Martin, whose succession to the dignity was only legal through the legality of the previous deposition and of the power exercised by the deposing Council, was the least qualified of all men to discredit either the act or the authority; so that, whatsoever struggles and protestations may afterwards have been made by individual Popes, the general principle was immutably established in the Church†.

The fathers of Constance also carried home with them another source of comfort and hope. In the thirty-ninth session, held on the 9th of October, 1417, it was enacted, as a perpetual law of the Church, that general councils should be held on every tenth year from the termination of the preceding; in such places as the Pope, with the consent of the Council sitting, should appoint.

But in the first instance, as the actual exigencies of the Church did not seem to allow even that short interval, another Council was to be assembled in five years from the dissolution of that of Constance, and a third in seven years after the second. In obedience to this constitution, Martin V. twice attempted to collect an obsequious assembly in Italy; but his summons were disregarded by the foreign prelates, to whom neither Pavia nor Sienna offered any prospect of independence. The scanty synods were hastily dissolved, and the only act which is recorded of the latter was to grant as ample indulgences to those, who should contribute gold for the extinction of the Bohemian heretics, as to those, who

* The substance of the paper is given by the Continuator of Fleury, l. civ., s. lxxiv. Some curious particulars of the dispute between the French and the Cardinals on the subject of Annates may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. i., pars xiii.

† It is well known that Transalpine divines dispute the principle even to this moment; but they have no ground to stand upon. If they admit the legitimacy of the Council of Constance, they must receive that decision; if not, they impugn the succession of their Popes ever since that Council—for they all flow uninterruptedly from Martin V. No sophistry can liberate them from this dilemma.

should serve *the crusade* in person. Basle, at length, was appointed for the meeting of the real representatives of the Church, and they crowded thither in great multitudes during the spring and summer of 1431.

In the meantime, on the 19th of the preceding February, Martin V. died. His long pontificate had been principally devoted to two objects, the recovery of the States of the Church and the amassing of wealth; and he had succeeded in both. As to *Council of Basle*, the former, he had restored the interests of the See nearly to the condition in which they stood before the schism. As to the latter, he destined the treasures, which he collected, rather for the aggrandizement of his own family, than for the benefit of the Catholic Church, or even of the Pontifical Government. At the same time, it is admitted that he possessed considerable talents, and a vigorous and consistent character; and he has escaped the imputation of any great vice, excepting avarice. At this crisis, the character of the successor to the chair was of consequence almost incalculable to the Church. The Council of Basle was irrevocably summoned; and its principles, its policy, and its power could easily be foreseen from the experience of Constance. What policy, then, was the new Pope to pursue? Was he openly to oppose, or craftily to elude, or generously to co-operate, in the work of reformation? The durability of the Roman Catholic Church depended on the answer.

The Cardinals were not, indeed, disturbed by such distant considerations; and the views, with which most of them entered the conclave, extended not beyond their private intrigues or immediate interests. Being unable at once to agree, they proceeded to the scrutiny; and their secret arrangements being not yet satisfactorily concluded, they continued to throw away their votes upon the names which held the lowest consideration, and were the last in the chance of success. And thus it happened, that, at the conclusion of one of these scrutinies, to the astonishment and dismay of the whole college, one Gabriel Condolmieri, the least and most insignificant member of the sacred body, was found in possession of two-thirds of the suffrages*. There was no space to repent or retract; the election was already valid, and the bark of St. Peter was *thus* consigned, in the most anxious moment of its destiny, to the hand of Eugenius IV.

*Election and Character
of Eugenius IV.*

Had that Pontiff been as deeply impressed with his own incapacity as the rest of the Christian world, he might occasionally have followed the counsel of wiser men; but, on the contrary, he was the most presumptuous, as he was the most ignorant, of mankind†. The rigorous habits of a monastic life had equally contracted his principles, and blinded his judgment; so that he perpetually mistook precipitation for decision, and then thought to redeem his rashness by his obstinacy. Without talents or any steady policy, through the very restlessness of his character, he exercised

* It is thus that Sismondi describes the elevation of Eugenius, without any question as to the credibility of his authorities. But we are bound to add, that several Ecclesiastical Historians, of various ages, whom we have consulted on this subject, are silent as to the circumstance mentioned in the text. Sismondi (chap. 66.) cites Andrea Billii *Histor. Mediolan.* l. ix. p. 143.

† He was remarkable for a downcast look. 'Vultu alioqui decoro et venerabili, nunquam oculos in publico attollebat, ut a parente meo, qui eum sequebatur, accepi.—Volaterra, lib. xxii., p. 815, ap. Bayle.

an influence which was everywhere felt, and everywhere felt for evil*. And if it were just to select from the long list of pontifical delinquents one name, to which the downfall of the Church should more particularly be ascribed, we should not greatly err in attaching that stigma to Eugenius.

The unexpected accident of his elevation inflated still further an inconstant mind. Some success which he gained in a struggle with the Colonna family for the treasures of his predecessors, filled him with unbounded confidence; and it was in such a mood that he plunged into hostilities with the Council of Basle. His first endeavours were directed to crush it, ere it came into operation or even existence; but finding that hopeless, and convinced that an assembly so solemnly convoked, and so earnestly desired, must meet or seem to meet, he determined to neutralize its character by changing its place. Accordingly, he notified to the President, towards the end of the year, that 'by his own full power' he had *transferred* it to Bologna, in Italy. The President was the *Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo*. Cardinal Julian Cesarini, a man whose eminent talents qualified him for that office, in which he was placed by Martin, and confirmed by Eugenius, and who may have deserved the reputation which he has received from Bossuet, of being 'the greatest character of his age.' At any rate, he was, on this occasion, more mindful of his duties to the Church, than of his obligations to his master, and respectfully refused obedience to the pontifical mandate.

Three purposes were specified, for which the Council of Basle was convoked†: (1.) The reunion of the Latin and Greek churches; (2.) The reform of the Church in its head and members; (3.) The reconciliation of the Hussites. We shall confine our account, for the present, to the second of these, and resume the thread which was broken at Constance: in so doing, it will be our misfortune again to observe the one party furiously contending against its own lasting interests, and repelling the friendly hand which would have purified and saved a foul and falling system; and the other party, thwarted by perpetual impediments, insults, artifices, so as to confine its exertions to unworthy objects, and not effectually to accomplish even those. The former, consisting for the most part of Italians, were the myrmidons of absolute papacy; while the latter comprehended almost all that was enlightened and generous and virtuous among the clergy of the rest of Europe.

Though many of the prelates had been long assembled, the first public session‡ was not held until the 14th of December, 1431; and from that time forwards, for the space of two entire years, the energies and patience of the

* Contemporary Italian historians exert all the talents of partizanship in his favour. But Sismondi, who has estimated with less prejudice his political, as well as his ecclesiastical character, speaks of him very differently. 'Dans les révolutions violentes où on le voit sans cesse engagé, en guerre avec son clergé, avec ses sujets, avec ses bienfaiteurs, il manque presque toujours en même temps et de la bonne foi, et de la politique. Il y a peu de tyrans à qui on peut reprocher plus d'actes de perfidie et de cruauté; il y a peu de monarques imbécilles, qui aient donné plus de preuves d'incapacité et d'inconséquence.' *Republ. Ital.*, cap. lxx.

† 'Concilium hoc congregatum est propter extirpandas hæreses, faciendum pacem, reformandum mores.' *Epist. (2) Juliani Card. ad Eugen. IV.* Julian places first that which seems to have been in his mind the most important object: the third, the reformation, he regarded rather as the means of restoring the unity of the Church.

‡ The method in which that very large body proceeded through its deliberations was both generally judicious, and particularly calculated to neutralize the majority of Italian deputies. It is given at length by the *Contin. of Fleury*, liv. cvii., § 6.

fathers were wearied, and their passions excited, and their attention wholly diverted from the great object of their meeting, by uninterrupted contentions with Eugenius. They had come together from all parts of Europe, and their numbers were swelled by the addition of many of the inferior clergy; they arrived, deploring the debasement, and eager for the regeneration, of their Church; they were confident, too, in their power, and it was to this power that they chiefly trusted to repress the excesses of papacy; yet, when they would have advanced with ardour to realize these hopes, they found themselves engaged in a tedious and irritating contest for their own independence. In the course of this contest they published and republished those decrees of Constance, which proclaimed the superior prerogatives of the Council. They reiterated the authorized assertions, that a Council General represents the Church, and is the Church; that, as such, it derives its attributes *immediately* from Jesus Christ; that, as such, it is impeccable; that it is thus possessed of infallibility—a boon which had been denied, not only to Popes who had erred in matters of faith, but to the angels* themselves, for they had sinned; that on these accounts the Pope was subject to the Council in all things regarding (1) faith, (2) the extirpation of schism, and (3) the reformation of the Church; that he was only the *ministerial*† head of the Church, inferior in eminence to that mystical body‡; and consequently (for this was the point to which the whole tended), that he possessed no power over the Council, either to dissolve or transfer it. But all these, and all similar assertions, fell without any effect upon the mind of a pontiff, who was in real monastic sincerity persuaded, that there existed in the Church no other legitimate authority whatsoever, excepting his own. It was in vain to appeal to ancient canons against modern usurpations, where ignorance had conspired with interest to overthrow reason and justice. It was in vain, that all the learning and genius and eloquence of the Church were arrayed on the same side—their weapons were unfelt or unheeded by a stupid and selfish bigotry.

During this controversy (if such it may be called) Cardinal Julian boldly maintained the principles of the Council and the cause of the Catholic Church. His mind was naturally capacious: deep and assiduous study, which so commonly contracts a feeble understanding, had enlarged and enlightened his; and a mission, which he had personally undertaken for the conciliation of the Bohemians, had brought before his eyes the causes, the obstinacy and the contagiousness of spiritual rebellion. He was one of the few Italians, who had penetrated the truth, so long manifest

Contention between the Council and the Pope.

Cardinal Julian Cesarini.

* The 'synodal response of the Council may be found in substance in the Continuator of Fleury, lib. cvi., § 14. The original is in Labbe's Hist. Concil.

† This is urged by Æneas Sylvius, Comment. de Gestis Basil. Concil., lib. i., p. 16. The same writer also argues that the Pope is more properly the *Vicar of the Church* than the Vicar of Christ.

‡ This last position, together with some of the others, was proved by arguments derived (1) from reason, (2) from experience, (3) from authority, in the synodal response addressed to Eugenius, at the second session. The argument from authority chiefly rested on the text from the 18th chapter of St. Matthew—'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, and will not hear thee, and shall neglect to hear the witnesses, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' . . . Still the question remained, what constituted the Church?

to the northern prelates, that a thorough reformation in *discipline* was necessary for the preservation of the Church. We cannot so well illustrate the condition of affairs at that period, as by citing some passages from the two celebrated epistles which he addressed from Basle to Eugenius*. 'One great motive with me to join this Council was the deformity and dissoluteness of the German clergy, on account of which the laity are immoderately irritated against the ecclesiastical state: so much so, as to make it matter of serious apprehension whether, if they be not reformed, the people will not rush, after the example of the Hussites, upon the whole clergy, as they publicly menace to do. Moreover, this deformity gives great audacity to the Bohemians, and great colouring to the errors of those, who are loudest in their invectives against the baseness of the clergy: on which account, had a general Council not been convoked at this place, it had been necessary to collect a provincial synod for the reform of the German clergy; since, in truth, if that clergy be not corrected, even though the heresy of Bohemia should be extinguished, others would rise up in its place.' . . . 'If you should dissolve this Council, what will the whole world say, when it shall learn the act? Will it not decide, that the clergy is incorrigible, and desirous for ever to grovel in the filth of its own deformity? Many councils have been celebrated in our days, from which no reform has proceeded; the nations are expecting that some fruit should come from this. But if it is dissolved, all will exclaim that we laugh at God and man. As no hope of our correction will any longer be left, the laity will rush, like Hussites, upon us. This design is already publicly rumoured. The minds of men are pregnant; they are already beginning to vomit the poison intended for our destruction. They will suppose that they are offering a sacrifice to God, when they shall murder or despoil the clergy. Sunk in general estimation into the depth of evil, these last will become odious to God and the world; and the very moderate respect which is now felt for them will entirely perish. This Council is still some little restraint upon secular men; but as soon as they shall find their last hope fail them, they will let loose the reins of public persecution.' . . . 'Should the Council be dissolved, the people of Germany, seeing themselves not only deserted but deluded by the Church, will join with the heretics, and hate us even more than they. Alas! how frightful will be the confusion! how certain the termination! . . . Already I behold the axe laid at the root. The tree is bending to its fall, and can resist no longer. And certainly, *though it could stand of itself, we ourselves*

* The first Epistle begins in these words—'Multa me cogunt libere et intrepide loqui ad Sanctitatem vestram; periculum videlicet eversionis fidei ac status ecclesiastici, et subtractionis obedientiæ a Sede Apostolica in iis partibus; denigratio quoque famæ ejusdem Sanctitatis. Cogit et me charitas qua erga V. S. afficio et qua mihi affici scio. Ita enim opus est ut, intellecto discrimine, cautius rebus agendis postea consulatur.' The following sentiment is worthy of the best ages of Christianity: 'Et si dicat S. V. Habuimus guerram (bellum); ego respondebo, quod etiam si guerræ adhuc durarent, etiam si essetis certi perdere Romanam, et totum patrimonium ecclesiæ, potius subveniendum est fidei et animabus, pro quibus Dominus noster Jesus Christus mortuus est, quam arcibus et mœniis civitatum. *Carior est Christo una anima* quam non solum temporale ecclesiæ patrimonium, sed etiam cælum et terra.' . . . Again, 'Pro Deo, non permittat sibi V. S. talia persuaderi, *quia timeo dissidium in ecclesia Dei.* Vereor ne advenerit tempus, de quo dicit Apostolus, quod oportet primum ut fiat secessio.' The fears of the Cardinal were obviously directed *not* to a second schism, a mere orthodox division of the Church, but to the absolute revolt of its children. But its destiny was not yet accomplished; one more century of turbulent, contested, and flagitious domination was yet required to fill the cup. But if the overflow did not take place at the time, it at least proceeded from the country, indicated by Julian.

should precipitate it to earth.' . . . 'Again, should a prorogation be proposed and a transfer of place, to the end that in the presence of your holiness greater blessings may be accomplished, no man living will believe it. 'We have been deluded (they say) in the Council of Sienna: so it is again in this; legates have been sent out, bulls have been issued; nevertheless, a change in the place is now sought, and a delay in the time. What better hope will there be then?' Most blessed Father, believe me, the scandals which I have mentioned will not be removed by this delay. Let us ask the heretics, whether they will delay for a year and a half the dissemination of their virulence? Let us ask those, who are scandalized at the deformity of the clergy, if they will for so long *delay* their indignation? Not a day passes in which that heresy does not sprout forth; not a day in which they do not seduce or oppress some Catholics; they do not lose the smallest moment of time. There is not a day, in which new scandals do not arise from the depravity of the clergy; yet all measures for their remedy are procrastinated! Let us do what can be done now. Let the rest be reserved for this *year and a half*. For I have great fears that, before the end of the year and a half, unless means be taken to prevent it, the greater part of the clergy of Germany will be in desolation. It is certain, that, if the word should be once spread through Germany that the council is dissolved, the whole body of the clergy would be consigned to plunder.' 'But I hear that some are apprehensive lest the temporalities should be taken away from the Church by this council. A strange notion! Though, if this council did not consist of ecclesiastics, there might be some question on the subject. But where shall we find the ecclesiastic, who would consent to such a project? not only from its injustice, but from the loss the body would sustain from it. And where the layman? there are none, or next to none? And if some princes should haply send their ambassadors, they will send, for the most part, ecclesiastics, who would in no wise consent. Even the few laymen, who will be present, will not be admitted to vote on matters strictly ecclesiastical; and I scarcely think that there will be, upon the whole, ten secular lords present, and perhaps not half so many. But if we dismiss the council, the laity will then come and take our temporalities indeed. When God wishes to inflict any misfortune upon any people, he first so disposes, that their dangers shall not be perceived nor understood. And such is now the condition of ecclesiastics; they are not blind, but worse than blind; they see the flame before them, and rush headlong into it.' 'Within these few last days I have received intelligence, which should tend still further to divert you from dissolving the council. The prelates of France have assembled at Bourges, and, after long and scrupulous investigation, have decided that this council is not only legitimate, but must also of necessity be celebrated both in this place and at this time; and so the French clergy is about to join it. The reasons which have moved them to this were sent at the same time, and have been forwarded to your holiness. Why then do you longer delay? You have striven with all your power, by messages, letters, and various other expedients, to keep the clergy away; you have struggled with your whole force utterly to destroy this council. Nevertheless, as you see, it swells and increases day by day, and the more severe the prohibition, the more ardent is the opposite impulse. Tell me now—is not this to resist the will of God? Why do you provoke the Church to indignation? Why do you irritate the Christian people? Condescend, I implore you, so to act, as to secure for yourself the love and good will, and not the hatred, of mankind.'

The eloquent expressions of reason and truth were wasted upon the sordid soul of Eugenius. He persisted in measures of opposition; they were met by a process of citation on the part of the council; and this was retorted by a Bull of dissolution; both were equally ineffectual. At length, on the 12th of July, 1433, the fathers proceeded one step farther; they suspended the pontiff from his dignity, and prohibited all Christians from paying him obedience. Eugenius, in the plenitude of his own power, annulled their decree; and this noisy but innocuous altercation might have continued for some time longer, without any advantage or any honour to either party, had not some accidental circumstances interrupted it. The political enterprises of the Pope had not been more happily conducted, than his ecclesiastical measures. During the winter of 1433 he was threatened by a complication of disasters. The Colonna attacked him at home; the Duke of Milan assailed him from abroad; his subjects were universally discontented, and their menaces resounded in his capital; while Sigismond had declared loudly in favour of the council, and had even countenanced it by his presence. Under these circumstances, Eugenius suddenly lowered his pretensions, and withdrew his opposition. The offensive Bulls were revoked; and under the plea of co-operating with the council, and with the design of embarrassing it, he sent two legates to Basle to represent his authority.

This hollow reconciliation took place early in 1434; and as the difficulties of the Pope increased during the following spring, so far as to oblige him to fly from his capital and take refuge at Florence, the fathers were at length enabled to turn with some reviving hopes to the subject of reformation.

Nineteen* sessions, during four invaluable years, had already been consumed without any benefit either to the Pope, the council, or the Church.

In the twentieth, which did not meet until *Articles of Reformation*. January 23, 1435, some edicts were at length published for the repression of ecclesiastical abuses; and during the fourteen months which followed, other canons were enacted to the same end. Their substance may be expressed in very few lines. (1.) Severe penalties were proclaimed against concubinary clergy, including all who, having suspicious women in their service, had disregarded the command of the Superior to dismiss them. (2.) It was prohibited (in the name of the Holy Spirit) to pay any fees in the court of Rome, or elsewhere, for confirmation of elections, for admissions, postulations, or presentations; for provision, collation, disposition, &c. &c. by laymen; for institution, installation, or investiture, in cathedral or metropolitan churches or monasteries, in dignities, benefices, or other ecclesiastical offices; for holy orders, for benedictions, or concessions of the pallium; for Bulls, for the seal, for common annates, *servitia minuta*, first-fruits, deports†; or on any other colour or pretext. The exaction, payment or

* We should, perhaps, mention that, in the nineteenth session, the council renewed the ancient decrees about the conversion and *excommunication* of Jews, and the necessary distinction in their dress and residence; and also on the establishment of oriental professorships in the various Universities—the last, in confirmation of a lifeless canon of the council of Vienne. Previously, too—in the twelfth session—a general decree had been promulgated, with a view to restore episcopal *elections* to their original form, and to deprive the Pope of reservations; but it was so general, that little practical effect could be expected from it.

† (1.) The *deport* was the year's income of vacant cures paid to the Pope or bishop. It was a tax instituted by the Popes of Avignon, under the pretext of holy wars. (2.) The

promise, of such fees were forbidden under the penalties of simony. 'And even (it was enacted), even, which may God prohibit, if the Roman pontiff himself, who is bound more than any other to observe the holy canons, should throw scandal on the Church by violating, in any way, this decree, he shall be brought to trial before a general council.' This passed in the twenty-first session (June 9, 1435); and it is curious to observe the desperate exertions, with which the Pope and his legates and inferior myrmidons put every resource of craft and intrigue into action, in order to prevent, to annul, or to neutralize this measure. But they were defeated by the firmness of the majority of the council in a good cause: and if many more such triumphs had been obtained by the same party; if many more such restrictions on the worst excesses of Rome had been imposed and enforced, her supremacy over the Catholic Church had not so speedily passed away from her.

(3.) The twenty-third session (March 25, 1436) regulated the election of the Pope, and confirmed the decree of the thirty-ninth session of Constance, which had prescribed a formula of faith, to be approved on oath, on the day of election. The oath was to be renewed every year on the anniversary of the election. It proceeded to moderate the nepotism of the pontiffs,—so far, at least, as to confine their *secular* favours,—the dukedoms, marquisates, captaincies, governorships, and other offices which were at their disposal as temporal monarchs—to the second degree of relationship. New laws were also published for the better constitution of the Sacred College, which differed in very trifling, if in any, respects, from the enactments of Constance on the same subject. The legislation of Basle also descended to some less important subjects: it consulted the delicacy of 'timorous consciences' by specifying the degree of obedience due to *general* sentences of excommunication; it restrained the punishment of interdicts to the offences of the city or its government: any sins of an individual citizen were held insufficient to provoke that indiscriminate chastisement. It prohibited appeals, while the causes were yet pending; it condemned the spectacles, which took place in the churches on particular festivals; it promulgated decrees for the greater solemnity of the divine offices, and for the more decorous dress and deportment of the officiating ministers.

Such is the substance of the enactments of the council of Basle for the reform of the Church. It is true that, at a much later period of its continuance, it published, in the thirty-first session (January 24, 1438,) two de-

grace expectative was the Pope's assurance of presentation to a particular benefice, when it should become vacant. This right originated in simple recommendation; afterwards it changed into command. To the first letters, called monitory, letters preceptory were added; and when it was necessary, letters executory were also addressed to some papal commissioners, whose duty it became to compel the ordinary to present, on pain of excommunication. This procedure gradually gained ground from the twelfth age. (3.) The *reservation* was a declaration, by which the Pope pretended to appoint to a benefice, when it should become vacant, with prohibition to the chapter to elect, or the ordinary to collate. From special, the Popes proceeded to *general*, reservations; from general to universal; at least John XXII. reserved, by a single edict, all the cathedrals in Christendom. This usurpation was attacked with success both at Pisa, Constance, and Basle; and the rights, which the French Church acquired in that matter at Basle, passed into the Pragmatic Sanction, and thence, with some modification, into the Concordat. The council of Trent abolished reservations entirely. The practice is traced as high as Innocent III. . . . Both the second and third of these were contrary to the canons of the third Lateran council, held by Alexander III. in 1179, which published a general prohibition against all dispositions of benefices previous to vacancy.—Fleury, Institut. au Droit Eccles., p. ii., ch. xv.

crees; the one for the limitation of *appeals* to Rome, the other to revoke and prohibit expectative graces, and subject the *provisions* of the Pope to certain specified restrictions; but these, even had they been very fundamental improvements, were passed at a period when the legitimacy of the council itself was much disputed; and probably they never acquired general authority. Those which we have above enumerated may be considered as comprising all that the assembled fathers really accomplished, during deliberations which continued, at least nominally, through the space of nearly twelve years.

The two legates, to whom the pontifical interests had been entrusted by Eugenius, followed with abundant zeal and capacity their private instructions. No device, which seemed calculated to thwart the progress of reform, had been neglected by them. Every objection had been magnified into a difficulty, every difficulty had been swelled into an insurmountable impediment. The meanest sophistry had been confronted with the boldest reason; artifice, fraud, seduction had been arrayed against upright purposes and generous principles*; delays had been created, falsehoods propagated, subterfuges invented, and all that minute machinery set in motion, which is at all times employed in the defence of corrupt systems, by those who find their profit in the corruption†. To the honour of the reformers of Basle be it recorded, that the intrigues which were eternally in operation to divide or to degrade them, were inefficient; the firmness of those respectable ecclesiastics‡, their intelligence and their honesty reflected upon the Catholic Church a splendid gleam of glory in the moment of her danger and tribulation; and their perseverance might still have wrought some great advantage, had not a new circumstance arisen to foil it.

Conduct of the Pope's Legates. The meanest sophistry had been confronted with the boldest reason; artifice, fraud, seduction had been arrayed against upright purposes and generous principles*; delays had been created, falsehoods propagated, subterfuges invented, and all that minute machinery set in motion, which is at all times employed in the defence of corrupt systems, by those who find their profit in the corruption†. To the honour of the reformers of Basle be it recorded, that the intrigues which were eternally in operation to divide or to degrade them, were inefficient; the firmness of those respectable ecclesiastics‡, their intelligence and their honesty reflected upon the Catholic Church a splendid gleam of glory in the moment of her danger and tribulation; and their perseverance might still have wrought some great advantage, had not a new circumstance arisen to foil it.

The conciliation of the Greek Church was one of the avowed objects of the council; and as deputies were expected from the east to confer on that subject, their convenience and inclinations as to the *place* of conference required some attention; both (it was justly said) would be best consulted by substituting for Basle some city in Italy. It was in vain that the council then

The conciliation of the Greek Church was one of the avowed objects of the council; and as deputies were expected from the east to confer on that subject, their convenience and inclinations as to the *place* of conference required some attention; both (it was justly said) would be best consulted by substituting for Basle some city in Italy. It was in vain that the council then

Final breach between the Pope and the Council. as to the *place* of conference required some attention; both (it was justly said) would be best consulted by substituting for Basle some city in Italy. It was in vain that the council then

* 'Scitis vosmetipsi quoties hæ vobis *dilationes* nocuerint, quotiesque paucorum mora dierum longissimum traxit spatium; qui jam octavum annum in *dilationibus* agitis, semper *dilationes* ex *dilationibus* vidistis emergere.'—*Cardinalis Arelatensis*, ap. *Æn. Sylv. Gest. Basil. Concil.*

† 'Quis est qui existimet Romanum pontificem ad sui emendationem concilium conjurare? Nempe ut peccant homines, sic etiam impunè peccar evolvunt.' *Æneas Sylv. de Gest. Basil. Conc.*, l. i., p. 20.

‡ The expressions of *Æneas Sylvius* almost rise into eloquence. 'Ubinam gentium talis patrum est chorus, ubi tantum scientiæ lumen, ubi prudentia, ubi bonitas est, quæ nomen patrum æquare virtutibus queat? Oh integerrimam fraternitatem! oh verum orbis terrarum Senatam! Quam pulchra, quam suavis, quam devota res fuit, hic celebrantes episcopos, illic orantes abbates, alibi vero doctores divinas legentes historias audire! . . . et unum ad lumen candelæ scribentem cernere, alium vero grande aliquid meditantem intueri. . . . Illic cum exeuntem cella aut Christianum aut alium quempiam ex antiquioribus vidisses, non alium certe videre putasses, quam vel magnum Antonium, vel Paulum simplicem; et illum sane Hilarioni, illum Paphnutio, illum Amoni æquiparasses. Plus autem hoc in loco quam in Antoniana solitudine reperisses, siquidem Hieronymo etiam et Augustino obiasses, quorum litteræ in conclavi fuerunt, in eremo non fuerunt. Custodiebatur inter dominos magna charitas, inter famulos bona dilectio, inter utrosque optimum silentium, &c. &c.' *De Gestis Basil. Concil.*, lib. ii., pag. 57. It should be mentioned that this description is not general, but relates only to the fathers who constituted the conclave for the election of the new Pope—the élite of the council.

proposed Avignon, or Savoy; the Pope would listen to no such compromise, but pressed the superior advantages of an Italian city. . . At the same time, both parties had opened negotiations at Constantinople; and the contests, which had been enacted at Basle, were repeated, with a different result, before the patriarch and the emperor. In that refined court, the superior tactics of the papal party prevailed; and in the intestine commotions of the hierarchy of the west, the oriental autocrat listened more partially to the monarch, than to the senate, of the

thus advancing his views had gradually diminished, thus elated, he determined ire. Accordingly we observed four sessions, his legates on the other hand, the council and thus, after a short and renewed, and not even the ended.

The Pope the council cited the Pope's exatious opposition to the plenitude of power to which sessions, declared the council (Oct. 1, 1437), Eugenius of the January following, he at session of the council of led every future act of the ould have reference to the

of Ferrara, Cardinal Julian, led, and earnestness in the ed,

Desertion of Cardinal Julian.

is, the fathers; and we can taken his resolution, he as he could influence, to rable fact, that, among the only were persuaded to does it appear that, even one bishop, or doctor, or rich he had first engaged. m, and the king of France ssembly at Ferrara.

Questions on the legitimacy of the Council.

COMFORT—ECONOMY—UTILITY.



PRICES AND LIST OF ARTICLES

Manufactured and Sold

WHOLESALE, RETAIL, AND FOR EXPORTATION, BY

M E C H I,

Cutler, Dressing Case Maker,

AND INVENTOR OF THE CELEBRATED

RAZOR, STROPS, AND PASTE,

No. 4,

LEADENHALL STREET,

THE FOURTH HOUSE FROM CORNHILL, SAME SIDE AS THE INDIA HOUSE.)

LONDON.

Public Notice.—In consequence of the immense number of Razors, Stropps, Knives, &c. brought daily to grind and Repair, and the difficulty of preserving regularity, a Check Number is given for each Job taken in, which must positively be produced (within 14 days) on reclaiming the Articles.

It is almost needless to say, that the legitimacy of the Council of Basle has been a subject of dispute among Roman Catholic writers, and that they have differed, according to the diversity of their opinions on the extent and nature of papal supremacy. It has been commonly designated the *Acephalous* Council; and some have maintained that its authority expired as early as the tenth Session; but even Bellarmine allows, that its decrees were binding on the Church, until it commenced its deliberations respecting the *deposition* of the Pope. This last is the more general opinion even among the Transalpine divines—of

crees; the one for the limitation of *appeals* to Rome, the other to revoke and prohibit expectative graces, and subject the *provisions* of the Pope to certain specified restrictions; but these, even had they been very fundamental improvements, were passed at a period when the legitimacy of the council itself was much disputed; and probably they never acquired general authority. Those which we have above enumerated may be considered as comprising all that the assembled fathers really accomplished, during deliberations which continued, at least nominally through the space of nearly twelve years.

The two legates, to whom by Eugenius, followed with

Conduct of the Pope's Legates. thwart them. E

culty, even

mountable impediment. That the boldest reason; artifice, right purposes and generous propagated, subterfuges invention, which is at all times in those who find their profit in reformers of Basle be it recorded operation to divide or to deg those respectable ecclesiastics deflected upon the Catholic Council of her danger and trial have wrought some great act to foil it.

The conciliation of the Council of the council; and as depicted that

Final breach between the Pope and the Council. as tent con: in I

* 'Scitis vosmetipsi quoties haec dierum longissimum traxit spatium dilationes ex dilationibus vidistis e Basil. Concil.

† 'Quis est qui existimet Romam curare? Nempe ut peccant homines, Basil. Conc., l. i., p. 20.

‡ The expressions of Æneas Silvius: talis patrum est chorus, ubi tantum nomen patrum æquare virtutibus queat.

On integerrimam fraternitatem: on verum orbis terrarum Senatam! Quam pulchra, quam suavis, quam devota res fuit, hic celebrantes episcopos, illic orantes abbates, alibi vero doctores divinas legentes historias audire! . . . et unum ad lumen candelæ scribentem cernere, alium vero grande aliquid meditantem intueri. . . . Illic cum exeuntem cella aut Christianum aut alium quempiam ex antiquioribus vidisses, non alium certe videre putasses, quam vel magnum Antonium, vel Paulum simplicem; et illum sane Hilarionem, illum Paphnutium, illum Amonem æquiparasses. Plus autem hoc in loco quam in Antoniana solitudine reperisses, siquidem Hieronymo etiam et Augustino obviasses, quorum litteræ in conclavi fuerunt, in remota non fuerunt. Custodiebatur inter dominos magna charitas, inter famulos bona dilectio, inter utrosque optimum silentium, &c. &c.' De Gestis Basil. Concil., lib. ii., pag. 57. It should be mentioned that this description is not general, but relates only to the fathers who constituted the conclave for the election of the new Pope—the élite of the council.

18

be better not to strop your Razor at all, than to do so hastily carelessly, when the Razor is once in good condition a few strokes on the Strop will keep it so, with a stiff beard; but for a soft and tender face, stropping once or twice a week is sufficient. The hand or wash leather should be used every day. If you once put away your Razor without stropping or other cleansing the edge; you must no longer expect to shave with the soap and damp so soon rust the fine teeth or edge. A piece of leather should be always kept with the Razors.

The operation of shaving is in effect precisely that of mowing. We may compare the stiff beard to the coarse grass, and the Razor to the scythe. The mower would cut but little did he not, gently, by using the stone, renovate the edge of his instrument. The same remark applies to the shaver. Experience convinces me, however, that many have never drawn the comparison; they would not continue to labour away for years on an old degraded Strop, from which every particle of composition must long since been worn off, or at all events have lost its cutting properties, for the composition, which should consist of a cutting angle, wears away as well as the Razor. Besides, the Strop, by being frequently laid down without its case, absorbs all sorts of dust and grit, (injurious in the extreme to a smooth edge) and requires occasional scraping, which may be best done by the back of a knife. Light silky beards require a keen elastic edge. Stiff grisly beards, on the contrary, require a stronger edge, with but little elasticity.

The method of holding a razor has a material influence on shaving, although back and edge is the usual way, I am decidedly of opinion that it is very inferior to holding the tang or the Razor flat between the two fore fingers and thumb, which prevents the *vaccilation*, that would otherwise take place from the resistance of a stiff beard, and which the first mentioned principle of holding cannot avoid. You are also less liable to lose the control over the Razor being more effective. That this has been the opinion of others, perhaps better judges than myself may be evinced by observing that a few of the old fashioned razors are roughed on each side instead of back and edge.

Never fail to well wash your beard with soap and cold water and rub it dry immediately, before you apply the lather, of which the more you use the easier you will shave. Never use close water which makes a tender face. Place the Razor (close course) in your pocket, or under your arm, to warm it. In order to shave very clean, it is sometimes necessary to lather and over your beard a second time. The moment you leave your face is the best time to shave; always putting your shaving brush away with the lather on it.

The Razor (being only a very fine saw,) should be moved in a sloping or sawing direction, holding it nearly flat to your face, care being taken to draw the skin as tight as possible, with the left hand, so as to present an even surface and throw out the be-

proposed Avignon, or Savoy; the Pope would listen to no such compromise, but pressed the superior advantages of an Italian city. . . . At the same time, both parties had opened negotiations at Constantinople; and the contests, which had been enacted at Basle, were repeated, with a different result, before the patriarch and the emperor. In that refined court, the superior tactics of the papal party prevailed; and in the intestine commotions of the hierarchy of the west, the oriental autocrat listened more partially to the monarch, than to the senate, of the Church. Besides, while his emissaries were thus advancing his views abroad, the Pope's domestic embarrassments had gradually diminished, and with them his fears and his prudence. Thus elated, he determined again to engage with the council in open warfare. Accordingly we observe, that, about the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions, his legates assumed a higher tone than formerly: on the other hand, the council breathed nothing but indignation and defiance; and thus, after a short and feverish suspension, the former quarrels were renewed, and not even the semblance of concord was ever afterwards restored.

The second contest began nearly where the first had ended. The Pope manœuvred to transfer the council to Italy. The council cited the Pope to Basle (July 31, 1437), to answer for his vexatious opposition to the reform of the Church. And the Pope, in that plenitude of power to which he had never formally abandoned his pretensions, declared the council transferred to Ferrara. In the 28th session (Oct. 1, 1437), Eugenius was convicted of contumacy; and on the 10th of the January following, he celebrated, in defiance of the sentence, the first session of the council of Ferrara. On that occasion he solemnly annulled every future act of the assembly at Basle, excepting only such, as should have reference to the troubles of Bohemia.

On the eve of the opening of the Council of Ferrara, Cardinal Julian, whose fidelity to the body over which he presided, and earnestness in the discharge of that office, had never been questioned, suddenly departed from Basle, and passed over to the party of the Pope. The defection of so considerable a person, at so dangerous a crisis, might naturally have shaken the firmness of the fathers; and we can also readily believe, that, after Cesarini had taken his resolution, he exerted his great talents to induce as many as he could influence, to follow him. It remains, however, as a memorable fact, that, among the numerous prelates assembled at Basle, four only were persuaded to imitate the example of their president; nor does it appear that, even after the arrival of the Greeks in Italy, any one bishop, or doctor, or dignified ecclesiastic, deserted the cause in which he had first engaged. The sovereigns of Europe remained equally firm, and the king of France even prohibited his subjects from joining the assembly at Ferrara.

It is almost needless to say, that the legitimacy of the Council of Basle has been a subject of dispute among Roman Catholic writers, and that they have differed, according to the diversity of their opinions on the extent and nature of papal supremacy. It has been commonly designated the *Acephalous* Council; and some have maintained that its authority expired as early as the tenth Session; but even Bellarmine allows, that its decrees were binding on the Church, until it commenced its deliberations respecting the *deposition* of the Pope. This last is the more general opinion even among the Transalpine divines—of

Desertion of Cardinal Julian.

Questions on the legitimacy of the Council.

whom none have been found so rash and inconsistent, as to dispute its canonical convocation and origiu. If it be admitted, then, thus generally, that, during those few Sessions, which it devoted to the reform of the Church, it was a true and infallible Council, the controversy, respecting the sessions which followed, can have little importance in the eyes of the historian; since they were consumed in an obstinate contest with a perverse pontiff, without producing any lasting alteration either in the principles or administration of the government of the Church.

We shall not pursue that contest into any detail. The Cardinal Archbishop of Arles, who was born in France near the borders of Savoy, was elected, no unworthy successor to the Chair of
Deposition of Eugenius. Cesarini*. Eugenius was presently ‘superseded from all jurisdiction;’ but it was not until the middle of April, 1439, that the Council published its celebrated ‘Eight Propositions’ against that pontiff, as a measure preparatory to his deposition. On this occasion great dissensions arose; the prelates of Spain combined almost unanimously with the Italian party; and the opposition was powerfully conducted by the Archbishop of Palermo (Panormus or Panormitanus †), who had recently made the sacrifice of his private principles to the will of his sovereign. His talents and his eloquence were admired by all; his sophistry influenced the weak or the wavering; and when the Fathers next assembled for the resumption of the debate, the benches of the prelates were almost deserted;—of the multitudes collected at Basle, scarcely twenty mitred heads could be numbered in that congregation ‡. The Cardinal of

* ‘Vir omnium constantissimus et ad gubernationem Generalium Conciliorum natus.’ Æn. Sylv. Comment. de Gestis Basil. Concil., lib. i. p. 25. This particular commendation is explained by subsequent expressions. We shall select two of a very different character. (1) The Cardinal, on an important occasion, fearing to be left in a minority, out-manœuvred the opposition, and prorogued the Council. His friends were delighted—‘Alii quidem eum, alii vestimentorum fimbrias, deosculabantur, secutique ipsum plurimi, prudentium ejus magnopere commendabant, qui, licet origine esset Gallicus, Italos tamen hac die summa homines astutia, superasset.’ Ibid. p. 37. (2) A violent pestilence broke out at Basle, and swept away some distinguished members of the Council. Every one supplicated the Cardinal to retire into the country; all his domestics, all his friends, joined with one voice in the same entreaty—“Quid agis, spectate Pater! fuge hunc saltem lunæ defectum, salva tuum caput, quo salvo salvamur omnes; quo etiam pereunte omnes perimus. Quod si te pestis opprimat, ad quem confugiemus? quis nos reget? quis ductor hujus fidelis exercitus erit? Jam tuam Cameram irrepsit virus, jam Secretarius tuus, jamque Cubicularius tuus mortem obiit. Considera discrimen, salva teipsum et nos . . .” Sed neque illum preces neque domesticorum funera flectere potuerunt, volentem potius cum vitæ periculo salvare concilium, quam cum periculo concilii salvare vitam. *Sciebat enim, quoniam, se recedente, pauci remansissent, facileque committi fraus in ejus absentia potuisset.* Ibid. lib. ii. p. 48. The man, who united more than Italian subtlety with the courage and self-devotion here discovered, was undoubtedly born to rule his fellow creatures.

† His speech is reported in the Commentaries of the then admirable advocate for the independence of the Church, Æneas Sylvius. His work is chiefly employed on those Acts of the Council, which more immediately preceded the election of Felix V. Panormitanus urged, among other things, that the Pope’s error in dissolving the Council was not a heresy; since, though the superiority of the General Council was a truth, it was not an article of faith—so that the Council had not sufficient ground for deposing Eugenius. This seemed unpardonable sophistry to Æneas Sylvius—to Pope Pius II. it probably appeared a very feeble defence of papal rights.

‡ The Council of Basle was composed, besides numerous prelates and abbots, of a great multitude of inferior clergy, who appear to have formed the majority; and we observe, from the narrative of Æneas Sylvius, that, during the violent debates which preceded the deposition of Eugenius, the prelates were for the most part on the side of Panormitanus, that is of the Pope, and the inferior orders on the other. In the session (the

Arles was prepared for this defection; and he had devised a remedy, suited no less to the character of the declining days of Papacy, than of its most prosperous. He commanded the relics of all the Saints in the city to be brought from their sanctuaries, to be carried by the priests to the place of assembly, and deposited by their hands in the vacant seats of the bishops. At this spectacle, (says Æneas Sylvius,) and on the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the multitudes present were moved by an extraordinary impulse of devotion, which overflowed in tears. And throughout the whole Church there was a soft and affectionate bewailing of pious men, who implored in sorrow the divine assistance, and deeply supplicated the Omnipotent God to give aid to the Church, whose children they were. The Session (the thirty-third) was then peacefully dissolved; but in that which followed (June 25th, 1439) the contested measure was carried; and, after eight years of open, or disguised hostility, Eugenius IV. was at length deposed.

On the 5th of November following, Amadeus, duke of Savoy, was elected to the See thus vacated, and assumed the name of Felix V. But as Eugenius retained, without any defection, the obedience of Italy and some other countries, the success of the anti-papal party had no other effect, than to create a second schism. Among the sovereigns of Europe, the most powerful, though ill affected to Eugenius, were far from approving the violent proceedings of the Council; and the German, as well as the French Court, became more distant and guarded in its intercourse with the fathers of Basle; while the inferior princes appear to have recognized or rejected the one Pope or the other, as suited the seeming policy of the moment. And this confusion continued with little interruption until May, 1443, when the Council celebrated its forty-fifth and last Session. It then dissolved itself—or rather transferred its (nominal) sittings to Lyons or Lausanne; while the rival assembly, which was still lingering at Florence, withdrew, by a simultaneous secession, to Rome.

Felix V. maintained his scanty Court, and the faint show of pontifical majesty, at Lausanne; and though the sovereigns both of France and Germany made some exertions to remove the schism, it continued until the death of Eugenius in 1447. Nicholas V. succeeded; and the more general recognition, which he received from the Courts of Europe, as well as his more popular reputation, induced Felix, whose ambition was destitute of selfishness, as his character was moderate and virtuous, to negotiate respecting the cession of his dignity. Certain conditions were accordingly proposed and accepted, and in the year 1449, the creature of the Council of Basle for ever resigned his claims on the Chair of St. Peter. The happy escape from this second peril, which

*Election of Felix V.
and Dissolution of
the Council.*

*Nicholas V. Cession
of Felix.*

thirty-third) described in the text, 'Nullus Arragonensium prælatorum interfuit, nullusque omnino ex tota Hispania. Ex Italia soli Grossitanus Episcopus et Abbas de Dona. Doctores autem et cæteri inferiores magno in numero Arragonenses fuerunt, et omnes fere, qui aderant, ex Italia Hispaniaque (*nec enim inferiores, sicut Prælati, principem timuerunt*). Maximaque tunc Arragonensium et Cathelanorum virtus in inferioribus emicuit, qui sese minime necessitati ecclesiæ denegarunt.' 'Si enim episcopi haud multi erant, plena tamen omnia fuerunt subsellia procuratoribus episcoporum, archidiaconis, præpositis, prioribus, presbyteris et divini et *humani juris doctoribus*, quos aut quadringentos aut certe plures esse dijudicavi, &c.' This republican constitution of the Council must, indeed, have rendered it peculiarly obnoxious to the prejudices of a monastic Pope.—Comment. Æn. Sylvii, l. ii. p. 43.

menaced the unity of the Church, filled the people with universal joy; the errors of the Hussites and the scandals of the clergy were for the moment forgotten; and everywhere, after the fashion of the times, a commemorative verse was chanted,—

Fulsit lux mundo; cessit Felix Nicolao.

Though the general measures of reformation, published by the Council of Basle, were very inadequate to the necessities of the Church, even in the eyes of an orthodox reformer, yet by concurrence with some national assemblies held in Germany, and especially in France, they became instrumental in improving the ecclesiastical government and discipline in both those countries. In Germany, a project, which had been prepared at Nuremberg, in 1438, having failed to obtain the approbation either of the Council or the Pope, a Diet was opened at Mayence in the March of the year following. The deputies from Basle, and some emissaries of Eugenius were present; and the Assembly, after some deliberation, received all the general decrees of the Council*. We do not learn, however, that any means were taken to give them efficacy, or to establish them as the permanent and living code of the German Church. At any rate, its independence was soon afterwards betrayed by Frederic III.; and in the negotiations between the empire and the Holy See, which were conducted by his secretary, Æneas Sylvius, that accomplished politician was less faithful to the interests which he thus represented, than to those over which he was destined hereafter to preside. The concordats, arranged at Aschaffenburg in 1448, resigned most of the advantages which the Germans had derived from the proceedings at Basle, and left the papal rights nearly in the situation in which they had been placed by Martin V.†

The French were at the same time conducting their national exertions with greater method and decision, and with a much better prospect of permanent effect. The first meeting of their prelates at Bourges was contemporary with that of the Council of Basle. Some useful resolutions were then passed. But the Grand Assembly, which fixed the liberties of the Gallican Church, was held in the same city in the year 1438. It was convoked by Charles VII., who presided in person; it was thronged by his most illustrious subjects, secular as well as ecclesiastic; and it was attended by the authorized legates both of Eugenius and the Council. The result of their deliberations was the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction‡, the great bulwark of the national Church, against the usurpations of Rome—that to which the French divines afterwards clung with so much resolution and tenacity, even after it had been betrayed to the enemy by an interested monarch.

* The Diet of Mayence withheld its sanction from those decrees, which were directly levelled against Eugenius.

† The Annates, the great bone of contention, were retained in substance by the Pope. Instead of the arbitrary reservation of benefices, he obtained the positive right of collation during six alternate months of every year. Episcopal elections were restored to the chapters—the Pope only nominating in case of translation, or of a person, canonically disqualified, being presented for confirmation.—See Hallam, Middle Ages, chap. vii.

‡ Pragmatic sanction was a general term for all important ordinances of Church or State—those, perhaps, more properly, which were enacted in public assemblies, with the counsel of eminent juriconsults, or *Pragmatici*.

The Gallican Liberties, while they embraced a number of particular provisions, were founded on two grand principles:—(1) That the Pope has no authority in the kingdom of France over any thing concerning temporals. (2) That, though the Pope is acknowledged as sovereign lord in spirituals, his power even in these is restricted and controlled by the canons and regulations of the antient Councils of the Church*, received in this kingdom.

The Articles constituting the Pragmatic Sanction were chiefly founded on the Decrees of the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-third Sessions of the Council of Basle. Some of these were, indeed, modified, with a view to accommodate them to the peculiar circumstances of the country, not (as was expressly declared) from any disrespect to the authority of that Assembly. But the greater part were at once adopted into the Church of France, and ardently embraced by the clergy and the nation. Yet can it scarcely be necessary to remind the reader, that most of the abuses thus removed concerned no more vital question, than the *patronage* of the Church—that the object of most of those vaunted resolutions was only to relieve the clergy (and, to a certain extent, the people of France) from the *contributions*, which, under a thousand names and pretexts, were exacted by the Apostolical Chancery; that the avarice of the Holy See was the most unpopular among its vices; and that mere pecuniary motives were at the bottom of more than half the grievances, which alienated its children from it †.

*The Pragmatic
Sanction.*

We shall not here relate the exertions which were made by Pius II. to subvert the principles, of which, as Æneas Sylvius, he had been the warmest advocate, and to overthrow the liberties, which his own hand had planted. The nominal repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction by Louis XI. was never ratified by his subjects, nor effected in defiance of their dissent; and the articles which were enacted at Bourges continued for the most part in force until the reign of Francis I. The consequence was, that the French people, being in a great degree sheltered from the extortions of Rome, were less disposed to question her general rights, and to rebel against her spiritual prerogatives. The most sordid and disgusting particulars of her system were not so commonly presented to their view. A smaller contribution, indeed, flowed into her treasuries, and her emissaries were more sparingly scattered in that country; but her

* 'La première est, Que les Papes ne peuvent rien commander ni ordonner, soit en général soit en particulier, de ce qui concerne les choses temporelles és pays et terres de l'obeyssance et souveraineté du Roy Tres-Chrestien: et s'ils y commandent ou statuent quelque chose, les sujets du Roy, encores qu'ils fussent clerics, ne sont tenus pour obeyr pour ce regard.

† 'La seconde, Qu'encores que le Pape soit reconnu pour suzerain és choses spirituelles; toutesfois en France la puissance absolue et infinie n'a point de lien, mais est retenue et bornée par les canons et règles des anciens conciles de l'Eglise réceus en ce royaumè. Et in hoc maximè consistit Libertas Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ.' See Commentaire sur le Traité des Lib. de l'Eglise Gall. de Pierre Pithov. Paris, 1652.

‡ The Pragmatic Sanction consisted of twenty-three articles, several of which regarded the police of cathedral churches, the celebration of the divine offices, and other matters not connected with papal prerogatives. There are also some few which are so connected, which have yet no reference to patronage—they respect the periodical assembly, and the superior authority, of General Councils, and the number of the Sacred College. But elections, reservations, collections, expectative graces, and annates formed after all the burden of the grievances—and to those we may fairly add appeals to the Court of Rome, which were now become only an additional method of raising money.—See *Histoire de l'Orig. de la Pragm. Sanct., &c.* par Pierre Pithov.

name was less odious, as her vices were less obtrusive. And while in Germany, the re-establishment of the Papal despotism, with all its train of annates, reservations, and indulgences, produced, by an inevitable necessity, the violent revolt and final independence of the oppressed, so the Catholics of France submitted with less reluctance to her mitigated sway.

The most important decree promulgated at Constance was, perhaps, that which fixed the periodical meeting of general councils; for it was in vain to have established the supremacy of those assemblies, unless continual opportunities were afforded them for its exercise. The spirit of Rome was invariable, and in perpetual action; it could not be counteracted and restrained, unless by frequent collision with the restraining body. The wisest resolutions, unless enforced by the constant protection of the power which created them, would be neutralized or crushed in the pontifical grasp. The justice of this apprehension was proved by the fate of the very decree, of which we are now speaking. It was perseveringly eluded by the Popes who followed, and with so much success, that no other general council was convoked before the end of the century. After the separation of the fathers of Basle, the repose and prerogatives of the pontiffs were never seriously disturbed, until the destined season at length arrived, in which they were invaded by a harsher voice and a far ruder hand.

It has been made a question among ecclesiastical writers, whether the decennial meetings of those bodies, as decreed at Constance, would have conferred benefit or the contrary, on the Roman Catholic Church. It is argued on the one hand, that they presented the only check upon the excesses of the Roman court, which were hurrying the Church to its destruction; that in the progressive light and information of the age, an absolute spiritual despotism could not possibly endure much longer, and that the monarchy of the Church could only hope for stability through an infusion of the popular principle; since even the clergy themselves were no longer well affected towards an unlimited government; that many abuses in morals and discipline, which were continually growing up, were most effectually corrected by the authority of Councils.

On the other hand, it is disputed whether the benefits derived from the three assemblies, which had taken place, were, in fact, so very substantial? Whether they were at all proportionate to the weighty machinery, which was moved to produce them? Whether the non-residence of so many prelates and other clergy, during such long periods, was not a new evil of immense importance? Whether those divisions and passionate contests among spiritual ministers, which seemed the necessary fruit of general councils, did not cast as many scandals on the church, as those which were removed? Whether the immediate danger of a positive schism, which had actually been occasioned by the proceedings at Basle, did not at least counterbalance those remote perils, which timely remedies might, or might not, perhaps, have averted?

To a Protestant impartially comparing these considerations, it is, in the first place, obvious, that a cordial co-operation between an enlightened Pope and a body of intelligent ecclesiastics, for the single purpose of correcting abuses in government and discipline, and otherwise modifying the system by seasonable alterations, would have afforded the best human probability of preserving the papal supremacy undisputed, and deferring the hour of a more perfect reformation. But, on the other hand, it is equally manifest, that, as the court of Rome was at that time constituted, so generous a co-operation, so provident a sacrifice of instant profit for

future security, could not possibly have formed the policy of the Vatican. Those, who have long been in possession of usurped prerogatives, have seldom the courage, when the moment of retribution approaches, to concede a part, though they should thereby save the rest; they cling pertinaciously to their meanest acquisitions, until the hand of the reformer is at length provoked to resume the whole. It was thus with the Bishops of Rome: educated in a profligate court, and in the narrowest principles, they commonly obtained their elevation by intrigue or bribery. The pontifical dignity was itself beset by seductions, sufficient to corrupt the most generous mind. So that it was vain to look to Rome for any other policy, than the most contracted and the most selfish.

If these conclusions be true, the periodical meetings of general councils would have only introduced periodical convulsions and schisms. And, although some partial benefits would no doubt have proceeded from their deliberations, they would scarcely have prolonged the duration of a system, of which unity was a necessary characteristic. The *manner* of its destruction might, indeed, have been different; it might have been torn in pieces by intestine discord, instead of sinking before the impulse from without. But its doom was irrevocably sealed; and the seeds of dissolution were too amply sown in the very vitals of the papal Church, to admit of any effectual reformation.

Again; however justly we may applaud the reforming projects of the fathers of Constance and Basle, as indicating some consciousness of shame or of danger, some foresight, at least, if not some virtue, yet it is certain that their general principles were in no respect more moderate than those of the Vatican. We have already observed how the former of those Councils, after investing itself with all the spiritual attributes and authority of the Church, immediately overstepped the boundary*, and drew, like the Popes whom it superseded, the temporal sword. But we have still to describe the most arbitrary and iniquitous act of the same assembly. The Holy Fathers, be it recollected, had met for the reformation of their Church. The word was perpetually on their lips, and they denounced, with unsparing vehemence, some of the corruptions of their own system. In the midst of them were two men of learning, genius, integrity, piety, who had intrusted their personal safety to the faith of the council, John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and these too were reformers. But it happened that *they* had taken a different view of the condition and exigencies of the Church; and while the boldest projects of the wisest among the orthodox were confined to matters of patronage, discipline, ceremony, the hand of the Bohemians had probed a deeper wound: they disputed, if not the doctrinal purity †, at least the spiritual omnipotence of the Church. Those daring innovators had crossed the line which separated reformation from heresy—and they had their recompense. In the clamour which was raised against them, all parties joined as with one voice: divided on all other questions, contending about all other principles, the grand universal assembly was united, from Gerson himself down to the meanest Italian papal minion, in common detestation

*General Principles of
the Councils of Con-
stance and Basle.*

* If the fathers of Constance offended the King of France by the orders which they issued respecting the safe conduct of Sigismund in his journey to Spain; so did those of Basle irritate the princes of Germany by an assumption of temporal authority; and this was their great mistake.

† See the following Chapter.

of the heresy, in implacable rage against its authors. Those venerable martyrs were imprisoned, arraigned, condemned; and then by the command, and in the presence of the majestic *senate* of the Church, the depositor of Popes, the uprooter of corruption, the reformer of Christ's holy Communion—they were deliberately consigned to the flames. Is there any act recorded in the blood-stained annals of the Popes more foul and merciless than that? . . . More than this. The guilt of the murder was enhanced by perfidy; and for the purpose of justifying this last offence (for the former, being founded on the established Church principles, required no apology) they added to those principles another, not less flagitious than any of those already recognized—'that neither faith nor promise, by natural, divine, or human law, was to be observed to the prejudice of the Catholic religion*.' Let us here recollect that this maxim did not proceed from the caprice of an arbitrary individual, and a Pope, —for so it would scarcely have claimed our serious notice—but from the considerate resolution of a very numerous assembly, which embodied almost all the learning, wisdom, and moderation of the Roman Catholic Church.

General councils, claiming to act under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, were consequently infallible, as well as impeccable. We shall, therefore, mention one or two of the subjects to which their unerring judgment was directed. In the July of 1434, the council of Basle confirmed a Bull, previously published by Eugenius IV., respecting the veneration due to the sacrament of the Eucharist, and the indulgences granted at the feast of the holy sacrament; with an order for its universal observance in the Church. The thirty-sixth session (Sept. 17, 1439) of the same assembly was occupied in drawing up a decree in favour of the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin†. This article of faith was solemnly enjoined to all good Catholics; and an universal festival was instituted in its honour, 'according to the custom of the Roman Church.' Two years afterwards, at their forty-third meeting, the same fathers confirmed, after a very long deliberation, the feast of the *visitation* of the Holy Virgin. They enacted that it should be celebrated throughout the whole Church by all the faithful; and they accorded to those, who should assist at matins, at the processions, at the sermon, at mass, at the first and at the second vespers, a hundred days of indulgences for each of those offices. At the same time, while they were thus extending the reign of superstition over their obedient children, they were contesting the double communion with the Bohemian rebels, and refusing every concession to reason and to scripture, excepting such‡ as was extorted from them

* 'Cum tamen dictus Johannes Huss, fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter impugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum, nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino vel humano, fuerit in prejudicium Catholicæ fidei observanda: idcirco dicta sancta synodus declarat, &c.' The words are cited by Hallam (Middle Ages, chap. vii.), without suspicion. We find it asserted, however, by Roman Catholics, that they exist in no MS. except that in the Imperial Library at Vienna; and that even there the formal signatures, attached to the other articles, are not subscribed to this; hence they infer its spuriousness. We should remark that Von der Hardt has published it (tom. iv., p. 521), without any expression of doubt.

† That is, that the holy Virgin was preserved in her conception from the stain of original sin. We observe that bachelors in theology, and others in the University of Paris, were compelled to subscribe, on oath, to their belief in this doctrine. In Spain it is considered an essential part of the Catholic faith at this moment.

‡ The concession of the council respecting the double communion amounted, at last, only to this; that whether the sacrament was administered in one kind or in both, it was still useful to communicants—'for there could be no doubt that Christ was entire in either

by force. Some individuals must certainly have existed among them, who had penetrated the *inward* depravity of their system and saw the tottering ground on which it stood; but they believed, no doubt, that things would continue to be, as they had been; they were blind to the slow but irresistible progress of inquiry and knowledge.

From the days of St. Bernard to those of Bossuet the extirpation of heresy formed a part or an object* of every scheme of Church reform proposed by churchmen. The principle of toleration was unknown in the ecclesiastical policy; it may have guided the private practice of many enlightened individuals, but it was never inscribed in the code of the Church. Those very councils, from whose generous professions and popular constitution a wiser legislation might have been expected, did but exclude it more fiercely, and banish it more hopelessly. But, in return for their adherence to the favourite vice, of the Church, did they amend any maxim of its government? Did they uproot any unscriptural tenet, any superstitious belief, any profitable imposture, any senseless ceremony, or degrading practice? Did they wash away any spiritual stain from the sanctuary, now that the light from abroad was breaking in upon it? On the contrary, they not only persevered in maintaining every absurdity which had been transmitted to them, but showed a preposterous anxiety to increase the number. It is perfectly true that, in mere matters of discipline, they were fearless innovators, and that they assailed with ardour the more palpable iniquities of the Vatican. But this was the extent of their daring; this was the limit, as they thought, of safe and legitimate reform; all beyond it was inviolable ground. Thus it was, that to question the sanctity of their spiritual corruptions was deemed profane and heretical; and their eyes were wilfully closed against the unalterable truth, that the Church of Christ cannot permanently stand on any other foundation, than the gospel of Christ.

In the meantime, while the fathers of Basle, who saw some part of their danger, were ineffectually contending with an infatuated pontiff, who was blind to the whole, the art of printing was discovered; and the star of universal knowledge, the future arbiter of Churches and of Empires, arose unheeded from the restless bosom of Germany.

CHAPTER XXV.

History of the Hussites.

(I.) General fidelity of England to the Roman See—The beginnings of Wiclif, and the hostility he encountered—To what extent his opposition to Rome was popular—His death at Lutterworth, and the exhumation of his remains in pursuance of a decree of the Council of Constance—His opinions on several important points—He was calumniated by the high churchmen—His translation of the Bible.—(II.) The writings of Wiclif introduced into Bohemia—Origin and qualities of John Huss—His sermons in the Chapel of Bethlehem—Division in the University of Prague—Secession of the Germans, in hostility against Huss—He incurs the displeasure of the Archbishop

element; and that the custom of communicating the laity in one kind, introduced with reason by the Church and holy fathers, long observed and approved by theologians and canonists, should pass for a law, neither to be censured nor altered without the authority of the Church.' This decree was published in 1437, in the thirtieth session.

* For instance, at Constance it formed a *part* of the scheme of the reformers. To 'repress simony, and prosecute Jerome of Prague,' were joint subjects of the same remonstrances. To restore the unity of the Church was to reform the Church. But at Basle the reformation in discipline was chiefly recommended as the *means* of extirpating heresy. (See the passages above cited from Cardinal Julian's two letters.) But it never occurred to either council to consider, whether the heretics might not possibly be right; or, being wrong, whether they might not safely be tolerated.

of Prague—of John XXIII.—is summoned before the Council of Constance—His attachment to the character of Wiclif—Opinions ascribed to the Vaudois and Hussites by Æneas Sylvius—many of them disclaimed by Huss—Notion respecting tithes—The restoration of the cup to the laity—demanded not by Huss, but by Jacobellus of Misnia—The principle of persecution advocated by Gerson—Huss proceeds to Constance—The safe conduct of the Emperor—The motives of Huss—Assurances of protection—nevertheless Huss is placed in confinement—and eight articles alleged against him—Condemnation of Wiclif—A public trial granted to Huss—The insults and calumnies to which he is exposed—Three articles to which he adhered—Principles of the Council—Huss refuses to retract—Declaration of Sigismund—Various solicitations and trials to which Huss is subject during his imprisonment—Overture made to him by Sigismund—Interview between Huss and John of Chlum—The sentence passed on Huss—The process of his degradation—and execution—Two principal causes of his destruction.—(III.) Jerome of Prague appears before the Council—His retraction—Subsequent avowal of his opinions—and execution—Observations.—(IV.) Movements occasioned in Bohemia by these executions—The name of Thaborite assumed by the Insurgents—The triumphs of Zisca—Massacre of the Adamites—The Bohemian Deputies proceed to the Council of Basle—The four articles proposed by them—and the consequent ineffectual debate—The scene of negotiation then removed to Prague—Various parties there—Defeat and massacre of the Thaborites—A compact concluded between Sigismund and the Separatists—Real principles of Rome—The Pope refuses to confirm the compact, and the dissensions continue—under Pius II. and Paul II.—Many of the opinions of the Hussites perpetuated by the ‘Bohemian Brothers,’ who became celebrated in the next century.

I. THE Roman See had been long accustomed to consider the English as the most obedient and exemplary among its subjects—an equivocal merit, which it rewarded by more oppressive extortions and more contemptuous insult. It is true, that our kings and statesmen had made at various times some vigorous exertions to mitigate the Papal dominion; but the Popes were enabled to thwart or elude their efforts by the fidelity of the clergy and the people*. Nor was it only the praise of ecclesiastical obsequiousness that our Catholic ancestors deserved of the Holy See; that of immaculate doctrinal purity was ascribed to them with equal justice. They received with reverence every innovation in their belief, every demand on their credulity, which proceeded from the unerring oracles of the Church; but they faithfully discouraged any new opinions originating in any other quarter. The continental heresies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had not been allowed to defile their sanctuary; still less had it been profaned by any weeds of indigenious growth. The land, in which Wiclif was already preparing his immortal weapons for the contest, was that, on which the pontifical regards were fixed with the deepest complacency and most unsuspecting confidence.

John of Wiclif † was born in Yorkshire about the year 1324. He was educated at Oxford; and the great proficiency, which he made in the learning of the schools, did not prevent him from acquiring and deserving the title of the Evangelic, or Gospel, Doctor. His earlier life was distinguished by a bold attack on the corruptions of the clergy, and by great zeal in the contest with the Mendicants, which, in 1360, disturbed the university and the Church. He was raised to the theological chair in 1372; he had previously defended the cause of the Crown against the Pope, respecting the payment of the tribute imposed by Innocent III., and he was known to harbour many anti-papal opinions: but he was not yet committed in direct opposition to Rome. Soon afterwards he formed

* The statutes of *provisors* and *præmunire*, enacted in 1350, anticipated most of the articles of the Pragmatic Sanction of France,—since the first restrained the usurpation of Church patronage by the Pope, and the second protected the temporal rights of the Crown; but neither of them was observed, and the Pope continued to fill the Sees with foreign prelates.

† We do not profess, in the present history, to treat in any detail the ecclesiastical affairs of England; and in the following short account of Wiclif there is little which may not be found much more fully and eloquently expressed in Professor Le Bas' ‘Life of Wiclif.’

part of an embassy to Avignon, instructed to represent and remove the grievances of the Anglican Church. It was not till his return from that mission, when his language was heated by long-treasured indignation, or by the near spectacle of pontifical impurity, that the reformer first incurred the displeasure of the English hierarchy. He was cited before a convocation, held at St. Paul's in 1377; and it seems probable, that he owed his preservation to the powerful protection of John Duke of Lancaster. At the same time the Vatican thundered; and the heresy of Wiclif was compared to that of Marsilius of Padua and others, who had been sheltered against the oppression of John XXII. by the imperial patronage. But the Papal Bull was so little regarded at Oxford*, that it was even made a question, whether it should not be ignominiously rejected; and when the offender was subsequently summoned to Lambeth, he was dismissed with a simple injunction to abstain from diffusing his opinions. Howbeit, the Pope and his myrmidons continued eager and constant in the pursuit; and there are many who believe, that it was the timely circumstance of the schism, which alone defrauded persecution of its intended victim.

On the other hand, the ardour of Wiclif† was still further inflamed by the appearance of this new deformity—when he saw ‘the head of Antichrist cloven in twain, and the two parts made to fight against each other.’ He even proceeded so far, as to exhort the princes of Europe to seize that signal opportunity of extinguishing the evil entirely. But in their eyes it did not perhaps appear to be an evil at all—at least it was still so deeply rooted in the prejudices of the people, that its extirpation, even had they thought it desirable, had not yet been practicable. It was the misfortune of Wiclif, as it was his greatest glory, that he anticipated, by almost two centuries, the principles of a more enlightened generation; and scattered his holy lessons on a soil, not yet prepared to give them perfect life and maturity.

As long as Wiclif confined, or nearly confined, his vehement reprehensions to the delinquencies of the clergy, or the anti-Christian spirit of the Court of Rome—so long he obtained many and powerful disciples, and could count on their attachment and fidelity. But no sooner did he rise from that manifest and intelligible ground of dissent, and advance into the region of doctrinal disputation, than the enthusiasm and number of his followers declined, and even John of Lancaster strongly enjoined him to desist. In 1381-2 he opened his Sacramentary Controversy; some considerable tumults followed; he was cited in consequence before the Convention at Oxford, and banished from that city. He retired to his rectory at Lutterworth; and after two more years diligently employed in the offices of piety, he died there in peaceful and honourable security—security which was alike honourable to his own character, to the firmness of his illustrious protectors, and to the moderation of the English prelacy. His opinions were never extinguished; and his name continued so formidable to the champions of the Church, that, after an interval of thirty years—after all personal malice and jealousy had long passed away—the Council of Re-

* ‘Diu in pendulo hærebant, utrum papalem Bullam deberent cum honore suscipere, vel omnino cum dedecore refutare.’ Walsingham.

† One of the latest labours of his life was another attack on the delinquencies of the clergy, which he described under thirty-three heads in the tract ‘How the office of curates is ordained of God.’ The more profound sense of those delinquencies which he had derived from inveterate habits and principles of piety, gave an ardour to the expressions of his advancing age which surpassed that of his youthful enthusiasm.

formers at Constance published that memorable edict, by which 'the body and bones of Wiclif were to be taken from the ground, and thrown far away from the burial of any Church.' . . . The decree met with a tardy obedience: after the space of thirteen years, the remains were disinterred and burnt, and the ashes cast into the adjoining brook. 'The brook (says Fuller, in words which should be engraven on every heart) did convey his ashes into Avon; Avon into Severn; Severn into the narrow seas; they into the main ocean. And thus the ashes of Wiclif are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over.'

His doctrine was formed, with an entire disregard of all spiritual authority, on the foundation of Scripture alone—for 'the

His opinions. Scripture alone (as he said) is truth.' Various innovations of the Roman Church were opposed

by him with various degrees of confidence. Respecting images and the invocation of the saints he wrote at no great length, but with reasonableness and moderation. He rejected transubstantiation, according to the sense of the Church; but he admitted a sort of *real* presence, without affecting to determine the manner. His notion concerning purgatory seems to have gone farther from the belief in which he was educated, as he gradually advanced in knowledge; but he never entirely threw off his original impressions. At last, indeed, he might appear to have considered it as a place of sleep; but his expressions are vague and betray the ignorance, which he was not careful to conceal, either from others or from himself. On other matters he expressed much bolder opinions. He rejected auricular confession; he held pardons and indulgences to be nothing but 'a subtle merchandise of anti-Christian clerks, whereby they magnified their own fictitious power; and instead of causing men to dread sin, encouraged them to wallow therein like hogs.' Excommunication and interdicts were repudiated with equal disdain. He reprobated the compulsory celibacy of the clergy and the imposition of monastic vows; and visited with the austerity of a Puritan, not only the vain and fantastic ceremonies of the Church, but even the devout use of holy psalmody. In the granting of absolution he treated the office of the priest as strictly ministerial and declaratory; and he hastily pronounced confirmation to be a mere ecclesiastical invention, for the purpose of unduly elevating the episcopal dignity. He appears not to have disputed, that the Pope was the highest spiritual authority in the Church; but he rejected with equal scorn his ghostly infallibility and his secular supremacy; and his abhorrence of the court of anti-Christ was so strong, as to be a continual incentive to the bitterest censure. According to the original institution he considered bishops and priests as the same order; and he ascribed (through a defect in historical knowledge) the distinction, which afterwards divided them, to the imperial supremacy. He objected to the possession of any fixed property by the clergy, and maintained that the ecclesiastical endowments were, in their origin, eleemosynary, and that they remained at the disposal of the secular government*.

Such were the opinions which Wiclif promulgated in the theological chair, and in the fourteenth century. His reputation and his dignity raised

* It is observed that, with these opinions, Wiclif held the Divinity Professorship at Oxford, a Prebendal Stall, and the Rectory of Lutterworth. He thought it excusable, no doubt, to conform to the system which he found established, and his enemies at the time thought it no crime in him that he did so; yet he would have stood higher with posterity, had he disdained the plausible excuse, and placed the unequivocal seal of private disinterestedness and generosity upon his public principles.

him far above contempt; but at the same time they embittered the malignity of his enemies. Yet, monstrous as many of his real tenets must have appeared in that age, recourse was had to the usual expedient of charging him with absurd inferences and notions* wholly at variance with any that he professed—as if the churchmen of those days had some secret consciousness of the weakness of their cause, and despaired to make the enemies of their system generally detestable, unless they could also stigmatize them as foes to the acknowledged principles of religion, of morality, and of reason. We are not surprised by such calumnies; neither is it strange that the dissemination of his actual doctrines (for they were diligently disseminated by emissaries† employed by him for that purpose) was followed by some tumults and disorders. The first open struggles of reason against prescription and prejudice—its first appeals to the sense and virtue of mankind against particular interests and established absurdities, are seldom unattended by popular heats and commotions; and the wonder in this case rather is, that the prematurity of the Reformation did not occasion the martyrdom of the reformer.

For many of Wiclif's opinions were too advanced and ripe for the bleak season in which he lived. They were calculated, indeed, for the consideration of all virtuous and disinterested men; and they were sure to *create* in succeeding generations a disposition towards better principles of belief and practice; but they could look for no general reception among those, to whom they were first addressed. Therefore was it wisely determined by that admirable Christian, when he sent them forth into a prejudiced and ignorant world, to promulgate along with them the sacred volume on which they professed to stand. His translation and circulation of the Bible was that among his labours, which secured the efficacy, as it was itself the crown, of all the others. This was the life of the system which he destined to be imperishable—this the treasure which he bequeathed to future ‡ and to better ages, for their immortal inheritance.

II. The queen of Richard II. was a Bohemian princess; and on the death of her husband, she returned, with a train of attendants, to her native land. It is commonly *John of Huss.* believed, that these persons introduced a precious, but a dearly preserved, possession among their countrymen—the works of Wiclif. Others suppose this present to have been made by an Englishman who had travelled to Prague; others by a Bohemian who had studied at Oxford. All may possibly have contributed; but in respect to the more important fact, there seems to be no dispute, that the writings of Wiclif kindled the first sparks of the Bohemian heresies. During the latter days of that venerable teacher, a youth was growing up in an obscure village of Bohemia, who was destined to bear, in his turn, the torch of truth, and to transmit it with a martyr's hand to a long succession of disciples—and he was worthy of the heavenly office. John of Huss, or Hussinetz, was very early distinguished by the force and acuteness of his understanding, the modesty and gravity of his demeanour, the rude and irreproachable austerity of his life. A thoughtful and attenuated countenance, a tall and

* They are to be found in great numbers, chiefly among the articles of impeachment, levelled against his name and memory, and published by Popes and Councils. One error ascribed to him is, 'that he represented God as subject to the devil.'

† Men whom he called his 'poor priests.' See chap. x. of *Le Bas' Life of Wiclif.*

‡ The effect was felt even in the next generation, and the high churchmen began to tremble. By a decree published by the Convocation at St. Paul's in 1403, it was prohibited either to compose or consult any private translation of the Scriptures, on the penalties attached to heresy.

somewhat emaciated form, an uncommon mildness and affability of manner added to the authority of his virtues and the persuasiveness of his eloquence. The University of Prague, at that time extremely flourishing, presented a field for the expansion of his great qualities; in the year 1401. he was appointed president, or dean, of the philosophical faculty, and was elevated, eight years afterwards, to the rectorship of the University.

The Church divided with the academy his talents and his reputation. In the year 1400 he was made confessor to Sophia of Bavaria, the Queen of Bohemia; and in 1405 he had obtained general celebrity by many eloquent sermons delivered *in the vulgar tongue* in his chapel* at Prague. In those fervent addresses to the people, who composed his audience, he frequently inveighed against the corruption of the court of Rome, her indulgences, her crusades, her extortions, and all the multitude of her iniquities; and his harangues were received with impassioned acclamation. Nevertheless, his name was not yet tainted by any charge of heresy; and as late as the July of 1408, Subinco, (or Suinco,) Archbishop of Prague, declared in a public synod, that the kingdom, over which his spiritual guardianship extended, was free from the stain of any religious error. But about this time the University of Prague was disturbed by a violent dissension. The German students, who formed the majority, and to whom a greater share in the government, the dignities, and emoluments of the institution had been allotted by the original statutes†, were vigorously assailed by the native Bohemians; who claimed, as a national right, that, according to the example of Paris, those enviable prerogatives should be transferred to themselves. Huss engaged with zeal in the cause of his countrymen. The king decided in favour of his own subjects, and he was considered to have been chiefly influenced to that resolution by Huss. Many German doctors resigned their offices and retired from the kingdom; and they carried with them, whithersoever they went, deep rancour against the author of their defeat and secession.

Again, about the same time, probably in the beginning of 1409, Huss was extremely zealous in bringing over his country from the cause of Gregory XII., in whose obedience it persisted, to that of the cardinals assembled at Pisa; and this laudable forwardness appears to have been the first offence, which awakened the displeasure of the archbishop. At least it is manifest, that this was the period at which the indignation of that prelate ‡ first broke out; and in the December of the same year, the Pope himself (Alexander V.) issued some prohibitory decree against Huss and his followers.

The existence and circumstances of the great schism, and the obvious evils produced by it, had long been a popular theme of censure for the Bohemian reformer. And after its extinction, John XXIII. furnished him, in 1411, with fresh matter for reprehension. That pontiff sent forth

* Called the Chapel of Bethlehem. An opulent citizen of Prague had built and endowed it for the maintenance of two preachers, 'qui festis profestisque diebus verbum Dei Bohemico sermone plebibus insinuerent.' *Æn. Sylv., Hist. Bohem., cap. xxxv.*

† The University, founded in 1347, by the Emperor Charles IV., was composed of four nations, Bohemia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Poland; and as the three last (even the last) were chiefly Germans, and had three votes, in four, three-fourths of the professors, doctors, &c., were Germans. On the other hand, in the economy of the University of Paris (where the division was also quadripartite) the natives had three voices. The declaration of King Wenceslas in favour of his subjects was made on Oct. 13, 1409.

‡ Subinco, Archbishop of Prague, is characterised by Maimbourg as 'a man who feared nothing when the service of God and the interests of the church were at stake.' Such a compliment, from the pen of Maimbourg, is at least suspicious.

his emissaries to preach a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, and to accord the usual indulgences. The minds of many had been previously inflamed against this mockery of the cross of Christ by the preaching of Huss; and so it proved, that, on three several occasions, the pontifical missionaries were interrupted by violent exclamations in the midst of their harangues. Three offenders were accordingly seized by the order of the senate, and privately executed; but the blood which flowed from the prison into the street betrayed their fate. The people rose; and having gained possession of their bodies, carried them in procession to the various churches, chanting holy anthems. They then buried them in the chapel of Bethlehem, with the aromatic offerings usually deposited on the tombs of martyrs. Other commotions followed; the clergy* of Bohemia conspired very generally against the principles of the reformer; and John XXIII. cited him, but without effect, before the tribunal of the Vatican. In fact, so great was the agitation which these disputes had now excited, that when the Council of Constance assembled presently afterwards, it issued an immediate summons for the appearance of Huss. With whatsoever disregard that ecclesiastic may have treated the mandate of the Pope, he proved, without hesitation, his allegiance to the council. He knew the hostility and the faithlessness of the court of Rome; but in the august representation of the Church, in the full congregation of holy prelates assembled for the reformation of abuses, and the redressing of wrongs, he might find some foundation for confidence, and some hope of justice.

It is proper now to examine, what was the nature of those spiritual offences which excited such attention throughout Christendom, and such terror among the directors *Opinions imputed to Huss*. of the Church. In the first place, the Bohemian innovator was accused of disseminating the mortal venom which he had imbibed from England. His devotion to the faith and memory of Wiclif, for it was for some years concealed, became at length too deep and ardent for dissimulation; and it is even related, that in his discourses from the pulpit of Bethlehem, he was wont to address his earnest vow to Heaven, that, whenever he should be removed from this life, he might be admitted to the same regions where the soul of Wiclif resided; since he doubted not, that he was a good and holy man, and worthy of a habitation in heaven†. It is certain, that on the first movement against Huss, the archbishop collected all the books of Wiclif, to the number of two hundred volumes, embossed and decorated with precious ornaments ‡, and caused

* If we are to believe Æneas Sylvius (*Historia Bohemica*, cap. xxxv), the clergy, in the first instance, were favourable to Huss; and the reason, which he malignantly gives for that fact, seems to prove at least his own conviction of its truth. 'Sequebantur Johannem clerici ferè omnes, ære alieno gravati, sceleribus et seditionibus insignes, qui rerum novitate evadere pœnas arbitrabantur. His et nonnulli doctrina celebres juncti erant; qui cum in ecclesia consequi dignitatem non potuissent, iniquo animo ferebant sacerdotia majorum censuum his committi, qui, quamvis nobilitate præirent, scientia tamen videbantur inferiores.' The probability seems to be, that Huss may have won, in the beginning of his preaching, the partial support of the secular clergy by the bitterness with which he inveighed against monastic abuses; but that they deserted him, as soon as they saw his views more perfectly developed.

† 'Qui, cum se libenter audiri animadverteret, multa de libris Wiclefi in medium attulit, asserens in iis omnem veritatem contineri; adjiciensque crebro inter prædicandum, se, postquam ex luce migraret, ea loca proficisci cupere, ad quæ Wiclefi anima pervenisset; quem virum fuisse bonum, sanctum, cœloque dignum non dubitaret.' *Æn. Sylv., Hist. Boh.*, l. xxxv.

‡ 'Quorum major pars argenteis atque inauratis fibulis et pretiosis integumentis ornabatur.' Harpsfield, ap. Contin, Fleury. Æneas Sylvius mentions the same fact nearly in the same words,

them to be publicly burnt. The same element, which consumed the writings of Wiclif, was destined to prey upon the body of his disciple; and it came like a signal, that his vow had been registered above, and that his master awaited his coming at the gates of Paradise.

It was another general charge against Huss, that he was 'infected with the leprosy' of the Vaudois: and that it may be seen how many gross offences were thought to be contained in this single accusation, we shall here follow the enumeration of *Æneas Sylvius*; only premising that many opinions are there ascribed to Huss, which, in his examinations before the council, he expressly disavowed. The most important among them were these—that the Pope is on a level with other bishops; that all priests are equal except in regard to personal merit; that souls, on quitting their bodies, are immediately condemned to eternal punishment, or exalted to everlasting happiness; that the fire of purgatory has no existence; that prayers for the dead are a vain device, the invention of sacerdotal avarice; that the images of God and the saints should be destroyed; that the orders of the mendicants were invented by evil spirits; that the clergy ought to be poor, subsisting on eleemosynary contributions; that it is free to all men to preach the word of God; that any one guilty of mortal sin is thereby disqualified for any dignity secular or ecclesiastical; that confirmation and extreme unction are not among the holy rites of the Church; that auricular confession is unprofitable, since confession to God is sufficient for pardon; that the use of cemeteries is without reasonable foundation, and inculcated for the sake of profit; that the world itself is the temple of the omnipotent God; and that those only derogate from his Majesty, who build churches, monasteries, or oratories; that the sacerdotal vestments, the ornaments of the altars, the cups and other sacred utensils, are of no more than vulgar estimation; that the suffrages of the saints who reign with Christ in Heaven are unprofitable, and vainly invoked; that there is no holiday excepting Sunday; that the festivals of the saints should by no means be observed; and that the fasts established by the Church are equally destitute of divine authority.

To these opinions, which he is accused of having habitually propounded in his chapel of Bethlehem, and of which he disclaimed many of the most important, he appears in truth to have subsequently added another, by no means calculated to conciliate the clergy. During a period of suspension from his preachings at Prague, he retired to his native village, and addressed to large rustic congregations the popular doctrine, that tithes are strictly eleemosynary, and that it is free for the owner of the land to withhold or to pay them, according to the measure of his charity. But the subject, on which the greatest heats were afterwards excited, and in which, indeed, the other points of difference were for the most part forgotten, was the distribution of the sacramental cup to the laity. And this innovation upon the modern practice of the Church is not, as it singularly happens, ascribed to Huss; though it originated in the same country, and at the same time. A celebrated preacher of the day, named *Jacobellus*, whose learning and piety are alike unquestioned*, first promulgated the tenet, that the communion in both kinds was necessary for salvation; and as the opinion was shown to rest not only on the authority of Scripture, but also on the practice of the ancient Church, 'the heretics embraced it with immoderate exultation, as evincing either the ignorance, or the wick-

* 'Per id tempus populum prædicando instruebat *Jacobellus Misnensis*, literarum doctrina et morum præstantia juxta clarus.' *Æn. Sylv.*, loc. cit.

edness, of the Roman See." . . . Wenceslas, the King of Bohemia, regarded the rise of these principles with a careless and, as some assert, a stupid indifference; his queen protected the person, if she did not profess the principles, of her confessor; and thus the secular sword slept peacefully throughout these disputes, though it was loudly evoked by the zeal of the archbishop, and though Gerson * himself raised his voice to awaken it.

It has been matter of surprise to many writers, that Huss, with the consciousness that he had taught many of the above tenets, and with the knowledge how de- *The safe-conduct of Huss.* testable they were held by the churchmen, should have advanced so readily from a position of comparative security, and placed himself at once in the power of his enemies. It was not that he was ignorant of his danger. A letter, which he addressed to a friend immediately before his departure for Constance, contains passages almost prophetic of his imminent fate. He had the precaution, however, to obtain an act of safe-conduct † from the Emperor, which was understood to be a pledge for his personal safety during the whole period of his absence from Bohemia.

* Sufficient extracts from Gerson's Letter to the archbishop are given by Cochläus, *Historiæ Hussitarum*, lib. i., p. 21, (ed. Mogunt. 1549,) and as it is curious to observe in what language the great Church Reformer of his day justified the principle of persecution, we shall cite some passages from it, only premising that, very nearly at the same moment, the Pope, John XXIII., was inditing an epistle to Wenceslas to the same purpose. 'Inveniuntur adhuc hæreses extirpatæ ab agro ecclesiastico diversis viis, veluti falce multiplici. Inveniuntur quidem primitus extirpatæ falce vel acuto sarculo miraculorum, attestantium divinitus Catholicæ veritati, et hoc tempore apostolorum. Inveniuntur extirpatæ postmodum per falcem disputationis argumentativæ per doctores. Sunt extirpatæ deinde per falcem sacrorum Conciliorum, faventibus imperatoribus, quum disputatione doctrinalis particularium doctorum inefficax videbatur. Tandem accessit, velut in desperata peste, securis brachii secularis, excidens hæreses cum auctoribus suis et in ignem mittens. *Providens hac tanta severitate et misericordi, ut sic dicatur, crudelitate ne sermo talium, veluti cancer, serpat in perniciem tam propriam quam alienam.* Et ante tempore non sinere peccatoribus ex sententia agere, sed statim *ultiones adhibere magni beneficii est indicium.*' After showing that none of the ancient methods of extirpation were applicable to the existing heresy, he thus proceeds:—'Superest igitur, si de præmissorum nihil prosit, quod *ad radicem* infructuosæ, immo *MALEDICTÆ, arboris ponatur securis brachii secularis.* Quale vos brachium invocare viis omnibus convenit, et expedit ad salutem omnium vobis creditorum.' . . . The doctrines attributed to Huss were condemned by the University of Paris, and the act was published with the signature of Gerson, as chancellor: it contains the following passage: 'For though there appears among the opinions of these heretics some zeal against the vices of the prelates, which in truth are very great and manifest, yet it is a zeal *not sufficiently enlightened.* A discreet zeal tolerates and deplors the sins which it finds in the house of God, when it cannot wholly remove them. It would be impossible to correct vice by vice, and error by error; as the devil is not expelled by Beelzebub, but by the spirit of God, whose will it is that the correction of abuses be undertaken with great prudence and regard to circumstances of time and place.' This, too, is language which might very well have proceeded from the court of John XXIII.

† The following are given as the words of this frequently controverted 'safe-conduct':—'Honorabilem magistrum Johannem Huss, S. T. Baccalaureum, etc., de regno Boemiæ, in Concilium Generale . . . transeuntem . . . vobis omnibus et vestrum cuilibet pleno recommendamus affectu, desiderantes, quatenus ipsum, cum ad vos pervenerit, gratè suscipere . . . omnique prorsus impedimento remoto transire, stare, morari et redire liberè permittatis, sibi que et suis.'—(Act. Public. apud Bzovium, ann. 1414., sect. 17.) It is not at all obvious that the Council was bound by this safe conduct—the less so, as the professed object of Huss's journey was to clear himself of heresy in the presence and judgment of the Council: but the Emperor was certainly so bound; and that which he committed, and which the Council persuaded him to commit, was direct, unqualified treachery. It was manifestly the duty of Sigismond to receive Huss from the hands of the Council, and restore him to his native country; then the affair might have been taken up *de novo*, without any reflexion on the faith of any party. The best illustrations of the rights of this question are such facts, as prove the light in which it was viewed by succeeding generations. Thus we observe, that before the assembling of the first Diet of Worms

But that admirable Christian was unquestionably impelled by motives too deep for the calculation of ordinary minds. He felt an intense conviction of the truth of his doctrines, and he was resolved, should need be, to lay down his life for them. That conviction, attended by that resolution, gave a confidence to his character, which, while it left him without fear, might at the same time animate him with the highest hopes. He was filled with that deliberate enthusiasm, which sometimes raises the soul of man above that which we call wisdom; and which, while it provokes the sneer of ordinary beings, has produced those lofty deeds of disinterestedness and self-devotion, which redeem human nature.

Doubtless Huss was so influenced, when he published, both before his departure from Bohemia and during his journey, repeated challenges to all his adversaries to appear at Constance, and meet him in the presence of the Pope and the Council; 'If any shall there convict me of any error, of any doctrine contrary to the Christian faith, I refuse not (he proclaimed) to undergo the last penalties of heresy*.' These expressions betoken confidence in his own principles and in the integrity of the Council. He had yet to discover, that his controversy was not with candid opponents, contesting his avowed opinions, before an impartial tribunal; calumny and secret malice, and ecclesiastical bigotry, were more dangerous enemies; and his fate was seemingly irrevocable, from the moment in which he placed his life in the power of that Catholic assembly.

He was attended by some Bohemian noblemen, and he received the strongest assurances of protection from John XXIII. *He is placed under confinement by the Council.* 'Though John Huss (said that Pope) should murder my own brother, I would use the whole of my power to preserve him from every injury, during all the time of his residence at Constance†. . . . ' Nevertheless, within a month from his arrival, after having professed before a meeting of the Council his readiness to repel every charge, he was placed under a surveillance which was immediately changed to strict confinement. It should not be forgotten, that this first violation of the safe-conduct was peculiarly the act of the Council. Sigismund, who was not present, strongly remonstrated against it; and the Pope (from whatever motive‡) disclaimed all share in the proceedings.

This advantage was instantly pursued by his enemies, of whom the most ardent were found among his countrymen; and accordingly

(1521), the Elector of Saxony privately required of the Emperor Charles V., a formal renunciation of the Decree of Constance—'that no faith be kept with heretics.' On the same occasion, we find that great pains were again taken by the Catholics to induce the Emperor to violate his safe-conduct to Luther; on which Louis, Elector Palatine, is recorded to have said—'That all Germany would not stain itself with the shame of public perfidy to oblige a few ecclesiastics;' and Charles himself to have uttered that celebrated apophthegm—'That if good faith were banished from the rest of the world, it should find refuge in the breast of kings.'—See Beausobre's Hist. Reform. liv. iii.

* 'Significo toti Boemiæ et omnibus nationibus, me velle sisti primo quoque tempore coram Concilio Constantiensi, in celeberrimo loco, presidente Papa, etc. . . . Eo conferat pedem quisquis suspicionem de me habuerit, quod aliena a Christi fide docuerim vel defenderim. Item doceat ibi, adstante Papa, me ullo unquam tempore erroneam et falsam doctrinam tenuisse. Si me de errore aliquo convicerit, etc. . . . non recusabo quascunque hæretici pœnas ferre.'—Huss. Bohemic., apud Bzovium, ad ann. 1414.

† Lenfant. Hist. Conc. Constant. lib. i. § xxviii.

‡ The cardinals were the agents in this affair; and John does not appear to have been present at that congregation. But we should not forget, that when Sigismund wrote to command the immediate liberation of Huss, on the strength of his own safe-conduct, the Pope opposed the execution of the order. Lenfant. Conc. Constant. l. i. § 50.

eight* articles of accusation were prepared, and presented to John XXIII. When a copy of them was delivered to the accused, where he lay sick in prison, he requested that an advocate might be granted him to defend his cause; but that was refused, on the plea of a general prohibition by the canon law to undertake the defence of any one suspected of heresy. And then, instead of striving to obviate the various intrigues which were employed for his destruction, he devoted the tedious leisure of his imprisonment, and the resources of a mind superior to ordinary agitations, to the composition of various moral and religious treatises †.

The next step in the process against him was the condemnation of the doctrines and memory of Wiclif. It was in the eighth session, held on the 4th of May, 1415, that a list of forty-five articles was drawn up, which embodied all (and more than all) the errors of that reformer; that it received the solemn censure of the fathers; and that the vengeance of that orthodox body pursued the spiritual offender even beyond the grave. It is a singular circumstance, and serves well to illustrate the position in which the Council then stood, as an assembly of reformation, that in the very sermon which opened that session, and which introduced the opinions of Wiclif to universal abhorrence, the Pope and his Court were treated with equal severity, and rebuked in language ‡ which would have been held blasphemous had it proceeded from the lips of a heretic.

It was an object of great importance with the council, bent, as it certainly was, on the destruction of Huss, and conscious, as it probably was, of the weakness of its own cause, to avoid the scandal of a public disputation. Accordingly, Huss was continually persecuted by private interrogatories, frequently accompanied by intimidation and insult; and depositions against his orthodoxy were collected with great diligence and great facility, since every kind of information was admitted against a suspected heretic. On the other hand, he vehemently remonstrated against this inquisitorial secrecy, and demanded for his defence an audience of the whole council. His Bohemian friends pressed the same point with equal earnestness. But in vain would they have solicited from that body this most obvious act of justice, if the emperor had not also been impressed with its propriety, and insisted with great firmness, that the trial should be public.

Consequently the fathers assembled very early in June for that purpose. The first charge was read. The defendant was called upon for his reply. But when he appealed in his justification to the authority of the Scrip- *Tried.*

* It seems almost unnecessary to enumerate these charges,—they were as follows:—(1) That communion in both kinds is necessary for salvation;—(2) that the bread remains bread after the consecration;—(3) that ministers in a state of mortal sin cannot administer the sacraments; and that any one in a state of grace can do so;—(4) that the Church does not mean the Pope nor the clergy; that it cannot possess temporal goods, and that the secular powers can rightfully take them away;—(5) that Constantine and other princes erred when they endowed the Church;—(6) that all priests are equal in authority; so that ordinations and privileges reserved to the Popes and bishops are the pure effect of their ambition;—(7) that the Church loses the power of the keys, when the Pope, cardinals, and the rest of the clergy are in mortal sin;—(8) that excommunications may be disregarded with safety.

† On marriage—on the Decalogue—on the love and knowledge of God—on penitence—on the three enemies of man—on the Lord's Supper—and others.

‡ The Bishop of Toulon preached the sermon—‘ubi puram dixit veritatem de Papa et cardinalibus.’ ‘Benedicatur anima Domini Episcopi,’ de Papa dixit,—‘Maledicatur caro sua;’ et alibi verè—‘ita mentitur, sicut si dicerem, Deus non est unus et trinus.’ The passage is found in a MS. of Vienna, and is cited by Lenfant, Conc. Const. lib. ii. § 59.

tures, and the venerable testimony of the fathers, his voice was drowned in a tumult of contempt and derision. He was silent; and it was interpreted as guilt. Again he spoke; again he was answered by disdainful jests and insults; and the assembly at length separated without any serious determination. The second audience was fixed for the 7th of June; and that greater decency might be preserved, the Emperor was requested to be present on that occasion. It is carefully recorded by historians, and not, perhaps, without some sense of superstitious awe, that the day, on which the fate of that righteous man was in fact decided, was signalled by a total eclipse of the sun—total, as was observed, at *Prague*, though not quite so at *Constance*. But the fathers were not moved by that phenomenon to any principle of justice, or any feeling of mercy. The various charges, already prepared, were pressed upon the culprit, less clamorously, indeed, but not less eagerly than before. His accusers were numerous and voluble, and armed with the most minute subtleties of the schools. Many among them were English; and these urged their arguments as warmly, as if they had thought to redeem the land of *Wiclif* by the prosecution of *Huss*, and to wash away the stains, which one heretic had cast upon them, in the blood of another.

Numerous depositions were likewise produced and read, alleging errors, which he had advanced in his writings or in his sermons, or even in his private conversations. Alone, and unsupported, save by two or three faithful Bohemians, and worn and enfeebled by confinement and disease, he presented a spirit which did not bend beneath this oppression. The opinions imputed to him related chiefly to the Eucharist, and the condemned propositions of *Wiclif*. . . There were some which he entirely disavowed; others which he admitted under certain modifications; others which he professed his readiness and his ability to maintain. Among the first was the charge respecting transubstantiation. On which subject he repeatedly and unequivocally asserted his entire concurrence in the doctrine of the Church. Among the last, the positions (they were ascribed to *Wiclif*) to which he clung with the greatest pertinacity, appear to have been three. (1.) That Pope *Sylvester* and the Emperor *Constantine* did evil to the Church when they enriched it. (2.) That, if any ecclesiastic, whether Pope, prelate, or priest, be in a state of mortal sin, he is disqualified for the administration of the sacraments. (3.) That tithes are not dues, but merely eleemosynary. In defence of these, and perhaps some other opinions, the few arguments, which he was permitted to advance, were temperate, if not reasonable and scriptural: at least they proved his uprightness and the integrity of his heart; but they were received, as before, with reiterated shouts of derision. The question, indeed, was not, whether the opinions of *Huss* were founded in truth, or otherwise: that consideration seems not to have influenced any one mind in the whole assembly, excepting his own; the question really to be decided; the only question with which the council affected any concern, was, whether they were the doctrine of the Church. Whatsoever had once been pronounced by that infallible body was law, and the alternative was obedience or death.

On the following day *Huss* was admitted to the mockery of another and final audience; and on this occasion he was chiefly pressed on twenty-six articles, derived (fairly or unfairly) from his 'Book of the Church.' A scene similar to the preceding was terminated, on the part of the judges, by urgent solicitations to the accused to retract his errors. This act of submission was advised by several of the fathers; it was strongly recom-

mended by the Emperor; but Huss was unmoved. 'As to the opinions imputed to me, which I have never held, those I cannot retract; as to those which I do indeed profess, I am ready to retract them, when I shall be better *instructed* by the Council.' . . . The province of the Council was not to instruct, but to decide—to command obedience to its decision, or to enforce the penalty.

If Huss had hitherto nourished any reasonable hope of safety, it was placed in the moderation of the Emperor; but at this conjuncture, even that prospect was removed. For, towards the conclusion of the session, Sigismund delivered his un-qualified opinion, 'that among the errors of Huss, which had been in part proved, and in part confessed, there was not one which did not deserve the penal flames;' to which was added, 'that the temporal sword ought instantly to be drawn for the chastisement of his disciples, to the end that the branches of the tree might perish together with its root.'

Condemned.

Huss was again conducted to his prison, and thither was still pursued by fresh solicitations on his constancy; and that, which had stood firm before public menace and insult, might have yielded to private importunity, to bodily infirmity, to friendship, to solitude. First of all, an official formula of retraction was sent to him by the Council; it was express as to his abjuration of all the errors which had been proved against him, and as to his unconditional submission to the Council; but it was free from any harsh or offensive expressions. Huss calmly persisted in his resolution. 'He was prepared to afford an example in himself of that enduring patience, which he had so frequently preached to others, and which he relied upon the grace of God to grant him.' Many individuals, of various characters, but alike anxious to save him from the last infliction, visited his prison, and pressed him with a variety of motives and arguments; but they were all blunted by the rectitude of his conscience and the singleness of his purpose. One of his bitterest enemies, named Paletz*, was among the number; but, though his counsels had been successful in degrading the person of the reformer, they failed when they would have seduced him to infamy.

Numerous deputations were sent by the Council, to which he always replied with the same modesty and firmness, equally removed from an obstinate perseverance in acknowledged error, and a base retraction of that which he thought truth. About the same time it was resolved to commit his books to the flames, as if to warn him by that prelude of the approaching catastrophe. But in a letter which he wrote to some friend on the occasion, he remarked, that *that* was no ground for despondency, since the Books of Jeremiah had suffered the same indignity; but the Jews had not thus evaded the calamities, with which the prophet had menaced them.

Notwithstanding his public and recent declaration, the Emperor appears, even to the very conclusion of this iniquitous affair, to have entertained some lingering scruples respecting his safe-conduct. These had been silenced, it is true, by the sophistry of the doctors; and he had even been taught to believe, that his protection could not lawfully be extended to a man suspected of heresy; that monstrous charge superseded the ordinary economy of government, and dispensed with the imperious obliga-

* It was supposed that the spiritual influence of a confessor might possibly be sufficient to lead him to retract; and Huss requested that the same Paletz might be the person so commissioned—partly to prove, that he could pardon his worst enemy; partly to show, how willing he was to confide the inmost secrets of his heart, even to one who might be disposed to proclaim them most loudly. The Council did not think proper to accede to this generous request. It sent a monk to him, who gave him the same counsel as the others, and absolved him, without any penitential imposition.—See Lenfant's Hist. Conc. Const., liv. iii. § xxxv.

tions of moral duty! Howbeit, notwithstanding the spiritual authority on which this principle was advanced, Sigismund would have greatly preferred some reasonable compromise to that violent termination, which was now near at hand. Accordingly, when he saw the fruitlessness of every other attempt to bend the spirit of Huss, he resolved himself to make one final effort for the same purpose. On the 5th of July, on the eve of the day destined for his execution, the prisoner was visited by an imperial deputation, commissioned to inquire, 'whether he would abjure those articles of which he acknowledged himself guilty?' And in regard to those which he disavowed, 'whether he would swear that he held thereon the doctrine of the Church?' One objection, to which Huss had throughout attached great importance, was removed by this proposal—the obligation to *retract* that which he had never maintained. But the grand, the insurmountable difficulty still remained—to abjure against conviction that which he did actually profess. Upon the whole, he saw no reason for any change, and returned to the Emperor the same sort of answer with which he had met all preceding solicitations.

It remained for him still to encounter one other trial; if, indeed, we can so designate the upright counsel of a faithful and virtuous friend—for such was the circumstance, which completed and crowned the history of his imprisonment—and it should be everywhere recorded, for the honour of human nature. A Bohemian nobleman, named John of Chlum, had attended Huss, whose disciple he was, through all his perils and persecutions, and had exerted, throughout the whole affair, every method that he could learn or devise to save him. At length, when every hope was lost, and he was about to separate from the martyr for the last time, he addressed him in these terms: 'My dear master, I am unlettered, and consequently unfit to counsel one so enlightened as you. Nevertheless, if you are secretly conscious of any one of those errors, which have been publicly imputed to you, I do entreat you not to feel any shame in retracting it; but if, on the contrary, you are convinced of your innocence, I am so far from advising you to say anything against your conscience, that I exhort you rather to endure every form of torture, than to renounce anything which you hold to be true.' John Huss replied with tears, 'that God was his witness, how ready he had ever been, and still was, to retract on oath, and with his whole heart, from the moment he should be convicted of any error by *evidence from Holy Scripture*.*' . . . In the whole history of the sufferings and the fortitude of Huss, there is not one discoverable touch of pride or stubbornness; the records of his heroism are not infected by a single stain of mere philosophy; he was firm, indeed, but he was humble also; he expected death, and he feared it, too; he neither sought the Martyr's crown, nor affected the ambition of the Stoic: his principles of action were drawn from the same source as the articles of his belief; he was a pure and perfect Christian, and he thought it no merit to be so.

There was a long interval between his imprisonment and his audience, and again a tedious month intervened between his audience and execution. This period was passed in preparation to meet his fate, not in struggles to avoid it. 'God, in his wisdom, has reasons for thus prolonging my life.

* Huss, on the eve of his execution, wrote to the Senate of Prague to the following effect:—'Be well assured that I have not retracted or abjured one single article. The Council urged me to declare the falsehood of every article drawn from my books; but I refused, unless their falsehood could be demonstrated from Scripture. So do I now declare, that I detest every meaning which may be proved false in those articles, and I submit in that respect to the correction of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who knows the sincerity of my heart.' See *Contin. of Fleury*, l. ciii, lxxviii.

He wishes to give me time to weep for my sins, and to console myself in this protracted trial by the hope of their remission. He has granted me this interval, that, through meditation on the sufferings of Christ Jesus, I may become better qualified to support my own*.' The time of those sufferings at length arrived. On the morning of July 6, 1415, he was conducted before the Council, then holding its fifteenth session; and after various articles of accusation had been read, a sentence was passed to the following effect,—‘That for several years John Huss has seduced and scandalized the people by the dissemination of many doctrines manifestly heretical, and condemned by the Church, especially those of John Wiclif. That he has obstinately trampled upon the keys of the Church and the ecclesiastical censures. That he has appealed to Jesus Christ as sovereign judge, to the contempt of the ordinary judges of the Church; and that such an appeal was injurious, scandalous, and made in derision of ecclesiastical authority †. That he has persisted to the last in his errors, and even maintained them in full Council. It is therefore ordained that he be publicly deposed and degraded from holy orders, as an obstinate and incorrigible heretic.’ . . . The prelates appointed then proceeded to the office of degradation. He was stripped, one by one, of his sacerdotal vestments; the holy cup, which had been purposely placed in his hands, was taken from them; his hair was cut in such a manner as to lose every mark of the priestly character; and a crown of paper was placed on his head, marked with hideous figures of demons, and that still more frightful superscription, *Heresiarch*. The prelates then piously devoted his soul to the infernal devils ‡; he was pronounced to be cut off from the ecclesiastical body, and being released from the grasp of the Church, he was consigned, as a layman, to the vengeance of the secular arm. It was in the character of ‘advocate and defender of the Church,’ that the Emperor took charge of the culprit, and commanded his immediate execution.

The last, which was not perhaps the bitterest, of his sufferings was endured with equal constancy and in the same blessed spirit. On his way to the stake he repeated pious prayers and penitential psalms; and when the order was given to kindle the flames, he only uttered these words—‘Lord Jesus, I endure with humility this cruel death for thy sake; and I pray thee to pardon all my enemies.’ The ministers executed their office; the martyr continued in uninterrupted devotion; and it was not long before a rising volume of fire and smoke extinguished at the same time his voice and his life. . . . His ashes were carefully collected and cast into the lake. But the miserable precaution was without any effect; since his disciples tore up the earth from the spot of his martyrdom, and adored it with the same reverence and moistened it with those same tears, which would otherwise have sanctified his sepulchre.

The points of difference strictly doctrinal between Huss and his persecutors were, after all, neither numerous nor important; since we are bound in this inquiry to give credit to the solemn disavowals of the accused, rather than to the malignant imputations of his accusers. Lenfant, in his

* Opera Joh. Huss., epist. 14, apud Lenfant.

† Probably, in the long list of Huss’s imputed heresies there was no single article which inflamed the Council against him nearly so violently as this appeal. The point which, above all others, that assembly was interested to establish, was its own omnipotence and infallibility—its agency under the *immediate* operation of the Holy Spirit—in fact, its divine power. Consequently, an appeal to any superior, even though it were Christ himself, was derogatory to the heavenly attributes, with which the Council had clothed itself.

‡ ‘Animam tuam devovemus infernis Diabolis.’

accurate history* of this affair, has investigated very minutely the real extent of the offences of Huss, and reduced them under two heads. (1.) He unquestionably refused to subscribe to any general condemnation of the articles of Wiclif. There were many particulars on which he dissented from that reformer, but in several others he professed the same notions; and among these last were disparagement of the Pope and the Roman Church, and opposition to tithes, indulgences, and ecclesiastical censures. (2.) It was also made a dangerous charge against him, that the spirit of ecclesiastical insubordination, which had already appeared in Bohemia, was principally occasioned by his preaching. . . . Such was the burden of his offence. And though all the leading authors and orators of the time were as unsparing as Huss himself, in their denunciations of papal and ecclesiastical enormities, even from the pulpits of Constance; though it was even usual with them to ascribe to these abuses the heresies of the day; still the independent exertions of a Bohemian preacher in the same cause were stigmatized by them as indiscreet and immoderate zeal—because the principles, from which that zeal proceeded, were not in accordance with their own hierarchical pretensions; because the Bible, and not the Church, was the source from which it flowed. . . . And as to the disaffection of the Bohemians, if the Council really hoped to repress it by the perfidious execution of the most pious and popular of their teachers, the events, which presently followed, were a lesson of bloody and indelible instruction both to those who indulged that error, and to their latest posterity.

III. In less than a year from the execution of Huss, the same scene of injustice and barbarity was acted a second time, *Jerome of Prague*. though with some variety of circumstances, in the same polluted theatre. Jerome, master in theology in the university of Prague, and a layman, was the disciple of John Huss. Huss (says *Æneas Sylvius*) was superior in age and authority; but Jerome was held more excellent in learning and eloquence. While the former presided in the chair, the latter delivered his lectures in the schools; and the same opinions were taught with equal zeal and effect by the one and by the other. In the troubles, which had been excited through those opinions, Jerome had had, perhaps, the greater share; there was at least no favourable feature to distinguish his offence from that of his master. Accordingly he was summoned to Constance soon after the meeting of the Council; and he appeared there on the 4th of April, 1415, not unprepared for the treatment which awaited him. It should be observed, that he also obtained a safe-conduct from the Emperor; but that in his case the conditional clause, *salva semper justitia*, was inserted; whereas that of Huss contained no such provision.

At his first audience (on May 23rd) he exhibited great firmness; but at the second, which took place only thirteen days after the execution of Huss, it was expected that the impression made by that frightful example would render him more tractable. And so assuredly it proved; for on his third examination (on September 11th) he submitted, after suffering much insult and intimidation, to make a formal and solemn retractation. He 'anathematized all heresies, and especially that of Wiclif and Huss with which he had been previously infected (infamatus); he denounced the various articles which expressed it, as blasphemous, erroneous, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, rash, and seditious; and professed his absolute adhesion to all the tenets of the Roman Church.' . . .

It was admitted that, in this mournful exhibition of human inconstancy, he had satisfied every demand which was made upon his weakness, both in

* Hist. Conc. Const. lib. iii. § 52, 60.

substance and in form; nevertheless he was still retained in confinement. After a short space, his enemies pressed forward with new charges against him. They found many eager listeners among the members of the Council; and Gerson * himself again took up the pen of bigotry, and again sought to dip it in blood. Matters continued thus until the 23rd of May, 1416, when a final and public audience was granted to his repeated entreaties. On this occasion he recalled, with sorrow and shame, his former retractation, and openly attributed the unworthy act to its real and only motive—the fear of a painful death.

His execution.

His bitterest foes desired no further proof against him; and only seven days were allowed to elapse before he was condemned, and executed on the same spot which had been hallowed by the sufferings of his master. The courage, which had abandoned him in the anticipation of the flames, returned with redoubled force as he approached them. The executioner would have kindled the faggots behind his back: ‘Place the fire before me,’ he exclaimed; ‘if I had dreaded it, I could have escaped it.’ ‘Such (says Poggio † the Florentine) ‘was the end of a man incredibly excellent. I was an eye-witness to that catastrophe, and beheld every act. I know not whether it was obstinacy or incredulity which moved him; but his death was like that of some one of the philosophers of antiquity. Mutius Scævola placed his hand in the flame, and Socrates drank the poison with less firmness and spontaneity, than Jerome presented his body to the torture of the fire.’

Whatsoever may have been the respective excellence, in their living or in their martyrdom, of those two venerable heralds of the Reformation, the conduct of the Council was not at all less iniquitous in respect to its second, than to its first victim. If in the one instance the violation of the safe-conduct displayed unblushing perfidy, the contempt of the retractation was at least as shameless in the other. The first crime was followed by no remorse; it seems rather to have led to the more calm and deliberate perpetration of the second. The *principle* by which the deeds were justified was never, for an instant, questioned in either case. And we should, at the same time, bear in mind (for it is a consideration deserving repeated notice), that this was not a principle exclusively papal—no peculiar emanation from the apostolical chair or the Court of Rome—it was a principle strictly ecclesiastical, animating the Council as the representative of the Church, and inflaming the individual bosom of the churchmen who composed it. It was embraced by the French and English, as warmly as by the Italians themselves; nor was it pressed to any greater extremity by the champions of ecclesiastical corruption, than by the men who called themselves its reformers.

* He composed at this time (in October, 1415) his treatise ‘De Protestatione et Revocatione in Negotio Fidei, ad eluendam Hæreseos notam.’ He sought to cast suspicion on such retractations; and this was the first step towards the execution of Jerome. The Composition may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. iii. p. iv.

† In a letter addressed to Leonardus Aretinus, of which the whole is valuable, as describing the entire transaction, and painting the character of Jerome. It is cited by Beausobre, Histoire de la Réformation, lib. ii.; by Von der Hardt, tom. iii. pars iii.; and other writers. There was, indeed, a little more of philosophical parade, and a little less of the genuine Christian spirit in the death of Jerome than in that of his master. Æneas Sylvius, however, whose eye was not likely to perceive this distinction, or to value it when perceived, includes both in the same sentence of admiration. ‘Pertulerunt ambo constanti animo necem et quasi ad epulas invitati ad incendium properârunt, nullam emittentes vocem, quæ miserî animi posset facere indicium. Ubi ardere cœperunt, hymnum cecinerunt, quem vix flamma et fragor ignis interciperere potuit. Nemo Philosophorum tam forti animo mortem pertulisse traditur, quam isti incendium.’ Hist. Bohem. cap. xxxvi.

IV. The condition of Bohemia is described to have been singularly flourishing at that moment. There was no other region * more abundant in useful productions, or in which the people were blessed with greater comforts; none more distinguished for the splendour of its churches and monasteries, and the wealth of its clergy. Unhappily, that body had used with little moderation the advantages enjoyed by it; and its excesses had for many years excited the murmurs of the laity. This disaffection had even shown itself in occasional outrages; but no systematic hostility had yet been arrayed either against the persons or the property of the sacred order. Howbeit, no sooner were the proceedings of the Council made known throughout the country, than the people gave indications of a ferocious spirit; the nobles † likewise addressed a bold remonstrance to the fathers; and as their rising opposition was met by new edicts ‡ of condemnation, which still farther inflamed it; and as Martin V. at length published a Bull § of Crusade against the contumacious heretics, every hope of reconciliation was removed, and the difference was fairly committed to the decision of the sword.

It was one of the earliest and most innocent acts of insubordination to spread three hundred tables in the open air, for the public celebration of the communion in *both* kinds||. And as the sense of some one specific grievance is necessary for the union of a large multitude in revolt against any established power, so it was wise in the Bohemian insurgents to select one among their spiritual wrongs, as the principal motive of resistance, and to select that which would be most intelligible to the lowest classes. Again, the distinction of a name was useful in rousing enthusiasm, and preserving the show of concord. And so this *chosen people*

*Insurrection of the
Bohemians.*

* Cochlæus (lib. i. p. 314) cites some verses ‘Conradi Celtis primi apud Germanos Poetæ Laureati,’ in praise of the city of Prague:—

Visa non est Urbs meliore cœlo;
Explicat septem hæc spatiosa colles,
Ambitu murorum imitata magnæ
Mœnia Romæ.

† They had previously addressed several remonstrances to the Emperour on the subject of Huss’s imprisonment, representing that there was no person, great or small, who did not see the violation of his safe-conduct with indignation. Their letter to the Council immediately followed the execution of Huss, and was dated September 2. The great considered the act as an affront to the kingdom of Bohemia; the populace exclaimed against the fathers, as persecutors and executioners, and assembling in the chapel of Bethlehem, decreed to the victim the honours of martyrdom. It is related, that Jérôme of Prague was prematurely associated with his master in this popular canonization; and it is remarkable that this crown was conferred upon him within a few days from that, on which he made his retraction.

‡ Among the edicts published at Constance against the Hussites, there was one, in 1418, which prohibited the singing of songs in derision of the Catholic Church.

§ The Bull published by Martin in 1421 contained a prohibition to keep faith with heretics, as distinctly conveyed as words can express it,—‘Quod si tu aliquo modo inductus defensionem eorum suscipere promisisti; scito *te dare fidem hæreticis, violatoribus Fidei Sanctæ, non potuisse, et idcirco peccare mortaliter, si servabis*; quia fidei ad infidelem non potest esse ulla communicio.’ It is addressed to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania, and published by Cochlæus, a prejudiced Catholic. Lib. v. p. 212.

|| After all, it appears nearly certain, that Huss was not the author of the restoration of the cup. Lenfant follows the account of Æneas Sylvius, and argues that he was not. The retrenchment of the cup appears to that author to be a necessary consequence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Huss seems to have professed to the last. The Catholics of Constance, and even Gerson himself, (for he published a very elaborate and artificial treatise on the subject,) appear to have been more perplexed in the defence of this, than of any other of their abuses. Antiquity, of course, is the great object of appeal; and yet the antiquity of this practice could scarcely reach two centuries (Lenfant, liv. iii., § xxxi.); and it certainly never acquired the force of a law till the contrary was declared to be heresy, in the 10th Session of the Council (May 14, 1415).

stigmatised the surrounding nations as Idumæans or Moabites, as Amalekites or Philistines; themselves were the well-beloved and elect of God; Thabor was the mount on which they pitched their tents, and Thaborite the appellation which they adopted. The first effects of their indignation were directed against the monks and clergy. These were plundered and even massacred without pity and without remorse. The sacred buildings were overthrown, the sanctuaries profaned, the altars stained with blood; and all those abominations were unsparingly committed, which commonly attend a premature resistance to inveterate oppression.

Sigismond conducted the armies of the Church; Zisca led the rebels against them; and the name of Zisca is signalised by several triumphs over the imperial crusaders, *Their triumphs.* which evinced not only his great military genius and resolution, but the deep religious enthusiasm and devotion of his followers. Atrocities were perpetrated by both parties, as if in emulation of each other, and of the heroes of former holy wars; and so keen was the thirst for blood, that the Hussites indulged it in the massacre of a sect of brother-heretics. A number of unfortunate enthusiasts, usually designated Adamites, were collected in an insular spot, in the neighbourhood of Zisca's encampment. They are accused by various writers of the habit of nudity, and of many scandalous crimes; and in this matter it is probable that they have been much calumniated. It may be, as Mosheim is disposed to think, that they were infected with some of the absurdities of mysticism; or, as Beausobre* learnedly argues, that their difference from the Catholics was confined to the use of the cup. It is beyond dispute, that they did not maintain all the opinions of the Thaborites; and it would seem that some fatal quarrels had taken place between individuals of the two sects. Zisca surrounded and destroyed them without any discrimination or mercy; but lest we should on this account consider him as having surpassed the wickedness of his Catholic adversaries, we may remark, that by this very act he has incurred the deliberate praise of their historians†, and redeemed in their eyes some portion of the guilt of his apostacy.

Zisca died in 1424, and divisions immediately ensued among his followers. Two other factions, the Orebiters and the Orphans, distracted the Bohemian reformers; *Divisions.* but they united on occasions of common danger.

In 1431 they repelled another formidable crusade, which was conducted by the celebrated cardinal of St. Angelo; and in this affair the rout was so complete, that the Pope's Bull, as well as the hat, cross, and bell of the cardinal, fell into the hands of the victors‡. In the meantime, a more moderate party arose and acquired influence among the Hussites; its hopes were turned to a pacific accommodation with the Church; and with that view it was arranged, that the Bohemians should send deputies to treat with the council of Basle. . . Accordingly some of the most renowned among their military and ecclesiastical directors appeared at that city on the day appointed. The fame of their fierce exploits made them objects of deep and fearful curiosity with that peaceful assembly; they were treated with respect, for they had earned it by their sword; and no

* This very ingenious writer, in his dissertation on the 'Adamites,' addressed in two books to M. Lenfant, and published together with the 'History of the Council of Constance' by the latter, certainly clears the Adamites from the worst charges that have been brought against them, which he shows to have been Catholic calumnies. Still the question, why Zisca destroyed them, is scarcely answered satisfactorily.

† See Cochläus, lib. v., p. 218. ‡ See Lenfant, *Guerre des Hussites*, l. xvi. s. v. &c.

violation of their safe-conduct, or other breach of faith, was on this occasion meditated.

They were introduced, on February 16, 1433, to a general meeting of the fathers, and immediately proposed the conditions of reconciliation, which were four in number*.

Embassy to Basle. (1.) The use of the cup in the administration of the sacrament. (2.) The free preaching of the word of God. (3.) The abolition of the endowments of the clergy. (4.) The punishment of heinous transgressions and mortal sins. A separate debate was then opened upon each of these articles; and John of Rokysan, the most conspicuous among the Hussite divines, commenced by a defence of the double communion, which lasted for three entire mornings. He was afterwards answered by John of Ragusa, an ingenious Dominican, who so far surpassed the prolixity of his opponent, as to occupy eight mornings in the delivery of his arguments †; six others were then consumed by the reply of Rokysan. The other subjects were contested with scarcely less tediousness; and when the debate had thus continued for nearly two months, and when it was found that, so far from any progress having been made towards accommodation, the obstinacy of both parties was only confirmed and inflamed, the Duke of Bavaria, the secular protector of the council, sought for other expedients to bring them to terms. But in this attempt he failed likewise; and after the Catholics had advanced some counter-propositions, which were rejected by the Hussites, the conference terminated, and the deputies returned to recount to their compatriots the failure of their mission.

But the Catholics, being now better informed as to the variety and nature of the dissensions which divided their opponents, thought to profit by that circumstance, if they should carry the controversy into the hostile territories; a solemn embassy was accordingly appointed to proceed to Prague. Negotiations were again opened; and again the Catholics essayed the arts of persuasion in vain. They then introduced such amendments into the four articles as effectually destroyed their force, or altered their meaning; but these were firmly rejected by the larger and more determined portion of the separatists. There existed, however, among these last, a more moderate and very influential party, which was strongly disposed to waive all other subjects of

The Calixtines. complaint, provided the double communion were fairly conceded by the Church. These were called Calixtines ‡—from the *chalice* § to which their demands were con-

* According to Cochlæus (lib. v., p. 205), these were first agreed upon in a general assembly “Baronum terræ Bohemiæ et Moraviæ, et dominorum inclytæ urbis Pragensis, militarium, clientum, civitatum et communitatum,” A.D. 1421. This will account for the moderation of the demands contained in them.

† It is observed that John of Ragusa gave great offence to his opponents by the frequent use of the word heresy, as applied to their opinions. With them it was still a question whether it was not the Church which was in heresy; with the Dominican, the Church was infallible. With them it was error to differ from the Scripture; with John, to differ from the Church. Thus the term, taken in a different sense, was as obnoxious in their eyes as in those of the Dominican.

‡ Cochlæus (lib. v., p. 192) mentions early differences between the Magistri Pragenses and the Thaborites. The former were the more moderate Dissenters; the Church Hussites and Jacobellus Misnensis, Rokysan, and other distinguished reformers, belonged to them. But the Thaborites, who were the Puritans, and also the soldiers of the party, had Zisca with them, and the two Procopiuses—both eminent warriors—so that they were for some time the stronger faction.

§ Tot pingit calices Bohemorum Terra per urbes,
Ut credas Bacchi numina sola coli—

is a contemporary distich. It should be observed, that every other picture was an object of aversion, at least to the more rigid reformers.

finéd—and they were distinguished from the Thaborites, who constituted the more violent faction; and the sum of whose grievances was by no means comprehended in the four articles, though they might consent in their public deliberations to suppress the rest. Among the Calixtins were several of the substantial citizens and leading members of the aristocracy; and of such too the Catholic party was chiefly composed. As these, next after the clergy, were the principal sufferers by the continuance of anarchy and the devastations of war, they entered without much difficulty into the designs of the council. And since it was now obvious, that no reconciliation was to be expected from discussion, it was determined to make another appeal to the sword.

A civil war was immediately kindled throughout the country (in 1434); the party of the council was directed with ability by a distinguished Bohemian, named Maynard: *Renewal of War.* his schemes were at first advanced by dissensions which raged between the Thaborites and the Orphans; and he afterwards conducted matters with so much address, that he engaged them when united, and entirely overthrew them. On this occasion it so happened, that the most hardened and desperate among the insurgents fell alive into the power of the conquerors; and as they were numerous, and objects, even in their captivity, of fearful apprehension, Maynard resolved to use artifice for their destruction. Among the prisoners there were also several, who were innocent of any previous campaigns against the Church, and who were neither hateful as rebels, nor dangerous as soldiers. These it was the design of the Catholics to spare; and the better to distinguish them from the veterans of Zisca, they caused it to be proclaimed, that the government intended to confer honours and pensions on the more experienced warriors, the heroes of so many fields. These were accordingly invited to separate themselves from their less deserving companions, and to withdraw to some adjacent buildings, where more abundant entertainment and a worthier residence were prepared for them. They believed these promises; and then it came to pass (says Æneas* Sylvius), 'that many thousands of the Thaborites and Orphans entered the barns assigned to them; they were men blackened, and inured and indurated against sun and wind; hideous and horrible of aspect; who had lived in the smoke of camps; with eagle eyes, locks uncombed, long beards, lofty stature, shaggy limbs, and skin so hardened and callous as to seem proof, like mail, against hostile weapons. The gates were immediately closed upon them; fire was applied to the buildings; and by their combustion, that ignominious band, the dregs and draff of the human race, at length made atonement in the flames, for the crimes which it had perpetrated, to the religion which it had insulted.' . . . Among the crimes with which the Thaborites are reproached, was there any more foul than that, by which they perished? or can any deeper insult be cast on the religion of Christ, than to offer up human holocausts in his peaceful name? In the balance of religious atrocities the mass of guilt must rest at last with those, who established the practice of violence, and consecrated the principles of Antichrist.

But the adversaries of Rome were not thus wholly extirpated: under the spiritual direction of Rokysan, they were still so considerable, that Sigismund did not disdain to negotiate with them. The result was, that a concordat or compact was concluded at Iglau in the year 1436, by

* Hist. Bohem., cap. li., ad finem.

which the Bohemians conceded almost all their claims; but in return, the use of the cup was^e conceded to them, not as an essential practice, but only through the indulgence of the Church*. Some arrangement was likewise made respecting the ecclesiastical property, which had been despoiled by the rebels. This affair was conducted with the countenance of the Council. The first result was favourable; and the contest with Rome might then, perhaps, have ceased; the Bohemians, fatigued with tumult and bloodshed, might have returned to the obedience of the Church, contented with one almost nominal concession, if the chiefs of the hierarchy could have endured any independence of thought or action, any shadow of emancipation from their immitigable despotism. For this was, in fact, the spirit which guided the Councils of Rome; it was not the attachment to any particular tenet or ceremony, which moved her to so much rancour; but it was her general hatred of intellectual freedom, and the just apprehensions with which she saw it directed to the affairs of the Church.

In September, 1436, Sigismund made his entry into Prague, amid congratulations almost universal; and the calamities which had desolated the country for two-and-twenty years appeared to be at an end †. But the Pope refused his assent to the concordat; he refused to confirm the appointment of Rokysan to the See of Prague, though the Emperor had promised it; and though all the factions of the people were united in desiring it. Wherever the guilt of the previous dissensions may have rested, henceforward we need not hesitate to impute it wholly to the Vatican. Legates and mendicant emissaries ‡ continued to visit the country, and contend with the divines, and tamper with the people. Even Pius II., whose personal §

* The Council of Basle, in its thirtieth session, published its Decree on the Eucharist, in which are these words:—'Sive autem sub una specie sive duplici quis communicet, secundum ordinationem seu observationem Ecclesie, proficit digne communicantibus ad salutem.' Cochläus, lib. viii. p. 308. Communicants might be saved according to either method, so long as that method was sanctioned by the Church.

† The appointment of a double administrator of the Sacrament in every Church, one for the Catholic, the other for the Separatist, was of somewhat later date. Lenfant places it in 1441, and mentions that great good proceeded from it.

‡ The most celebrated among these papal missionaries was John Capistano, a Franciscan, who had gained great distinction in a spiritual campaign against the Fratricelli in the Campagna di Roma and March of Ancona, and had condemned thirty-six of them to the flames. . . . He is described by Cochläus (lib. x. ad finem) as a little emaciated old man, full of fire and enthusiasm, and indefatigable in the service of the Church. The year of his exertions in Bohemia was 1451. Such emissaries were in those days among the most useful tools of the Roman hierarchy.

§ It was in 1451 that Æneas Sylvius made his celebrated visit to Bohemia, as imperial envoy. His mission was merely political; but it deserves our notice from the very interesting description which he has drawn of the manners of the Thaborites, among whom he found an asylum when in some danger from bandits:—'It was a spectacle worthy of attention. They were a rustic and disorderly crew, yet desirous to appear civilized. It was cold and rainy. Some of them were destitute of all covering except their shirts; some wore tunics of skin; some had no saddle, others no reins, others no spurs. One had a boot on his leg, another none. One was deprived of an eye, another of a hand; and to use the expression of Virgil, it was unsightly to behold

— populataque tempora raptis

Auribus et truncos inhonesto vulnere nares.

There was no regularity in their march, no constraint in their conversation; they received us in a barbarous and rustic manner. Nevertheless, they offered us hospitable presents of fish, wine and beer. . . . On the outer gate of the city were two shields; on one of them was a representation of an angel holding a cup: as it were to exhort the people to this communion in wine,—on the other Zisca was painted an old man, blind of both eyes. . . . whom the Thaborites followed, not only after he had lost one eye, but when he became a perfectly blind leader. Nor was there inconsistency in this, etc.—(See his 130th Letter.) In the mean time these wild and unseemly sectarians nourished in their

intercourse with the sectarians had not softened his ecclesiastical indignation at their disobedience, exhibited in his negotiations with Pogebrac*, the king, an intolerant and resentful spirit. And at length Paul II., his successor, once more found means to light up a long and deadly war in the infected country. It was considered, no doubt, as a stigma upon the Church, which all occasions and instruments were proper to efface, that a single sect should anywhere exist, which dared to differ from the faith or practice of Rome on a single article, and which maintained its difference with impunity.

It was in 1466 that Paul II. excommunicated and deposed Pogebrac, and transferred the kingdom to the son of Huniades. In that object he was not successful; but *The Bohemian brothers*, during the discords of almost thirty years which followed, the offensive names of Thaborite, Orphan, and even Hussite, gradually disappeared, and the open resistance to the Catholic predominance became fainter and fainter. But the principles were so far from having expired in this conflict, that they came forth from it in greater purity, and with a show of vigour and consistency, which did not at first distinguish them. Early in the ensuing century, about the year 1504, a body of sectarians, under the name of the 'United Brethren of Bohemia,' begins to attract the historian's notice. Beausobre † affirms, that this association was originally formed in the year 1467; that it separated itself at that time from the Catholics and Calixtines, and instituted a new ministry; that it made application to the Vaudois, in order to receive through them the true apostolical ordination; and that Stephen, a bishop of that persuasion, did actually ordain Matthew, the first bishop of the 'United Brethren.' It is unquestionable, that those among the Thaborites, and the other more determined dissenters, who had escaped the perils of so many disasters, continued with uncompromising constancy to feed and mature the tenets for which they had suffered; and that many of the leading articles of the Reformation were anticipated and preserved by the 'Bohemian Brothers.' It is also true, that the evangelical principles of their faith were not unmixed with some erroneous notions; but it is no less certain, that when Luther was engaged in the accomplishment of his mission, he was welcomed by a numerous body of hereditary reformers, who rejected, and whose ancestors had rejected, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, transubstantiation, prayers for the dead, the adoration of images; and who confirmed their spiritual emancipation by renouncing the authority of the Pope ‡.

rude abodes opinions, which were the glory of the following age, but which were indeed pernicious to themselves. Exactly seven years after the visit of Æneas Sylvius, the King of Bohemia, Pogebrac, willing to bring them to more moderate sentiments of reform, summoned a General Council of Hussites, who condemned some of their tenets; and then, on their refusal to abjure them, the King assaulted Thabor, and destroyed them (as it is related) with such scrupulous exactness, that not one was left alive.

* Pogebrac was a moderate reformer, a Calixtine; he was extremely anxious to be subject to the Church, on the condition only, that it would leave him the cup: he had been brought up, as he said, in that practice, and would never resign it. His persecution of the Thaborites sufficiently proves how far he was from any anti-ecclesiastical tendency. Yet he seems to have been as much hated at Rome, as if he had gone to the full extent of opposition, and he was certainly much less feared. The Pope had still a powerful party among the aristocracy of Bohemia.

† Dissertation sur les Adamites. Part I.

‡ Bossuet (in the eleventh chapter of his Variations) consumes his ingenuity in endeavouring to show that the 'Bohemian Brethren' were descended from the Calixtines, not from the Thaborites, and had thus only one point of doctrinal difference with Rome. But, at the same time, he admits their *disobedience*—'Voilà comme ils sont disciples de

CHAPTER XXVI.

History of the Greek Church after its Separation from the Latin.

Origin, progress, and sufferings of the Paulicians—They are transplanted to Thrace, and the opinions gain some prevalence there—Their differences from the Manichæans—and from the Church—Six specific errors charged against them by the latter—Examined—Points of resemblance between the Paulicians and the Hussites—Mysticism at no time extinct in the East—and generally instrumental to piety—Introduction of the mystical books into the West—Opinions of the Echites or Messalians—Those of the Hesychasts or Quietists—who are accused before a Council, and acquitted—The mixed character of the heresy of the Bogomiles—Controversy respecting the God of Mahomet—terminated by a compromise—Points of distinction between the two Churches—Imperial supremacy constant in the East—Absence of feudal institutions—Superior civilization of the Greeks—They never received the False Decretals, nor suffered from their consequences—Passionate reverence for antiquity—Animosity against the Latins—Hopes from foundation of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—Its real consequences—Establishment of a Latin Church in the East—Influence of the military orders—Legates *a latere*—Latin conquest of Constantinople—confirmed by Innocent III.—A Latin Church planted and endowed at Constantinople—Tithes—Dissensions of the Latin ecclesiastics—Increasing animosity between the Greeks and Latins—Secession of the Greek hierarchy to Nice—Mission from Rome to Nice—Subject and heat of the controversy, and increased rancour—John of Parma subsequently sent by Innocent IV.—Extinction of the Latin empire—The Church does not still withdraw its claims—Subsequent negotiations between the Emperor and the Pope—Confession of Clement IV.—Conduct of the Oriental Clergy—Ambassadors from the East to the Second Council of Lyons—Concession of the Emperor presently disavowed by the Clergy and People—Subsequent attempts at reconciliation—Arrival of the Emperor and Patriarch at Ferrara—First proceedings of the Council—Private deliberations by Members of the two churches—The four grand Subjects of Division—The Dispute on Purgatory—Doctrine of the Latins—of the Greeks—First Session of the Council—Grand Disputations on the Procession—The Council adjourned to Florence, and the same Discussions repeated there—Suggestions of compromise by the Emperor, to which the Greeks finally assent—The common Confession of Faith—A Treaty, by which the Pope engages to furnish Supplies to the Emperor—The Union is then ratified—The manner in which the other differences, as the Azymes, Purgatory, and the Pope's Primacy, are arranged—Difficulty as to the last—How far the subject of Transubstantiation was treated at Florence. On the fate of Cardinal Julian—Return of the Greeks—Their angry reception—Honours paid to Mark of Ephesus—Insubordination of three Patriarchs—Russia also declares against the Union—Critical situation of the Emperor—The opposite Party gains ground—The prophetic Address of Nicholas V. to the Emperor Constantine—Perversity and Fanaticism of the Greek Clergy—They open Negotiations with the Bohemians—Tumult at Constantinople against the Emperor and the Pope's Legate—Fall of Constantinople—*Note.* On the Armenians—and Maronites.

WHILE the jealousies, which had so long disturbed the ecclesiastical concord of the east and west, were ripened into open schism by the mutual violence of Nicholas and Photius*, the Eastern Church was in the crisis of a dangerous contest with a domestic foe. A sect of heretics named Paulicians had arisen in the seventh century, and gained great prevalence in the Asiatic provinces, especially Armenia. It was in vain that they were assailed by imperial edicts and penal inflictions. Constantine, Justinian II., and even Leo the Isaurian successively chastised their errors or their contumacy; but they resisted with inflexible fortitude, until at length Nicephorus, in the beginning of the ninth century, relented from the system of his predecessors, and restored the factious dissenters to their civil privileges, and religious liberty.

During this transient suspension of their sufferings, they gained strength to endure others, more protracted and far more violent. The oppressive edicts were renewed by Michael Curopalates, and redoubled by Leo the Armenian; as if that resolute Iconoclast wished to make

Jean Huss. Morceau rompu d'un morceau, schisme séparé d'un schisme—Hussites divisés des Hussites; et qui n'en avoient presque retenu, que la désobéissance et la rupture avec l'Eglise Romaine.'

* We refer the reader to the 12th chapter of this History.

amends to bigotry, for his zeal in the internal purification of the Church, by his rancour against its sectarian seceders. The struggles, the victories, and the misfortunes of that persecuted race are eloquently unfolded in the pages of Gibbon: we shall not transfer the narrative to this history, for it belongs not to our purpose to trace the details even of religious warfare. It may suffice to say, that the sword, which was resumed by the enemy of the Images, was most fiercely wielded by their most ardent patroness; and that, during the fourteen years of the reign of Theodora, about 100,000 Paulicians are believed to have perished by various methods of destruction. The conflict lasted till nearly the end of the century; and, at length, the survivors either sought for refuge under the government of the Saracens, or were transplanted by the conqueror into the yet uncontaminated provinces of Bulgaria and Thrace. But not thus were the doctrines silenced, or the spirit extinguished. The fierce exiles carried with them into their new habitations the sectarian and proselytizing zeal; and the errors of the East soon took root and flourished in a ruder soil. During the tenth and eleventh centuries the Paulicians of Thrace were sufficiently numerous to be objects of suspicion, if not of fear; and in the latter we find it recorded, that Alexius Comnenus did not disdain to employ the talents and learning, with which he adorned the purple, in personal controversy with the heretical doctors. Many are related to have yielded to the force of the imperial eloquence; many also resigned their opinions on the milder compulsion of rewards and dignities; but those who, being unmoved by either influence, pertinaciously persisted in error and disloyalty, were corrected by the moderate exercise of despotic authority*.

After this period we find little mention of the Paulician sect in the annals of the Oriental Church. But we should remark that Armenia, the province of its birth, was never afterwards cordially reconciled to the See of Constantinople; and that, though it no longer fostered that particular heresy, it continued to nourish some seeds of disaffection, which frequently recommended it in later ages to the interested affection of the Vatican.†

It is generally much easier to describe the fortunes of a suffering sect than to ascertain the offence for which they suffered. The resistance of the Paulicians, their bravery, their *Opinions of the Paulicians.* cruelty, their overthrow, are circumstances of unquestionable assurance; the particulars of their opinions are disputed. By their enemies, they were at once designated as Manichæans—it was the name most obnoxious to the Eastern as well as the Western Communion: yet, if we may credit contemporary testimony‡, they earnestly disclaimed the imputation. The truth is, that they are only

* They were removed to Constantinople, and placed in a sort of honourable exile in the immediate precincts of the imperial palace. Anna Comnena (Alexiad, b. xiv.) describes with filial ardour her father's zeal and patience in converting these *Manicheans*. Τοῖς μὲν ὅπλοις τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκηα, ταῖς δὲ λόγοις ἐχειροῦτο τοὺς ἀντιθέους. ὡσπερ δὲ τότε κατὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων ἐξῶπλιστο, ἀποστολικὴν ἀντὶ στρατηγικῆς ἀναδιζήμενος ἀγωνίαν—καὶ ἔγωγος τοῦτον τρισκαίδεκατον ἂν ἀπόστολον ἠνομάσαμι . . . ἀπὸ πρώιας οὖν μεχρὶ δεύτης ἡμέρας ἢ καὶ ἰσπίρας, ἴστιν αὖ καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τρίτης φυλακῆς τῆς νυκτὸς μεταπιμπόμενος αὐτοῦς, &c. &c.

† See the Note at the end of this chapter.

‡ 'Idem sunt (says Petrus Siculus, page 764) nec quicquam divertunt à Manichæis Paulliciani, qui hasce recens a se procusas hæreses prioribus assuerunt, et ex sempiterno exitii barathro effoderunt: qui, tametsi se a *Manicheorum impuritatibus alienos dicitant*, sunt tamen dogmatum ipsorum vigilantissimi custodes, &c.' 'Historia de Manichæis;' a Latin translation of which is published in the Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum Veterum; tom.

known, like so many other sects, through the representations of their adversaries*. These have been investigated by Mosheim† with his usual care and impartiality, and the result of his inquiry may be received with as much confidence as is consistent with the nature of the evidence.

The most obvious difference between the Paulicians and Manichæans related to the ecclesiastical profession and discipline. The former rejected the government by bishops, priests, and deacons (to which the Manichæans adhered), and admitted no order or individuals set apart by exclusive consecration for spiritual offices. Neither did the authority of councils or synods enter into their system of religious polity. They had, indeed, certain doctors, called *Synecdemi*, or Notarii; but these were not distinguished by any peculiar dignities or privileges, either from each other or from the body of the people. The only singularity attending their appointment was, that they changed, on that occasion, their lay for scriptural names. They received all the books of the New Testament, except the two Epistles of St. Peter; and the copies of the Gospel in use among them were the same with those authorized by the Church, and free from the numerous interpolations imputed to the Manichæans.

The peculiarities already mentioned may appear alone sufficient to have excited the animosity of the established clergy of the East; but these were by no means the only offences objected to the Paulicians by the Church writers. These last, without professing to give a perfect delineation of the monstrous system of the Heretics, are contented to charge them with six detestable errors: 1. That they denied that either the visible world or the human body was the production of the Supreme Being; and distinguished their Creator from the most High God who dwells in the heavens. 2. That they treated contemptuously the Virgin Mary. 3. That they disparaged the nature and institution of the Lord's Supper‡. 4. That they loaded the cross of Christ with contempt and reproach. 5. That they rejected, after the example of the greatest part of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testament, and looked upon the writers of the Sacred History as inspired by the Creator of the world, not by the Supreme God. 6. That they excluded Presbyters and Elders from all part in the administration of the Church§.

xvi., ann. 860—900. The expressions of Photius are ‘Μηδὲς δ’ οὐδένα ῥίζης ἐτέρας βλάστημα εἶναι, παρ’ ἣν ἐπίζωσεν ὁ θεόμαχος Μάνης, τὴν παραφυάδα ταύτην τὴν δυσσεβῶν Σεργίου δογμάτων’ μία γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ, &c.’ (*Διήγησις*, &c., published in the *Bibliotheca Coisliana* (Paris, 1715) page 349.

* The books from which our best accounts of the Paulicians are derived, are Photius (*Διήγησις τῶν νεοφάντων Μανιχαίων καταβλαστήσεως*), and Petrus Siculus (*Historia de Manichæis*). By the account of Petrus Siculus we learn, that, in the year 870, under the reign of Basilus the Macedonian, he was sent as ambassador to the Paulicians at Tibrica, to treat with them concerning the exchange of prisoners, and that he lived among them for nine months.

† Cent. ix. p. 2. chap. v.

‡ The words of Petrus Siculus are—‘Quod divinam et tremendam corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri conversionem negent, aliaque de hoc mysterio doceant—A Domino nempe non panem et vinum in cœna discipulis propinatum, sed figuratè symbola tantum et verba, tanquam panem et vinum, data.’ In the article following—‘Quod formam et vim venerandæ et vivificæ crucis non solum non agnoscant, sed infinitis etiam contumeliis onerent.’ The six articles thus stated by Petrus Siculus are given by Photius in the same order, and with no very important alteration or addition: only, the patriarch increases the list by the charge of the most abandoned obscenity and profligacy.

§ The Sicilian elsewhere admits that the Paulicians professed the principal Catholic doctrines; but *aliter ore, aliter corde*. These *mental heresies*, so gratuitously imputed where every outward proof is wanting, are the most wicked invention of ecclesiastical rancour.

We are, of course, bound to receive these articles with suspicion, as the allegations of an enemy. Still they had, unquestionably, some foundation. The first and fifth are sufficient to prove that the Paulicians maintained some opinions resembling those of Manes. It seems, indeed, most probable that they were descended from some one of the ancient Gnostic sects, which, though diversified in many particulars, all professed one common characteristic. Again, whether or not they believed the eternity of matter is questionable; but it was seemingly their opinion that matter was the seat and source of all evil; and that, when endued with life and motion, it had produced an active principle, which was the cause of vice and misery. Respecting the third charge, it appears that, in their passion for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, they attached merely a figurative sense to the bread and wine administered by Christ at the last supper, understanding thereby a spiritual food and nourishment for the soul. The second and fourth evince their freedom from some of the popular superstitions of the Greeks—adoration of the Virgin, and reverence for the fancied relics of the Cross; and this, again, had alone been crime sufficient to arm against them, in the eighth and ninth centuries, the intemperate zealots of the Oriental Church. Add to this, that they held the images of the Saints in no reverence, and recommended to every class of the people the assiduous study of the sacred volume; not suppressing their indignation against the Greeks, who closed the sources of divine knowledge against all, except the priests*. . . These various subjects of difference duly considered, we shall not wonder that the Paulicians became the victims of the most deadly persecution which ever disgraced the Eastern Church. And since they were, in some manner, the reformers of their time, and as their zeal was indiscriminately directed as well against the sacerdotal order as against the corruptions introduced or supported by it, the Schismatics of Armenia resembled, both in their principles and their excesses, the Bohemians of the fifteenth age. The resemblance was increased by the violent means which were in both cases adopted to crush them, and which were resisted with the same ferocious heroism by both. Nor were their concluding destinies very different; for, though the sect of the Paulicians was at length expatriated, and finally extinguished or forgotten in the Bulgarian deserts, the Christians of Armenia never afterwards returned with any fidelity to the communion from which they had been so violently dissevered.

Amidst the metaphysical disputes which agitated the Greeks in the sixth and seventh centuries, that strong disposition to mysticism, which is peculiarly congenial with the oriental *Mysticism prevalent in the East.* character, gave frequent proofs of its activity, though it never became the predominant spirit. It was princi-

* A considerable proportion of the work of Petrus Siculus is consumed in describing the process, by which the mind of Sergius or Constantine, the founder of the sect, was corrupted by the seductions of a Manichæan woman. The following is an important specimen of the dialogue (page 761): 'Audio, Domine Sergi, te literarum scientia et eruditione præstantem esse, et bonum præterea virum usquequaque. Dic ergo mihi, cur non legis sacra Evangelia? Quibus ille ita respondit. *Nobis profanis ista legere non licet, sed sacerdotibus duntaxat.* At illa—Non est ita ut putas; nec enim personarum acceptio est apud Deum. Omnes siquidem homines vult salvos fieri Dominus et ad agnitionem veritatis venire. At sacerdotes vestri, quoniam Dei verbum adulterant et mysteria occultant, quæ in Evangeliiis continentur, ideoque, vobis audientibus omnia non legunt quæ scripta sunt; &c. It is related that Constantine received from a deacon, in return for some acts of hospitality, the present of the New Testament. Thus it appears that, before the middle of the seventh century, the Eastern clergy had effectually shut up the sources of sacred knowledge.

pally cherished in the monastic establishments; and when free from the strange notions into which it not uncommonly seduced irregular minds, it gave birth, without any doubt, to much genuine and ardent piety. But in the course of ecclesiastical history, through a painful necessity perpetually imposed upon its writer, it is by the excesses of piety rather than its natural and ordinary fruits, by the abuses of religion rather than its daily and individual uses and blessings, that attention is fixed and curiosity excited. In the civil and political records of nations the exploits of patriotism and the deeds which throw dignity on human nature, are proclaimed and celebrated, because they were performed in the public fields of renown, with kings and nations for their witnesses. But in a religious society the purest characters are commonly those, which shun celebrity and court oblivion. The noblest patriots in the kingdom of Christ are men who serve their Heavenly Master in holiness and in peace. They have their eternal recompense; but it is rare that they rise into worldly notice, or throw their modest lustre on the historic page.

On this account it is, that, while the absurdities of mysticism are commonly known and derided, the good effect which it has had, in turning the mind to spiritual resolves and amending the heart of multitudes imbued with it, is generally overlooked. We cannot now recall the names, or publish the pious acts or aspirations, which have been concealed or forgotten; yet may we approach, in a spirit of benevolence, the follies which have been so carefully recorded; and while we pursue with unsparing denunciation the crimes of ecclesiastical hypocrites—the ambition, the frauds, the avarice, the bigotry of a secular hierarchy—we may pass with haste and compassion over the errors and extravagances of piety.

Mosheim* ascribes the introduction of the mystical theology into the Western Church to a copy of the pretended works of Dionysius the Areopagite, sent by the Emperor Michael Balbus to Lewis the Meek. Whether this be true or not, it was certainly in the East that those opinions were most prevalent, not in earlier only, but also in later ages. It is particularly recorded, that, in the twelfth century, numerous fanatics disturbed the unity and repose of the Oriental Church by errors proceeding from those principles. It is said that they rejected every form of external worship, all the ceremonies, and even the sacraments of the Church; that they placed the whole essence of religion in internal prayer; and maintained that in the breast of every mortal an evil genius presided, against which no force nor expedient was availing, except unremitting prayer and supplication. One Lycopetrus is believed to have founded this sect, and to have been succeeded by a disciple named Tychicus; and their followers were presently known throughout the East by the denomination of Euchites, or Messalians†, *Men of Prayer*. The term was considered ignominious; and it presently came generally into use to designate all who were adverse to the persons of the clergy, or the system of the Church. The Churchmen of the West were at the same period beginning to employ the terms Waldenses and Albigenses with the same latitude and for the same purpose; and as, in the one instance, we are well assured, that many holy individuals were involved in the indiscriminate scandal, so also may the

* Cent. ix. p. 2, chap. iii. The works of Dionysius, though long received as genuine, are a palpable forgery, probably of the fifth century.

† This was, in fact, only the revival of an ancient heresy, condemned, under the same name and probably for the same errors, by the Council of Antioch, held towards the end of the fourth age. See Fleury, l. xix. s. 25, 26, and l. xcv. s. 9.

seeds of a purer worship have lurked in the barren bosom of the Messalian heresy.

Two centuries afterwards, the eye of Barlaam, an inquisitive ecclesiastic, sharpened by much intercourse with the hierarchy of the West, detected, in the monasteries of Mount Athos, a *Hesychasts*, or very singular form of fanaticism. A sect of persons was there discovered, who believed that, through a process of intense contemplation, they had attained the condition of perfect and heavenly repose. The method of their contemplation is conveyed in the following instructions, handed down to them, as it would seem, from the eleventh century* :—‘ Being alone in thy cell, close the door, and seat thyself in the corner. Raise thy spirit above all vain and transient things; repose thy beard on thy breast, and turn thine eyes with thy whole power of meditation upon thy navel. Retain thy breath, and search in thine entrails for the place of thy heart, wherein all the powers of the soul reside. At first thou wilt encounter thick darkness; but by persevering night and day thou wilt find a marvellous and uninterrupted joy; for as soon as thy spirit shall have discovered the place of thy heart, it will perceive itself *luminous* and full of discernment.’ When interrogated respecting the nature of this light, they replied that it was the *glory of God*; the same which surrounded Christ during the transfiguration. These enthusiasts were originally called *Hesychasts*, or, in Latin, *Quietists*; they afterwards obtained the name of *Ομφαλόψυχοι*, or *Umblicani*, ‘men whose souls are in their navels.’ They were also known by that of *Thaborites*, from their belief respecting the nature of their divine light.

It might seem beneath the dignity of history to waste a thought or a sigh on such pure fanaticism. Yet such was it not considered in the age in which it rose; but it occupied, on the contrary, the solemn consideration of courts and councils. Barlaam officiously denounced the heresy to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Metropolitan was astounded, and instantly summoned the *Hesychasts* into his presence. As they argued with confidence, a Council was thought necessary to decide so grave a controversy; but the Emperor Andronicus hesitated to convoke it, and strongly recommended to both parties silence and reconciliation. However, the polemics persisted; the Emperor yielded; and the Council was assembled†. The Archbishop of Thessalonica, Gregory Palamas, advocated the cause of the *Thaborites*; and, what might astonish even those most familiar with the triumphs of religious extravagance, he succeeded. Nay, so signal was his success, that the accuser thought it expedient to retire from the country and return to Italy. . . . The controversy was soon afterwards renewed, and became the occasion of other councils, which agreed without exception in the condemnation of the *Barlaamites*. But the question had now assumed a more general form; the *Quietism* of the Monks of Mount Athos was no longer the subject of dispute; it ascended to the mysterious inquiry, whether the eternal light with which God was encircled, which might be called his *energy* or operation, and which was manifested to the disciples on Mount Thabor, was distinct from his *nature* and essence, or identified with it‡? The former was the opinion of the pious Archbishop Palamas. It grew gradually to be considered as the

* It is found in a spiritual treatise of Simon, abbot of the monastery of Xerocerca, at Constantinople, and is cited by Fleury, l. xcv. s. 9.

† It was held on June 11, 1341, and the Emperor presided in person, together with the Patriarch and many of the nobility of the empire.

‡ See Mosheim. Cent. xiv. p. 2, ch. v.

more reasonable tenet,' and finally took its place, after a series of solemn deliberations, among the dogmas of the Oriental Church.

We must notice one or two other disputes, of greater notoriety than importance, which occasioned some transient agitation in *Bogomiles*, the East. A monk named Basilius was burnt in the Hippodrome during the reign of Alexius Comnenus for opinions which he refused, on repeated solicitation, to renounce*. They are known to us only from his enemies. He is said to have maintained that the world and all its inhabitants were the creation of an evil and degraded demon, so that the body was no better than the prison house of the immortal spirit: wherefore, it became man to enervate and subject it by fasting, prayer, and contemplation, and thereby to redeem the soul from its degrading captivity. This Heresiarch had many followers, who were called *Bogomiles*—as it is said, from a Mysian word signifying 'the invocation of divine mercy.' These sectarians also denied, with the Phantastics, the reality of the body of Christ; while, with the Gnostics, they rejected the law of Moses. Upon the whole, it would seem that their creed was formed by an infusion of mysticism into the leading Paulician tenets—a combination which it was natural to expect in an age, when the latter were still in some repute, and in a Church, wherein the former never wholly lost its influence†.

About the same time, the same Alexius Comnenus was compelled to apply to the exigencies of the state some of the figures which adorned the churches. Leo, Bishop of Chalcedon, loudly exclaimed against the sacrilege, asserting that the images were endued with some portion of *inherent sanctity*. The monks re-echoed the charge, and a council was in consequence assembled at Constantinople. It decided that images had only a relative worship (*σχετικῶς προσκυνούμεν οὐ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας*); and that it was offered not to the substance of the matter, but to the form and features, of which they bear the impression; that the representatives of Christ, whether in painting or sculpture, did not partake of *the nature* of Christ, though enriched by a certain communication of divine grace; and lastly, that invocations were to be addressed to the saints only as servants of Christ in their relation to their master. This moderate exposition of the doctrine did not, however, satisfy the Bishops, who persisted in their lofty notions, until the secular authority interposed to repress them‡.

The curious learning of Manuel Comnenus gave birth, in the twelfth century, to several frivolous disputes. There is, however, one which deserves some notice, as well from the singularity of its subject as from the spirit in which it was conducted and concluded. The catechisms of the Greek Church contained a standing anathema against the God of Mahomet. Through the imperfect comprehension of an Arabic word, the Greeks represented that Being as *solid* and *spherical*§, and consequently

* 'Ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἀπᾶσαν τιμωρίαν καὶ ἀπειλὴν καταφρονητικὸς καταφαίνεται. οὔτε γὰρ τὸ πῦρ κατεμίλαξε τὴν σιδηρᾶν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν, οὔτε αἱ τοῦ Αυτοκράτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν διαπομπικαὶ διαμνήσεις κατίδελξαν. The people demanded the execution of all his followers, but the Emperor was contented with a single victim. See the *Alexiad.* book xx.

† Anna Comnena's expression is, τὸ τῶν Βογομίλων δόγμα, ἐκ Μασσαλιανῶν καὶ Μανιχαίων συγκείμενον. That orthodox princess vituperates in very strong language the persons, the practices, and the opinions of the *Bogomiles*, and relates how the heresiarch was one night stoned by demons while reposing in his cell. She also particularizes an error respecting the Eucharist; but is not otherwise very specific in her charges.

‡ Mosh., c. xi., p. 2, ch. iii.

§ 'Ὀλόσφαιρος. The Arabic word, which bears that signification, also signifies *eternal*.

not an object of spiritual adoration. As this anathema tended to add irritation to the subsisting animosity, and offended especially such Mahometans as had embraced, or were disposed to embrace, the Christian faith, the Emperor ordered it to be erased from the public ritual. The doctors and dignitaries were scandalized at the rashness of the innovation; they entered eagerly into the most abstruse inquiries respecting the nature of the Deity; they condemned the imperial decree, and the purple itself was an insufficient shelter against the imputation of heresy*. But an imperial heretic will never be destitute of supporters; and the contest was carried on with the accustomed vehemence and rancour. In this, as in most other controversies, a moderate party interposed and proffered a project of conciliation; but in this, unlike the usual fortune of theological conflicts, the moderate party prevailed. A council was assembled; and, after an angry and protracted struggle, the Bishops at length consented to the following compromise:—‘That the anathema should keep its place in the ritual, but that its object should be changed from the God of Mahomet to Mahomet himself.’ On these conditions the fathers retired, authorized to denounce the impostor, but compelled to spare the Deity.

In resuming, after so long an interval, the history of the Oriental Church, it becomes necessary to recur to some of the leading principles of its constitution, and to notice the material feature by which it was early distinguished, as it is still distinguished, from its Roman rival.

Essential distinctions between the two Churches.

And as we have before traced the connexion of those communions until the beginning of the schism, and as we now propose shortly to describe the principal attempts which were made to reunite them, it is proper to observe the different ground on which they stood, that we may truly estimate the difficulty of those attempts; for, though the matters of doctrinal dispute may be reduced to a few articles, and though the differences on discipline and government might seem to be virtually absorbed in one—the supremacy of the Pope—nevertheless, the numerous diversities which subsisted in all the principles, as well as the economy, of the two establishments, threw impediments in the way of reconciliation, which, though not always in sight, were ever in active operation.

In the first place, we may mention the firm, uninterrupted maintenance of the imperial supremacy. While the pontiffs of the West were first securing their emancipation, and then asserting their pre-eminence over every secular authority, the Greek ecclesiastics were the subjects of the civil magistrate; they were translated, deposed, or even executed, at his undisputed control; and whatever wealth or influence they may have obtained, they were never able to withdraw themselves from the temporal yoke, nor to establish, like their Latin brethren, a distinct and independent republic†. Hence it results that the individuals who composed the higher order of the clergy, were essentially different in the two communions; different in their personal habits, in their private views, in their public estimation of the sacerdotal character, and the true polity of the Church.

* Hildebrand himself, in an earlier age, had made himself liable to the same imputation. In a letter to the King of Morocco, expressing thanks for the liberation of some Christian captives, he expressed his conviction that the King had been moved thereto by the spirit of God; and that both he and the infidel worshipped the same God, though the modes of their adoration and faith were different. This is mentioned by Mills in his History of the Crusades.

† See Gibbon, chap. liii

How much more widely was this distinction extended by the absence in the East of all feudal institutions, and of the character which they so deeply impressed upon every order, and almost every individual, living under them! That patrimonial jurisdiction by which public justice became private property; the secular pomp and appendages of baronial state; and, above all, the practice of military achievement, were circumstances unknown to the hierarchy of the East. They viewed with astonishment the temporal greatness of the apostolical successors; they condemned it with justice and seeming sincerity; and the envy, which may have mingled with that condemnation, rendered it the more severe and malevolent.

Notwithstanding the literary degeneracy and languor of the Greeks, their superstitious reverence for the ancient models, the servility with which they copied without daring to emulate—though it be true that ‘in the revolution of ten centuries not a single discovery was made to exalt the dignity or promote the happiness of mankind, not a single idea added to the speculative systems of antiquity’—yet was it something in those barren ages, to admire, to copy, to praise, even to possess the noblest monuments of human genius. And, though they lay fruitless in the hands of their possessors, and unproductive of any original effort or bold imitation, yet were they not without effect in diffusing light and information, and in raising the people, by which they were cultivated however imperfectly, far above the prostrate barbarism of the West*. Nor was it only that the education of the clergy embraced more subjects of useful instruction, but also, that education was not wholly confined to the clergy, but extended generally to the higher classes in society. It was the same with theological as with profane literature. It was an object of very general interest and inquiry; and the industry to pursue it was kept alive among a disputatious race, by the occasional appearance of domestic heresy, and by the long-protracted controversies with the rival Church. A superiority in literary discrimination will account for the circumstance that the forgery called the ‘false decretals’ was at once rejected by the Eastern Church. There were, indeed, other sufficient reasons to prevent a code, which conferred supremacy almost unlimited on the Roman Bishop, from being acknowledged either by the Court or the Church of Constantinople: but it is also probable that the penetration of the Greeks at once detected the clumsy imposture.

The mention of the Decretals recalls the consideration of the Papal polity, founded in a great measure upon them. We have observed, that, after their promulgation, a system of government and a form of discipline unknown to earlier ages grew up, and continued, as it grew, to deviate farther and farther from the original canons and practices. We have traced the gradual usurpations of the See of Rome, and the changes introduced by pontifical ambition into the very heart and vitals of the Ca-

* The eleventh age, for instance, produced, besides Alexius Comnenus, and others of less renown, Cerularius, Cedrenus, and the illustrator of Aristotle, Michel Psellus. Among the literary names of the twelfth (and thirty-six are enumerated by Dupin as *commendables* for their knowledge of theology, canon law, and history) are Cinnamus, Glycas, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Dionysius the geographer, and the celebrated commentator Eustathius, Bishop of Thessalonica. The industry of the Greeks seems ever to be most keenly excited by controversy; and this age was enlivened, not only by some warm disputes with the Latins, but also by a contest between the systems of Plato and Aristotle. During the greater part of the thirteenth age the Latins were in possession of Constantinople; but in the fourteenth, the names of Nicephorus Gregoras, Manuel Chrysoloras, Nicephorus Callistus, are boasted by the Greeks; and the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic writers, were translated and studied. Yet Plato had still his followers.

tholic Church. That powerful agency had no existence in the East; before it began to operate with any great success, the separation of the Churches was so decidedly pronounced, and their animosity so strongly marked, that the introduction of a change into the one would have been reason almost sufficient for rejecting it in the other.

It was not, indeed, that the Patriarchs of Constantinople were exempt from the ruling passion of their Roman brethren, nor that they failed to profit by any favourable occasion to extend their authority and curtail the independence of their clergy. But such occasions were rare, because they could only arise through the co-operation or connivance of the civil authorities; and what the caprice of one despot had bestowed, might be as easily taken away by the opposite caprice of another. In the mean time, there was one steady and unvarying principle, on which the ecclesiastical policy of the East was conducted—an inviolable reverence for antiquity. It was by this standard that the excellence of every institution was measured. The canons of the Seven General Councils, the precepts of the early fathers, the practice of the primitive Church—these were the unalterable rules and models for the guidance and government of the Church. It was not so with the worldly hierarchy of Rome. They presently learned to subject antiquity to the more flexible laws of expediency. When it countenanced the purpose of the moment, they bowed to its venerable name. But whenever its voice was unequivocally raised in opposition to their schemes, then was it readily discovered, that all truth and excellence were *not* communicated in the beginning; but that something was reserved for more seasonable revelation, or mere human discovery. On the other hand, the Greeks were the *bigots* of antiquity; their worship was blind, and therefore both consistent and passionate. Hence it happened, that the least important among the modern opinions or practices* of their rivals disgusted them at least as deeply as the most essential; and that, while they rejected the change, they detested the innovator. They were as intolerant in their feelings towards the Latins, as were the Latins towards their own heretics; and so general were those feelings and so carefully nourished by the clergy, and so continually rekindled by the continuance of schism and controversy, that if a sincere reconciliation, founded on compromise, could possibly have been effected by the directors of the two Churches, it was scarcely probable that it would be accepted by the inferior clergy and people of Greece.

The foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem at the end of the eleventh century gave to the Latins a substantial footing in the East, and seemed to open the gates of concord. In a *Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.* close alliance against the common enemy of the Christian name, there was hope that the less perceptible differences among Christians would altogether vanish and be forgotten. The harmony of so many sects and tongues united in adoration of the same Saviour, at his birth-place and round his tomb, might have afforded a spectacle of charity and a prospect of peace. If any circumstance of place or association, any reverence of sacred monuments, any brotherhood in holy enterprise, could have quenched the fire of sectarian animosities, we might have expected that blessing from the occupation of Palestine and the redemption of the Sepulchre of Christ. . . . What was really the result? The very circumstances, which should have produced religious

* The Latin practice of Tonsure (*κρίσιμα*) may be particularly mentioned, as exciting the indignation and disdain of a bearded priesthood.

unanimity, seem to have had no other effect than to multiply the causes of discord, to exasperate its nature, and to aggravate its shame.

The first act of the conquerors was to establish, throughout the narrow extent of their new kingdom, a numerous body of Latin clergy. A Latin Patriarch was appointed at Jerusalem, a second at Antioch; and episcopal sees were multiplied under the jurisdiction of both. Of the native population, those who followed the Christian faith were indissolubly attached to a different rite, and the authority of the Latin Prelates was confined to a precarious host of crusaders and colonists. Nevertheless, their first care was to place on a solid foundation the temporalities of their Churches*; and since the feudal institutions were those on which the civil government of Godefroy was formed, so the bishops sought to attach to their sees cities, and fortresses, and baronies, according to the preposterous practice of the West. Then arose the customary dissensions between the spiritual and secular authorities, on the extent of their prerogatives and the limits of their jurisdiction: and they were inflamed in Palestine, even beyond their usual violence, by the peculiar position and character of the Military Orders; for these were endowed with various privileges by the Roman See, and were not disposed to concede them. Thence proceeded perpetual appeals to Rome, with all their train of pernicious consequences: legates *a latere* were profusely poured into the Holy City; and by their ignorance, their obstinacy, their arrogance, and their avarice, precipitated the downfall of the kingdom.

It was dissolved after the battle of Tiberias in 1187; and whatsoever contempt of their Latin brethren the clergy of the East may have previously and perhaps ignorantly entertained, it was not diminished by the nearer inspection of their character, which was afforded by the conquest of Palestine. Thus it proved, that the advances towards conciliation, which were made during this century by the Emperors of the Comnenus family, led to no good result. Negotiations were opened; but the demands of the Vatican were positive, and they amounted to nothing less than spiritual submission. Perhaps the Emperors, who had discovered the secret of their own political weakness, and began to tremble at the temporal influence of the Vatican, might have consented even to that condition. But the Prelates of the East, who were swayed by different views and interests, indignantly rejected it; and the failure of the attempt only increased the asperity of both parties.

The reign of the Latins in Palestine was concluded in less than ninety years; their dominion in Constantinople had a still shorter duration: yet its effects on the ecclesiastical relations of the East and the West were more direct and permanent, without being in any respect more beneficial. The capital of the East was stormed by the crusaders in the year 1204. Innocent III. was at that time Pope; and in the first instance he strongly reprobated the treacherous achievement: but the conquerors were acquainted with a sure expedient to soften his displeasure. Already did

* See Fleury's Sixth Discourse on Ecclesiastical History. 'According to the spirit of the Gospel (says that writer) the Latin clergy should have attended principally to the instruction and correction of the crusaders; to form, as it were, a new Christianity, approaching as nearly as possible to the purity of the early ages, and capable of attracting, by its good example, the surrounding infidels. Next they should have engaged in the reconciliation of heretics and schismatics, and the conversion of the infidels themselves: it was the only method of making the crusade useful. But our Latin clergy was not sufficiently well-informed to have views so pure and exalted—as it was on this side of the sea, such was it in Palestine, or even more ignorant and more corrupted. . . .'

Alexis, when raised to the purple which he so soon forfeited, greet the Pontiff with promises of spiritual obedience for himself and for his Church; and Innocent, in rejoinder, gave him divine assurance of prosperity should he observe his faith*, and of speedy reverse should he violate it. It was also one of the first acts of the Latin conquerors to tender the same submission to the Pontiff, to proffer the same promises, and likewise to solicit, with all humility, his confirmation of the conquest. Innocent professed some embarrassment at this application; the perversion of the legitimate object of the crusaders was too scandalous—their excesses in the spoliation of the city too notorious—their motives too obvious—the offence too recent. Accordingly the Pontiff expressed his disapprobation both of the enterprise itself and the circumstances attending it; and particularly condemned that sacrilegious violence which had exasperated the Greeks, and turned them away from ‘obedience to the Apostolic See†.’ Nevertheless, since the deed was perpetrated, he thought it expedient, after mature deliberation, not only with his cardinals, but with all his influential clergy, not to withhold from it his sanction—because, forsooth, the designs of Providence were inscrutable; and it might be, that, in chastising the long-endured iniquities of the Greeks, a just God had employed the arms of the Latins as the instruments of a holy regeneration‡.

In the year following, the Pope applied himself more directly to reap the fruits of this unprincipled adventure. He excited the zeal of all the faithful for the defence of the new empire. He wrote a circular letter to the leading prelates of France, exhorting them to preach the indulgence for its defence, and at the same time observing, that Providence had transferred the sceptre from the proud, superstitious, and rebellious Greeks, to the humble Catholic and obedient Latins, to the end that his holy Church might be consoled by the reunion of the schismatics.

In the mean time not a moment was lost in establishing the Latin Communion at Constantinople; in introducing the Latin Liturgy; in encouraging eminent ecclesiastics to emigrate to the East, and firmly to plant in the churches and schools of Constantinople the doctrines, the discipline, the polity, and the learning of the West. That the nature of that encouragement was not wholly spiritual—that an establishment founded by Innocent III. held out no inconsiderable temporal allurements§—is a circumstance which will excite no surprise in us; though it did not, perhaps, increase the respect or affection of the Greeks towards their new instructors. A concordat was signed in 1206 by the Latin Patriarch on

*Establishment of
the Latin Church.*

* The express condition prescribed by Innocent to Alexis was, that he should engage the Patriarch to send a solemn deputation to Rome, for the purpose of recognizing the supremacy of the Roman Church, promising obedience to the Pope, and soliciting the *Pallium*, as necessary for the lawful exercise of his patriarchal functions.

† ‘*Ut jam merito Latinos abhorreant plus quam canes.*’ Epistle to the Marquis of Montserrat.

‡ See the Epistle of Innocent to the Marquis of Montserrat, published by Raynaldus, ad ann. 1205. ‘*Divinum enim videtur fuisse judicium, ut qui tamdiu misericorditer tolerati, et toties non solum ab aliis sed etiam a nobis studiosè commoniti noluerunt redire ad Ecclesiæ universitatem, nec ullum terræ sanctæ subsidium impertiri, per eos, qui ad utrumque pariter intendebant, omitterent locum et gentem, quatenus perditis maiè malis terra bona bonis Agricolis locaretur, qui fructum reddant tempore opportuno, &c.*’

§ The following are the Pope’s expressions, addressed to the Archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans:—‘*Exhortamur, quatenus tam clericos quam laicos efficaciter inducatis ut ad capessendas spirituales pariter et temporales divitias ad præfatum Imperatorem accendant, qui singulos vult et potest, secundum status suos, &c. augere divitiis et honoribus ampliare. . . .*’

the one hand, and the regent, barons, knights, and people on the other, by which a fifteenth portion of all domains without the walls, of all cities, castles, villages; of corn-fields, vineyards, forests, meadows and other immoveables, was at once bestowed upon the Latin Church. At the same time, all the monasteries, even within the walls, appear to have been transferred to the ascendant establishment*. By another article it was regulated, that tithe should also be paid by all Latins—and 'if (it was added) in process of time it should be found practicable to persuade the Greeks also to contribute their tithe, the laity shall offer them no impediment.' We should here recollect, that this method of remunerating the clergy, so long familiar to the people of the West, had never been sanctioned by any law, or grown into any general use, in the Oriental Church.

If one of the earliest exhibitions presented by the Roman Catholic clergy to the schismatics of the East was that of their *Dissensions*. avarice; another as early, as violent, and almost as revolting, was that of their dissension. Before the storming of the city by the French and Venetians, a sort of convention had been made between those two nations, to this effect—that, if the empire should be vested in a Frenchman, the Church should be under Venetian superintendence. Accordingly the first patriarch, Thomas Morosini, was a native of Venice; and he immediately took measures so to fill the chapter of the Patriarchal Cathedral, as to secure a compatriot for his successor. Innocent vehemently remonstrated against this design. He sent his legates to Constantinople; and as they acted in opposition to the resident head of the Church, the schismatics were edified by witnessing the jealous disputes of two independent authorities. But it was on the death of Morosini (in 1211) that the struggle really commenced. The Venetian Canons entered the Church of St. Sophia, with arms in their hands, and proceeded to the choice of a Venetian successor. Other ecclesiastics of other nations, who also claimed their share in the election, nominated three other candidates, and the matter was referred to Rome. The Pope commanded them to meet and deliberate in common, and the result was a second disagreement. The dispute was conducted with the customary violence; and as it lasted for about three years, during which space the highest office in the Church remained vacant, it furnished the schismatic spectators with another equivocal proof of the superior excellence of the Roman polity. In the mean time the sectarian antipathy continued to be so strongly manifested on their part, that there were many of their clergy who, before they celebrated the Communion, caused those altars to be washed, which had been polluted by the ceremony of the Latins; and who likewise insisted on re-baptizing all who had received that sacrament from Latin hands. These proofs of insubordination are mentioned with censure in one of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Church.

While the Roman hierarchy was endeavouring to fix and extend its conquest along the western shores of the Bosphorus, the genuine pastors of the oriental Church, the legitimate guardians of its apostolical purity, were assembled in honourable exile at Nice. They had witnessed the shame, the pillage, and the desolation of the metropolis of their faith; they had seen their churches despoiled, and their altars violated; the holy images trampled under foot, the relics of departed saints scattered in

* It should be mentioned that the French and Venetians had entered into a convention, by which, after making a decent provision for the Oriental clergy, they proposed to divide between themselves the rest of the Church property. But Innocent took under his own protection the property even of a rival Church, and immediately annulled the convention.

the dust, the sacred utensils desecrated, and the sanctuary of St. Sophia profaned and plundered by lawless and *Latin* hands. Such assuredly was not the season for any dreams of reconciliation. But after the lapse of one generation, when these bitter recollections were not quite so recent, an accident occurred which opened the way to a serious negotiation between the churches—if we should not rather say, the courts—of Nice and Rome. Five Franciscan missionaries, in the discharge of their perilous duties among the infidels, were seized by the Turks, and on their liberation, dismissed to Nice. They were humanely received by the patriarch Germanus, who was edified by their poverty and their zeal; and, in the communications of a friendly intercourse, the division of the two churches was mentioned and deplored by both parties. The emperor (John Vataces) had strong political reasons for desiring an accommodation; and with his consent the patriarch addressed some amicable overtures, though not un-mixed with untimely reproach*, both to the Pope and the cardinals.

This took place in 1232, during the reign of Gregory IX.; and in the year following the Pontiff sent four mendicants (two Dominicans, and two Franciscans) to conduct the *Latin Mission* negotiations in the east. They presented themselves at *to Nice.* Nice before the emperor and the patriarch, in the January of 1234; and a series of conferences then commenced, which did not finally terminate, though occasionally interrupted, till the middle of May. It were needless to unfold the particulars of this controversy, though they are not destitute of interest and instruction to the theological reader; nor shall we pursue the intricate manœuvres of the disputants, though the most practised polemic might possibly peruse them with profit. It is sufficient to mention, that the dispute turned entirely on two points, the procession of the Holy Spirit; and the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The Greeks urged the ancient doctrine and practice; the Latins, without conceding their claims to the authority of early writers, rested the weight of their defence on scripture. The debates were broken off, and renewed; the same arguments and assertions were repelled and reiterated; and the ardour of the opposition increased, as the contest was prolonged.

At length the emperor, who was less heated by the theological zeal, and more sincere, as he was more interested, in his desire for reconciliation, personally proposed to the envoys a compromise. As in political,

* ‘To go to the bottom of the question (said the patriarch) many powerful and noble persons would obey you, if they did not fear your oppression, and the wanton extortions and undue services which you exact from your subjects. Hence proceed cruel wars, the depopulation of cities, the closing of the churches, the cessation of the divine offices, every thing short of martyrdom, and some things not far short of that. For there is now imminent danger that the tyrannical tribunal will be unclosed, and torments and bloodshed, and the crown of martyrdom proposed to us. Is this the lesson which St. Peter teaches, when he instructs the shepherd to conduct his flock without constraint or domination?’ In his letter to the cardinals he wrote with equal bitterness. ‘Permit me to speak the truth to you. Our division has arisen from the tyrannical oppression which you exercise, and the exactions of the Roman Church, which, from being a mother, has become a step-mother, and tramples upon others in proportion as they humble themselves before her. We are scandalized to see you exclusively attached to the good things of this world; heaping up from all quarters gold and silver, and making kingdoms your tributaries.’ That such reproaches, however just, should have broken forth in letters expressly conciliatory, might well have led those, to whom they were addressed, to despair of the success of the negotiation. The original epistles are given by Matthew Paris, *Histor. Major.* ann. 1237; whose remark it is that the animosity of the Greek Church was occasioned by the acts, more than the opinions, of its rival. See also Raynaldus, ann. 1232-3.

(said this simple mediator) so be it in theological, negotiations. When princes differ respecting a city or a province, each party relaxes somewhat of his pretensions for the attainment of peace. Our differences in this matter are two*, and if you sincerely wish for concord, concede one of them. We will approve and revere your holy sacrament; abandon to us your creed; say the creed as we say it, effacing the offensive addition. They replied—Let us tell you that the Pope and the Roman Church will not abandon one iota of its faith, or of any thing contained in its creed. But the following proposal we may consent to make to you. You must firmly believe and teach others, that the body of our Lord may be consecrated with unleavened *as well as* leavened bread; and you must burn all the books which your churchmen have written to the contrary. And in respect to the Holy Spirit, you must believe that it proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, and teach the people so; but the Pope will not oblige you to insert the article in your creed—only all books which have been written against it shall be burnt. . . . On hearing this final declaration, the emperor resigned himself to despair †; but in his prelates it excited only feelings of indignation and revenge. One other violent conference followed, to which large multitudes of the people were admitted; and it was broken off by mutual charges of heresy, and confirmations of the ancient anathema. The legates then withdrew; having increased the evils which they had proposed to remove, and added fresh fuel and fierceness to the controversy.

The failure of this enterprise did not prevent a similar attempt on the part of Innocent IV., which was conducted with more moderation, but with no better success, than the former. The agent, selected for the conduct of this mission, was of great dignity and reputation in the Church. John of Parma, general of the Franciscan order, and alike eminent for his theological erudition, and the austerity of his life, was a character well calculated to influence the prelates of the East. It is something to be enabled to assert that his sojourn at Nice (in 1249) produced no mischief; but the negotiations, which seemed likely to result from it, were prevented by the death of the Pope and the Emperor. In 1261, the sceptre of the Latins was broken; and, upon the whole, we are unable to observe that their conquest had any spiritual fruits, or any other consequences than bitterness and aggravated rancour ‡. And we may here remark, that as the Latins on their expulsion from the East did not resign their claims to ecclesiastical ascendancy, or abolish the titles of the dignities there con-

* We should observe, that throughout this dispute, it was always assumed by the Latins, that the result, or rather that the meaning, of the reconciliation would be the *obedience* of the Greek to the Roman Church; a return to that (supposed) submission which the former had shaken off. Now this assumption was not (as far as we can see) contested by the Greeks, certainly it was not made matter of argument. And yet that establishment of *supremacy* was, in fact, the point at which the Roman was ultimately aiming—as it was also that to which his pretensions were most slightly founded.

† ‘De corpore Christi ita dicimus—quod oportebit vos firmiter credere et aliis prædicare quod Corpus Christi confici potest ita in Azymis sicut in fermentato; et omnes libri, quos vestri scripserunt contra Fidem, condemnentur et comburantur. De S. Sancto ita dicimus; quod oportebit vos credere S.S. procedere a Filio sicut a Patre, et istud necesse, ut prædicetur in populo; quod autem cantetis istud in Symbolo, nisi velitis, non compellet vos Dominus Papa; condemnatis et combustis omnibus libris, qui huic capitulo sunt contrarii. Quod audiens imperator graviter tulit, &c.’ The envoys wrote an account of their own embassy, addressed to the Pope, and contained in *Libro Censuum*; whence Raynaldus (ann. 1232) has made extracts.

‡ Fleury goes so far as to consider the schism, properly speaking, to have *commenced* only at this period. Such, however, was not the opinion of people in those days; in the account of the previous negotiations at Nice, we observe, that the emperor, on some

ferred upon their own clergy, so there continued long to exist about the Roman court titular patriarchs, and titular bishops, of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and other oriental sees, who, by the assumption of those empty names, offended the sensitive vanity of the Greeks, and kept alive the mutual irritation.

Howbeit, for a short period after the restoration, the reunion was negotiated with much more ardour than at any former time, and even with a momentary show of success. *Subsequent attempts at re-union.* The reason of this eagerness on the part of Palæologus was the consciousness of his weakness, and the terror of another crusade against his still unsettled government. 'I speak not now,' he said, 'about dogmas or ceremonies of religion. If there is any difference on that subject, we can arrange it more easily, after peace shall have been concluded between us.' The union desired by the emperor was external and political: a perfect theological concord he might think hopeless, or he might not comprehend its importance. Some Franciscans were once more sent to the East by Urban IV.; and some articles were hastily drawn up. But Clement IV. refused them his ratification, and composed a more accurate formulary of faith, which he proposed for the acceptance of the Greeks. This confession contained not only the disputed tenet of the Holy Procession, but also expressed, with great precision, the doctrine of purgatory, and specified the condition of souls after death, according to the degrees of their impurity. Also, the doctrine and name of transubstantiation were marked in it very particularly. Moreover, the plenitude of pontifical power, and the duty of universal appeal to that tribunal were carefully inculcated. Clement could scarcely have expected so much acquiescence from the *clergy* of the East; but in a subsequent letter to the emperor he failed not to remind him, that the crown possessed power sufficient, and even more than sufficient, to control the inclinations both of the clergy and the people.

In the earlier part of these negotiations, the clergy had preserved the appearance of neutrality; because they were unwilling, without great necessity, to oppose any project of the emperor, and because they considered his present project as wholly impracticable. Probably they did not suppose that he was himself sincere in so desperate a scheme. Nevertheless, as his political difficulties increased, he became more earnest in his design; and when some of his prelates were at length alarmed into resistance, he employed the secular authority to repress them.

In the mean time, the second council of Lyons had been called together, and one of its professed objects was the reconciliation of the churches. It was still assembled, *Council of Lyons*, when (on June 24, 1274) the ambassadors from the East arrived. Several difficulties were still apprehended; and there were many who reasonably trembled, lest that solemn meeting of the universal church should be distracted by the passionate broils of an endless controversy. But the emperor had arranged it otherwise; and at the session which immediately followed, the Western fathers were edified and astonished by the voice of the prelates of the East, chaunting the *Double Procession*, in unison with the worship of the orthodox. The policy, which had dictated the humiliating concession, did not hesitate

occasion, remarked, that the schism had *then* lasted three hundred years. On the other hand, the emperor did not date with accuracy—from the breach between Photius and Nicholas, the space was above 360 years; from the dispute between Cerularius and Leo IX., not more than 180.

there; probably there was no depth of spiritual submission to which the emperor was not then prepared to descend: for it seemed to depend on the decision of that council, whether the armament, to which all Europe was contributing, should be directed against Syria or against himself. Accordingly, the Pope's supremacy was acknowledged without any scruple; and a communication from Palæologus was publicly recited, in which he professed, without any equivocation or cavil, every tenet laid down in the confession of Clement IV. The reunion of the churches was then officially announced; and the Pope pronounced the *Te Deum*, with his head uncovered, and his eyes suffused with unsuspecting joy.

As long as the fears and necessities of the eastern empire continued, as long as the fragile vessel of state lay at the mercy of any tempest from the west, so long did this hollow truce subsist. But not quite ten years after its conclusion, Andronicus, having succeeded to the sceptre of his father, proceeded, without delay, to dissolve the union. A council was assembled at Constantinople; the hateful act of humiliation was repealed; and the revival of the schism was proclaimed amidst the acclamations of the clergy of Greece. One circumstance, indeed, is here particularly forced upon our attention. The motive which chiefly persuaded Andronicus to re-open that ancient wound was, that he might heal a still more dangerous disorder, which the reconciliation with Rome had inflicted upon his own Church. The power of Palæologus had secured the outward submission, but it had not changed the opinions, or the principles, or the passions, of his prelates; the great majority remained adverse to the re-union; and in their importunate and pressing clamours, the fears of an ancient and distant rival were forgotten. Howbeit the domestic dissensions of the Greeks were not even thus allayed; there were some too strongly impressed with the policy of their late connexion to applaud its hasty dissolution; and there remained ever afterwards a party in the East which professed its adherence to the Roman communion.

We shall not pursue the insincere and fruitless overtures which were so often defeated and renewed during the fourteenth century, and especially under the Popes of Avignon. The pontificates of John XXII., of Clement VI., of Innocent VI., and Benedict XII., were particularly marked by those vain negotiations*; and during this period we may remark that the motives of both parties were equally removed from any spiritual consideration. If political exigencies invariably actuated the one, the other was now chiefly moved by pecuniary necessities. The military succours, which the Pope might be the means of raising, would be recompensed by obedient contributions to the apostolical treasury. According to the approach or suspension of immediate danger, the zeal for reconciliation burnt fiercely, or subsided; but the characters were still sustained under all circumstances. 'That old song respecting the Greeks (said the fathers of Basle) has already lasted for three hundred years, and every year it is chanted afresh.' At length the progress of the Turks excited a permanent alarm, and a proportionate sincerity; and we shall now shortly trace the chief events to which it led.

* It was on the last occasion that the emperor sent that Barlaam, whom we have already mentioned, (the same who instructed Petrarch in the rudiments of Greek,) to the court of Avignon. Sufficient accounts of these various negotiations are given by Bzovius, ad ann. 1331, s. i. 1339, s. 22, 1345-6-9, and particularly 1356, s. 22. On one occasion (in 1339) great efforts were made to show that the Greek opinions had always been the *same* with the Latin (after so many mutual excommunications!) and this, as we all know, furnished Leo Allatius in a later age with a fruitful field for sophistry. The detestation, which the Greeks still entertained for the Pope, is strongly expressed by the Patriarch Gennadius in a document which is cited by Bzovius, ann. 1349, s. 14.

After separate negotiations with Pope Eugenius and the Council of Basle, the Emperor of the East at length decided to accept the proposals of the former. An oriental despot might well be perplexed by the claims of two rival authorities, both professing to be legitimate and supreme, and both acknowledged by many adherents in their own communion. But whether his imperial prejudices inclined him towards the *Monarch* of the church, or from whatsoever other motive, he embarked (in November, 1427) with his patriarch, and numerous ecclesiastics, on the galleys of Eugenius, and arrived in due season at the appointed city, Ferrara. A trifling difference first arose respecting the seats to be respectively occupied during the conference by its spiritual and temporal presidents. But this was arranged by a compromise, by which the Pope conceded a part of his claim, but retained his pre-eminence. They were placed on different sides of the Church, but the Pope was on the right, and his throne was one step higher than that of the Emperor. The next proceeding, and it might occasion some surprise, if not distrust, among strangers, unused to the discords of the west, was the promulgation of a solemn anathema against the Council of Basle. All public deliberations were then adjourned for some months; but it was arranged that, during this interval, a select number of doctors of the two churches should frequently meet, and prepare the way by amicable discussions for a more speedy reconciliation.

Accordingly these deputies, who were, indeed, the leading members of both parties, did meet. On the one side was the celebrated Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo, and so lately the President of the rival Council; and with him were Andreas, Bishop of Colossus (or Rhodes), John a Doctor of Spain, and some others. Marc of Ephesus, and Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, conducted the disputations, on the other. It was here agreed, seemingly without difference, that the articles by which the schism was entirely occasioned were four. (1) The Procession of the Holy Spirit. (2) The use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. (3) Purgatory. (4) The Primacy of the Pope. It was further settled, that the subject of the first discussion should be Purgatory.

Accordingly, Cardinal Julian laid down the doctrine of his Church on that matter as follows:—that the souls of the just, which are pure and without stain, and have been exempt from mortal sin, proceed directly to heaven, to the enjoyment of eternal happiness; but that the souls of men who have fallen into sin after their baptism, unless they have fully accomplished the penance necessary to expiate that sin, (even though they may have performed some penance,) and also manifested fruits worthy of their penitence, so as to receive entire remission, pass into the fire of purgatory; that some remain there for a longer, others for a shorter period, according to the nature of their offences; and that, being at length purified, they are admitted to beatitude. But that the souls of those who die in mortal sin are consigned to immediate punishment. . . . To this, Marc of Ephesus replied, that the doctrine, in the main, was that of the Greek Church; only that the latter did not admit the purification by fire, but held that sinful souls were sent into a place of darkness and mourning, where they remained for a season in affliction, deprived of the light of God. He admitted that they were purified, and delivered from this desolate abode by sacrifice and alms; but he held that the condemned would not be wholly miserable; and that the saints would not be admitted to perfect beatitude until after the resurrection of their bodies. . . . On this last point an unexpected difference arose between Marc of Ephesus and his col-

league, Bessarion, as to what really was the doctrine of their Church; and this was pressed to dispute and altercation. In the mean time, the season advanced, and these preliminary conferences were discontinued before the disputants had touched on any other subject, or arrived at any specific conclusion even upon that.

At length the formal deliberations of the Council commenced, and the first public session was held on the 8th of October; but there were some among the Greeks who, observing that the Fathers of Basle had shown, in the mean time, no indications of submission, began already to despair of any durable effect from their mission. However, the Prelates assembled in considerable numbers; the same were recognised by both parties, as the important subjects of difference, and it was agreed that the *first* of them was that, in which the whole difficulty of reunion was, in fact, involved. They prepared, in consequence, to argue the mystery of the Procession with becoming solemnity: and it was vainly hoped, that a question which had employed the learning and wearied the ingenuity of the Christian world for about eight hundred years, would finally be set at rest by the eloquence of the Doctors of Ferrara.

It must be admitted that the advocates of both opinions displayed on this occasion abundant talents, unwearied zeal, and resources almost inexhaustible, especially the Cardinal of St. Angelo*; who here exhibited, in defence of the doctrine of his Church, the same commanding faculties and energy with which he had urged, at Basle, the reformation of its discipline. Through fifteen tedious sessions the controversy was maintained with unabated ardour; and though the point principally argued was only, whether the words *Filioque* were, properly speaking, an addition or an explanation, it might have been supposed, from the warmth and prolixity of the orators, that the very existence of the Christian faith was at stake. At length, as no immediate result seemed at all probable, and as Ferrara was found, on many accounts, inconvenient for so large† an assemblage, the Pope, with the consent of the Emperor, adjourned the Council to Florence.

The Council of Florence held its first session on Feb. 26, 1439; and it opened with some proposals on the part of the Emperor and Cardinal Julian, for arriving more directly at the practical object of these conferences—a public reconciliation. But no expedient was discovered for attaining that end, and the disputations were accordingly renewed. The results of the conferences at Ferrara had not been such, as either to bring the Latins to retrench the contested expression from the creed, or the Greeks to insert it: thus the Procession became once more the subject of debate. For the seven succeeding sessions the same assertions were advanced and denied, the same arguments reiterated and confuted. At length, however, the Latins found a new and powerful champion in John, provincial of the Dominicans. This learned mendicant, by reference to ancient manuscripts of St. Basil, and other Greek Fathers, professed to demonstrate, that those venerable Patriarchs had asserted the double Procession. This was an assault upon that point, on which alone the Greeks were very sensible.

* Tiraboschi (vol. vi. p. I, l. ii.) cites the testimony of Sguropulos, who was present at all these discussions, and expressed his astonishment at the eloquence of Julian.

† About one hundred and fifty Bishops, besides numerous Abbots, are said to have been present. We should here mention that the Greeks lived at the expense of the Pope, receiving a regular stipulated allowance from the Apostolical Treasury. Notwithstanding, so great was their despondency as to the result of the embassy, that they betrayed from time to time a strong desire to return to Greece.

Every shaft of reason might be foiled or blunted by sophistry or prejudice; every other authority might be suspected or disavowed; but when the archives of their own unerring Church were cited against them, it was hard indeed to raise any defence, or reply with any confidence. It would appear, too, that Bessarion had for some time taken little share in the disputes, and at length even Marc of Ephesus withdrew from the conference. The victory now appeared to rest with the Latins; when the Emperor, who possessed some skill in theology, and was sincerely desirous of the reunion, discovered what he considered an equitable method of compromise. In a letter of St. Maximus, that Father was found to have asserted, that ‘the Latins, when they declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, do not pretend that the Son is the cause of the Holy Spirit, since they know very well that the Father is the only cause both of the Son and the Holy Spirit—of the Son by generation, of the Holy Spirit by Procession—they only mean, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *through* the Son, because he is of the same essence.’ Soon after this proposal had been made, the public sessions of the Council were suspended, and the Greeks held several conferences among themselves, with a view to some honourable accommodation.

The Greeks were now openly divided. Bessarion, gained, as his adversaries assert, by the presents and promises of the Pontiff, at once avowed his adhesion to the Latin dogma, and defended it with confidence and eloquence. Of this same party was the Emperor, through his anxiety to reconcile the Churches on any terms, and at any sacrifice. Marc of Ephesus obstinately maintained his original opinions; he abhorred the *heresy* of the Latins, and rejected every overture of compromise. Nevertheless the conferences continued: several attempts were made to devise some explanation of the Oriental doctrine which might be satisfactory to the Latins; and the party of the Unionists gained ground. The Emperor saw his advantage, and pursued it by such means of persuasion as an Emperor may always exercise. And at length, after more than two months of discussion, the Greeks unanimously consented to the terms of reconciliation, with the single honest exception of Marc of Ephesus.

The confession of faith, on which this treaty of concord was founded, was as follows:—‘In the name of the Holy Trinity, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, we, Latins and Greeks, agree in the holy union of these two Churches, and confess that all true Christians ought to receive this genuine doctrine: that the Holy Spirit is eternally of the Father and the Son, and that from all eternity it proceeds from the one and the other as from a single principle, and by a single production, which we call *Spiration*. We also declare that what some of the Holy Fathers have said, viz. that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, should be taken in such manner as to signify, that the Son, as well as the Father, and conjointly with him, is the principle of the Holy Spirit. And since, whatsoever the Father hath, that he communicates to his Son, excepting the paternity which distinguishes him from the Son and the Holy Spirit, so is it from the Father that the Son has received, from all eternity, that productive virtue through which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as well as from the Father.’

We should here mention, that while this spiritual negotiation was in progress, another convention of a very different character was also under consideration; and the two treaties were brought to their conclusion at the same

Common Confession of Faith.

Treaties of Union.

time. It was stipulated by the latter, that his Holiness should furnish the Greeks with resources for their return; that he should maintain a standing military and naval force for the defence of Constantinople; that the galleys carrying pilgrims to Jerusalem should be compelled to touch at Constantinople; that, if the Emperor should require twenty galleys for six months, or for a year, the Pope should bind himself to supply them; and that, if soldiers were wanted, he should use his influence with the princes of the west to procure them. This convention having been officially ratified, the emperor announced the consent of his Prelates to the doctrinal accommodation; and on the 6th of June, 1439, it was announced, that the divisions of so many centuries were at length closed for ever. The Confession of Union was recited in Greek and in Latin, and it was hailed by the acclamations of both parties, who embraced with seeming warmth, and interchanged the salutation of peace.

It will have been observed, that the public disputations had been entirely confined to one of the four subjects of difference; and that the arrangement of that, as it was considered by far the most difficult question, was held to be a sufficient pledge of agreement upon all. And so indeed it proved. The difference on the Azymys was removed by the confession of the Greeks, that the Eucharist might be celebrated with unleavened, as worthily as with leavened, bread. Respecting Purgatory, it was acknowledged on both sides, that those souls which could neither, through some unatoned sins, be received into immediate beatitude, nor yet deserved eternal condemnation, were delivered into some abode of temporary duration and purification; but regarding the method of purification—whether it was by fire, as some thought, or by darkness and tempest, as seemed to be the opinion of others—it was held more prudent to abstain from any positive declaration. The question of the Pope's primacy occasioned somewhat greater embarrassment, because its practical consequence was more directly perceptible; and though the Imperial eye might overlook the importance of doctrinal differences, it was not blind to any encroachment on Imperial prerogative. And thus, though Palæologus readily assented to the *general* proposition of papal supremacy, he objected to its application in two cases. He would not consent that the Pope should call councils in his dominions without his approbation and that of the Patriarchs; nor would he permit appeals from the Patriarchal courts to be carried to Rome. He maintained that the Pope should send his legates to decide them on the spot. The Pontiff insisted; but as the Emperor declared that he would prefer to break off the negotiations even in that their latest stage, rather than yield those points, a method of verbal compromise was discovered, which satisfied the consciences of both parties.

To the attentive reader it will, perhaps, appear strange, that in so many controversies between the two Churches no dispute had yet been raised on the subject of Transubstantiation. *Question on Transubstantiation.* And it will thence seem natural to infer, that, on that point, no difference existed between them. In a later age, when the Protestants were contending with the Roman Catholics for the spiritual adhesion of the Greeks, this important question was thoroughly investigated; and the result, as it appears to us*, was not quite favourable to either party. For, if some of the ancient Fathers indulged in very lofty expressions on the nature of the Eucharist, yet the Latin dogma was

* This subject has been shortly treated by the author of this history, in a work 'On the Condition and Prospects of the Greek Church.'

never formally established among the Articles of the other Church. We shall now mention, that during the conferences at Ferrara and Florence certain expressions fell from the Greek Doctors, which excited suspicions of their orthodoxy so generally, that the Pope deemed it necessary to demand of them a formal declaration on that point, before the 'Decree of Union' should be finally ratified. Accordingly, Bessarion of Nice, on the part and in the presence of his brethren, made an affirmation to this effect:—' Since in the preceding congregations we have been suspected of holding an erroneous opinion touching the words of the Consecration, we declare, in the presence of your Holiness, . . . that we have learnt from our ancient Fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom, that it is the words of our Lord which change the substance of the bread and wine into that of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and that those divine words have the force and virtue to make that wonderful change of substance, or that Transubstantiation; and that we follow the sentiments of that great Teacher.' These expressions are, in themselves, sufficiently explicit: but, on the other hand, we are bound to recollect, that the Greeks at Florence had by this time abandoned in despair every manner of resistance to the Emperor and the Pope; and also, that the Prelate who read the declaration, and whose motives are liable to very well-founded suspicion, was afterwards exalted to the dignity of a Cardinal in the Roman Church*.

After this last confession of Bessarion, the 'Decree of Union' was signed and ratified; and the Greeks, their object accomplished, set forth, with various emo-

*Return of the
Greeks.*

* Bessarion, an Asiatic Archbishop, ended his days in the peaceful enjoyment of a Roman dignity. His great antagonist, Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo, under a less auspicious influence, exchanged the field of controversial achievement for that of military dishonour. Let us here trace his concluding fortunes. Being appointed by the Pope to superintend, as his legate, the warlike operations against the Turks, he attached himself to the camp of Huniades. Under his sanction, and with his consent, (it was a reluctant consent,) a truce for ten years was signed, with religious solemnities, between the contending parties; and Amurat reposed in confidence on the shores of the Bosphorus, or employed his forces in some other enterprise. Suddenly some new circumstance came to light, which promised advantage to the Christians from the renewal of hostilities. Hereupon the Cardinal Legate, perceiving some hesitation among the generals, seized a favourable moment to counsel the violation of the truce. To this effect, he urged the impolicy of the secret engagement, the *infidelity* of the party with whom it was contracted. He pressed the injustice thereby offered both to the Pope and the Emperor; the prejudice done to their own reputation, and to the interests of the Church. He maintained that the very compact with the Turk was in itself an act of perfidy to their allies. These and similar arguments he advanced with his customary power. But seeing that his unlettered hearers were not yet persuaded, that a treaty so solemnly ratified could at once be violated without reproach, he proceeded more curiously to distinguish between the obligation due to a mere promise and that which is demanded by the public welfare, and to show the higher authority of the latter. Whenever these, forsooth, were at variance, the faith plighted to an infidel could have little solid weight. For though, in truth, an oath is binding, when it is just and founded in equity, it is properly considered as null, and displeasing to God, when it leads to private or public calamity, &c. &c.!

The eloquence of the Cardinal so well enforced his fallacies upon minds which probably were only thirsting for conviction, that the whole assembly demanded with acclamations the violation of the truce. The army moved forwards, and immediately engaged in that campaign, which was terminated by the battle of Varna. In that fatal encounter, among thousands of less illustrious victims, fell the Cardinal of St. Angelo. The nature of his death is uncertain. It is variously asserted that he was slain in the field, and in the rout; that he was drowned in the Danube; that he was plundered and murdered by Hungarian robbers. And it had been happier for his memory had the last struggle of his genius been wrapt in the same obscurity—could we forget that it was made for the purpose of corrupting the rude morality of Christian soldiers and statesmen, and leading them into that perjured enterprise, which ended in his destruction and their disaster, and the infamy of all.

tions perhaps, but with general satisfaction, on their return to the east. The voyage was favourable; and on the 20th of February, 1440, they were restored to the altars of Constantinople. With what feelings were these messengers of religious concord welcomed? What salutations hailed them on their arrival from that holy enterprise? The joy, the gratitude, the affection of their fellow-*Catholics*? Let us turn to the circumstances of their reception: through a general confederacy of the Clergy, of the people, and particularly of the Monks, who chiefly swayed the conscience and directed the movements of the people, the authors of the Union found themselves excluded even from their ecclesiastical functions. They were overwhelmed with insults. They were called azymites, apostates, traitors to the true religion; the sanctuaries which they entered were deserted; they were shunned, as if convicted of impiety, or blasted by excommunication; and in many of the Churches the spirit went so far, that the very name of the Emperor himself was erased from the Dyptics. On the other hand, Marc of Ephesus, who had fought without concession or compromise the battles of his Church, and persisted inflexibly in his repugnance to the reunion, was rewarded by universal acclamation. Marc of Ephesus had alone stood forth as the defender of the faith, and of the honour of the Œcumenic Church.

The controversy was immediately renewed in the East. Marc placed himself at the head of the schismatics, and many compositions were published, as well by himself as by others, to press the repeal of the Union. Various polemical treatises were also put forth in rejoinder; and at the same time the Emperor exerted, on the same side, a more equivocal method of persuasion. He selected for the Patriarch of Constantinople a decided supporter of the Union, and caused the patronage of the See to be conferred exclusively upon ecclesiastics of that party. . . . Within the limits of his temporal sovereignty the Head of the Oriental Church received a reluctant obedience. But beyond those boundaries, in the Patriarchats of Jerusalem, of Antioch, and Alexandria, his spiritual subjects—for they were no more than spiritual—broke forth into undisguised rebellion. In 1443 those three Prelates united in publishing a Synodal Epistle, in which they pronounced the sentence of deposition against all those, on whom their Brother of Constantinople had conferred ordination; and then added the threat of excommunication, in case this sentence should be neglected. At the same time they addressed to the Emperor himself a similar menace, should he still continue to protect his Patriarch.

A Synod, which combined the authority of three of their Patriarchs, was reverentially regarded by a people already predisposed to embrace its edicts. Even the resolution of Palæologus appears to have been shaken by so bold an act of insubordination. At the same time, as if to increase his confusion, the Clergy and populace of the Northern Provinces of his Church, Russia and Muscovy, loudly declared themselves against the Union, and insulted and imprisoned a Papal Legate who was sent to publish it among them. Thus, after his sojourn under foreign dominion, after his personal exertions in allaying the heats of controversy, and conducting it, as he fondly fancied, to a lasting termination, the Emperor of the East discovered that his ecclesiastical influence was confined almost to the city and suburbs of Constantinople; and that the treaty from which he expected such advantage was received even there with a reluctant and precarious, even though it was an interested, submission.

It might have been supposed that some sense of political advantage

would have moved the feelings of his subjects; that the prospect of a powerful alliance would have exerted some influence; that the sight of the advancing Turk would have inspired some moderation; or, if reason was, indeed, excluded from the controversy, that the passion of fear would, in some degree, have counteracted the passion of bigotry. Some mitigation of the first phrenzy might at least have been expected from time; and in the interval of eleven years, more charitable feelings, and more provident considerations might gradually have gained prevalence under the Imperial patronage. But the event was far otherwise: if the heat of either party relaxed during this critical period, it was that of the friends of the Union; its opponents increased in strength, and remitted nothing of their original rancour.

In the year 1451 Nicholas V., after engaging in some earnest endeavours to rouse the energies of Christendom against the common foe, issued a celebrated address to the Greeks. He exhorted them to pay some regard to their own safety, and not to paralyse the efforts which Providence was making to preserve them; to display their devotion in acts of penitence; and to receive, without delay, the decree of the Council of Florence. To the Emperor Constantine he addressed a menace, dictated, as some have thought, by a prophetic spirit. After complaining, that the Greeks had now too long trifled with the patience of God and man, in deferring their reconciliation with the Church, he announced that, according to the parable in the Gospel, three years of probation would still be granted for the fig-tree, hitherto cultivated in vain, to bring forth fruit. But, if it did not bear fruit in that season—if the Greeks, during the space which God still indulged to them, did not receive the decree of the Union—that then, indeed, the tree would be cut down even to its root—the nation extirpated by the ministers of divine justice.

Prediction of Nicholas V., and fall of the Greek Empire.

This denunciation contemplated no improbable catastrophe; and the Emperor took such measures as were left to him to conciliate the dispositions of the Vatican. But what was the spirit which at this last crisis animated his subjects? It was during this very year that several Greek ecclesiastics addressed, in the name of the whole Church, a communication to the rebels of Bohemia. They praised the zeal of their brother-schismatics; they applauded them for their rejection of the innovations of Rome, and their adherence to the true faith; and, finally, called on them to conclude a treaty of Union with themselves—not such union as that mockery of concord dressed up at Florence, from which truth was far removed, but Union, founded on the respectable opinions of the ancient Fathers! . . . And thus, those precious moments, which the Pope devoted to vows and exertions for the salvation of Greece, were employed by her zealous theologians in courting the bitterest enemies of his government.

In the year following, the Emperor having received with honour the Papal Legate, and made him some fair promises, they proceeded to celebrate the Liturgy in St. Sophia. But as soon as mention was made, in the course of the service, of the names of the Pope and the Latin Patriarch*, the whole city rose in commotion, and the multitude, uncertain what course to take, rushed in a mass to consult a popular fanatic, named Gennadius. This man was a monk; and attached to the door of his cell

* Gregory—then a voluntary exile at Rome, through his reluctance to preside over a rebellious Church.

they found a written rescript, denouncing the last inflictions against all who should receive the impious decree of Florence. Then it was that Priests and Abbots, Monks and Nuns, soldiers and citizens, the entire population, except the immediate dependents of the Emperor, shouted, as with a single voice—‘Anathema against all who are united with the Latins!’ The sanctuary of St. Sophia was proclaimed profane; all intercourse was suspended with all who had assisted at the service with the Latins; absolution was refused, and the Churches were closed against them.

This was the madness of a falling empire—this was the heaven-inflicted delirium which prepared the path for destruction. The measure of fanaticism was at length filled up; the pontifical prophecy* hastened to its accomplishment. And while the frantic people of Greece were in the highest ferment of theological excitement,—while their religious hatred against their brother Christians was burning most intensely,—while partial differences were most exaggerated,—while sectarian intolerance was most fierce and uncompromising, the banners of the Infidel were in motion towards the devoted city, and a nation of Christians was consigned in bondage to the common enemy of Christ.

Notes on Chapter XXVI.

NOTE (1) ON THE ARMENIANS.

THE first occasion on which we can observe the Armenians to have come into contact, as an independent communion, with the Church of Rome, was the following:—In the year 1145, while Pope Eugenius was resident at Viterbo, certain deputies from their patriarch (also called their *Catholic*), arrived to salute the Pontiff, and proffer every sort of respect and deference. The particular object of their mission appears, however, to have been this,—to appeal to the decision of the Pope respecting their differences with the Greek Church. The differences principally debated were two;—the Armenians did not mix water with the wine in the eucharist; they made use of leavened bread, excepting on the festivals of Christmas and the Epiphany. . . . We do not learn that there were any lasting results from this embassy; but it is carefully recorded,† that the Orientals assisted at the Latin Mass celebrated by the Pope in person; and that one of them beheld on that solemnity a sunbeam resting on the head of the Pontiff, as well as two doves ascending and descending above him, in an inexplicable manner—a marvel which greatly moved him to reverence and submission.

Notwithstanding, the circumstances under which the Armenians next present themselves to the historian, prove the futility of the former overtures to Rome. For we find that, in the year 1170, the *Catholic* Norsesis addressed a letter to Manuel Comnenus, in which he mentioned some points, whereon himself and the Greeks were not agreed, and expressed a strong desire for reconciliation. The Emperor entrusted the com-

* Constantinople was certainly taken in the third year (inclusive) after the prediction of Nicholas. The Pope wrote some time in 1451; the city fell on May 29, 1453. The coincidence, even with this latitude, was fortunate; but after the battle of Varna, no light from heaven was necessary to foreshow the speedy downfall of the Greek empire.

† By Otho Frisingensis, who was at that time at Viterbo.

mission to a philosopher named Theorian, who proceeded to Armenia, and conferred with the patriarch and another influential prelate. On this occasion much more important differences were advanced than those discovered at Viterbo; and that, which was most prominent, respected the nature of Christ. From the account of this controversy it would appear, that, in the outset, the Greeks supposed the Armenians to be involved in the Eutychian heresy; while the Armenians imagined the Greeks to have embraced the opposite error of Nestorius. In the course of the conference both were undeceived. The Armenians did indeed admit, that they held *one incarnate nature*; but not by confusion, like Eutyches, nor by diminution, like Apollinaris: but in the 'orthodox' sense of Cyril of Alexandria*. The Greeks cleared their own tenets from the charge of Nestorianism with equal perspicuity. The result was, that the Catholic acknowledged their orthodoxy, and undertook to bring over all his compatriots to the same opinion. Some other differences of inferior weight were also discussed; and these, too, the Armenian is related to have softened away with equal facility. At length, after an affecting interview, in which many tears were poured forth in pious sympathy by both parties, Theorian returned to Constantinople, and Narsesis prepared to communicate his own convictions to the Church over which he presided.

With what little success these negotiations were attended appears from the next glimpse that we catch of the ecclesiastical affairs of the Armenians. On the 23rd of May, 1199, Leo, their king, addressed an epistle to Innocent III., expressing his anxiety for the re-union of his Church with that of Rome. At the same time he disclosed the motive of his anxiety; for he deplored the ravages, to which his kingdom was exposed by the inroads of the infidels, and proclaimed the absolute need in which he stood of foreign succour. This application was accompanied by one from the Catholic, in which he professed his wish for reconciliation, and his readiness to make submission to the Vatican. The Pope sent, in reply, many civil expressions; and intended, no doubt, to confer a more substantial service on his militant fellow Christians, when he presented them at the same time with the standard of St. Peter, as a safeguard against the sword of the unbeliever. Some negotiations succeeded: at length (in the year 1205), the king prevailed upon his subjects to acknowledge their spiritual allegiance to the Pope; and the Catholic publicly placed the act of his submission in the hands of the legate. He accepted the *pallium* † from the same authority, and engaged to visit the holy See, by his Nuncios, once in every five years, and to assist in person, or by deputy, at all councils which might be held in the west for the regulation of his interests. Greater objections appear to have prevailed among those orientals against the introduction of the Roman code of canon law; but it was arranged that some part of its institutions should be received at once, and the rest

* See 'Theoriani Orthodoxi cum Catholico Armeniorum Colloquium,' in the Maxima Biblioth. P.P. tom. xxii. p. 796—812, (Edit. Lugdun. 1677). 'Dicimus in Christo naturam unam esse, non secundum Eutychen confundentes, nec secundum Apollinarem detrahentes, sed secundum Alexandrinum Antistitem Cyrillum, in Orthodoxia, quæ in libro contra Nestorium scripsit, unam esse naturam *Sermonis* incarnatam'. . . . The controversy turned a good deal on the distinction (real or imaginary) between *Christus* and *Sermo*, in this question.

† See the Letter from Leo to Innocent, published by Raynaldus, ann. 1205, in which he boasts, that, with great labour, and through divine grace, he had at length brought about that obedience of the Armenians to the Roman Church, which his ancestors had so long attempted in vain.

at some future time, after more mature deliberation among the Armenian prelates. Such was the general nature of the reconciliation then effected; but some dissensions presently arose between the king and one of the pontifical legates; and there seems no reason to believe that the above negotiation had any lasting consequences.*

As the amicable overtures from Armenia to Rome were entirely occasioned by the political necessities of the former, they were more frequent during the desolation of the East in the fourteenth century. The interested obedience of that communion was tendered to John XXII., and accepted by him. A few years afterwards (in 1341) we observe another king, named Leo, soliciting temporal assistance from Benedict XII. The Pope made answer in two letters, respectively addressed to the king and to the Catholic. In the former, he made mention of the errors entertained by the Armenians, and of the exertions which he had made, both by personal inquiry from those professing them, and by the examination of the authorized books, to ascertain their nature and extent. In the latter, he exhorted the clergy to assemble in council, to condemn and extirpate the false opinions which they held, and then, for their better instruction in the faith and observances of the Roman Church, to receive the Decree, the Decretals and other Canons used in the West. He expressed a pious persuasion, that when the errors of the Armenians should once be removed, the enemies of the faith would no longer prevail against them; and concluded his address by the proposal of a conference.

The first of these epistles was accompanied by a memorial, in which the errors in question were enumerated. They were expanded into a tedious catalogue of one hundred and seventeen; but they may, without much inaccuracy, be reduced under the following heads:—1. The Armenians were accused of adhesion to the opinions of Eutyches, involving, of course, the Monophysite heresy, the rejection of the council of Chalcedon, the condemnation of St. Leo, and the secession from *both* the Œcumenic Churches. 2. They were charged with administering the sacraments of confirmation and the eucharist, together with that of baptism—a practice which (as Fleury observes) had very early prevalence in the Church. 3. They mixed no water with the wine in the holy communion—which again was an ancient usage. 4. They rejected Transubstantiation, and maintained that it was the figure only, not the real body, that was received by the Communicants—an opinion which was then naturally considered as a consequence of the Eutychian error respecting the nature of Christ—for if any doubts were thrown on the reality of Christ's body on earth, the same would extend in an equal (if not in a greater) degree, to the reality of his flesh in the sacrament of his supper. The other imputations concerned some fabulous notions respecting the resurrection, the last judgment, the place of punishment, the earthly and heavenly paradise, the intermediate state, and other questions of difficult determination.

In consequence of the pontifical remonstrances, the Patriarch assembled his council, and condemned all the imputed errors; he then sent deputies

* From the fragment of a Greek writer, named Nico, (probably of the thirteenth century,) translated and published in the Max. Bibliotheca P.P. (tom. xxv. p. 328), and entitled 'De Pessimorum Armeniorum pessima Religione,' it appears that they still retained all the errors imputed to them by *either* Church. Among a multitude here enumerated it is one, that 'they do not adore the venerable images, but, on the contrary, that their Catholic anathematizes those who do so. Neither do they worship the Cross, until they have driven a nail into it, and baptized it,' &c.

to the succeeding Pope (Clement VI.), charged with a general obligation, to retract any other obnoxious opinions which might thereafter be discovered; and at the same time to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as the chief of the Church of Christ, and to solicit copies of the decretals, for the more faithful administration of his own subordinate communion. The Pope engaged to send them, and in November, 1346, despatched two legates on a mission to the East.

Five years afterwards, the Pontiff, still dissatisfied with the communications (perhaps equivocal) which he received from his new subjects, and desiring a more express declaration of their opinions on those points which most interested himself, addressed the Catholic of Lesser Armenia in terms not substantially different from the following:—‘ Since we are unable clearly to collect your opinions from your answers, we desire distinctly to propose the following questions:—Do you believe that all who at their baptism have received the Catholic faith, and have afterwards separated from the communion, are Schismatics and heretics, if they persist in such separation? and that no one can be saved, who has renounced obedience to the Pope? Do you believe that St. Peter received from Jesus Christ full power of jurisdiction over all the faithful? that all the power which the apostles may have possessed in certain provinces was subject to his? and that all the successors of St. Peter have the same power with himself? Do you believe that, in virtue of that power, the Pope can judge all the faithful immediately, and delegate to that effect such ecclesiastical judges as he may think proper? Do you believe that the Pope can be judged by no one, except God himself; and that there is no appeal from his decisions to any judge? Do you believe that he can translate bishops, and abbots, and other ecclesiastics from one dignity to another, or degrade and depose them, if they deserve such punishment? Do you believe that the Pope is not subject to any secular power, even regal or imperial, in respect to institution, correction, or destitution; that he alone can make general canons, and grant plenary indulgences, and decide disputes on matters of faith? These interrogations were accompanied by the notice of some Armenian errors on the intermediate state, on the sacraments, and especially the Eucharist; and by some complaints, that promises, hitherto made with facility, had not been sufficiently observed. But they chiefly merit the historian’s attention, as they prove the uncompromising severity with which Rome, even during the exile of her Pontiffs, exacted all her usurped ecclesiastical rights, and imposed the whole weight and pressure of her yoke even on the most distant and most reluctant of her subjects. Howbeit, after that period, we do not observe any proof of the continuance or renewal of friendly negotiation between Rome and Armenia, sufficiently important to deserve a place in this history.

NOTE (2) ON THE MARONITES.

MARO, or Maroun, from whom this sect derives its appellation, lived during the latter part of the sixth century on the banks of the Orontes; and in the disputes then prevailing between the eastern and western Churches, he exerted his influence, which was considerable in that part of Syria, in favour of the latter. About a century later, a certain John, surnamed the Maronite, was distinguished by his opposition to the Melchites Greeks; and it seems to have been under his guidance, that the Syrian

‘rebels’* settled apart in the secure recesses of Libanus and Antilibanus. There they formed a powerful association, formidable alike to the orthodox Greeks and to the Mahometan invader. . . . The first crusades brought them once more into immediate contact with the Latins; but not always as allies, nor by any means as members of the same ecclesiastical communion. For it appears certain, that the Maronites had imbibed, in the first instance, the opinions of the Monothelites, and that they long maintained them, together with some other peculiarities in rites and discipline. At length, however, about the year 1182, they were induced to abandon their leading error, and were then received into the bosom of the Roman Church.

At the same time it was stipulated, that the Pope should in no respect interfere with any of their ancient practices or ceremonies; consequently they continued to observe the discipline of the Greek Church, regarding the marriage of the clergy, and to administer the eucharist in both kinds, and according to the manner generally in use in the East. They retained, too, in other matters, a much closer resemblance to their original, than to their adopted, communion. Nevertheless, they have faithfully preserved the name of obedience to Rome from that time to the present; and if the contributions, which they have continually received from the apostolical treasury, should occasion any suspicion respecting the motives of their fidelity, it is worthy, at least, of observation, that the pecuniary current has invariably set in that direction, and that the more ordinary principles of the Vatican have never extended to the oppression of its Maronite subjects.

CHAPTER XXVII.

From the Council of Basle to the beginning of the Reformation.

The real weight of General Councils as a part of the Constitution of the Church—Circumstances preceding the accession of *Nicholas V.*—His popular qualities—Love of all the Arts—His public virtues—Recorded particulars of his Election—Concord with Germany—Celebration and abuse of the Jubilee—Death of the Cardinal of Arles—His recorded miracles and canonization—Efforts to unite the Christian States against the Turks—Dissatisfaction and Death of *Nicholas—Callixtus III.* Crusading enthusiasm of *Æneas Sylvius*—Jealousy between the Pope and *Alphonso of Arragon*—Nepotism of the former—*Æneas Sylvius* justifies the Pope against the complaints of the Germans—His history—The circumstances of his elevation to the Pontificate—The Council of Mantua, for the purpose of uniting Europe against the Turks—The project of *Pius II.*—Failure of the whole Scheme—Embassy to Rome from the Princes of the East—*Thomas Palæologus* arrives at Rome—Canonization of *Catharine of Sienna*—The Bull of *Pius II.* against all appeals from the Holy See to General Councils—The Pope retracts the errors into which he fell, as *Æneas Sylvius*—Probable motive of his apostasy—His speech in Consistory—Departure against the Infidels—Arrival at Ancona, and Death—His Character—Compared to *Nicholas V.*, and *Cardinal Julian*—Conditions imposed by the Conclave on the future Pope—Remarks—*Paul II.* is elected, and immediately violates them—A native of Venice—Principles of his Government—He diverts the War from the Turks against the Hussites, and persecutes a literary Society at Rome—*Sixtus IV.* makes a faint attempt to rouse Christendom against the Turks—Violent broil between the Pope and the Florentines—Otranto taken by the Turks—Excessive Nepotism of this Pope—Institution of the Minimes—Increased venality of the Court of Rome—The moral character, talents, learning of *Sixtus*—Elevation of *Innocent VIII.*—Violation of the oath taken in Conclave—Preferment conferred on his illegitimate Children—His weakness and his avarice—The great wealth, election, and reputation of *Alexander VI.*—Distribution of his Benefices, &c. among the Cardinals who voted for him

* They were then called Mardaites—which means Rebels. The reader is familiar with the picture of the Maronites drawn in *Volney's* admirable ‘Travels in Syria.’

—Great Festivities at Rome—Moral profligacy and indecency of the Pope—His projected alliance with the Sultan Bajazet—He confers the possession of the New World on the Kings of Spain—The Act contested by the Portuguese—On what ground—His negotiations with Charles VIII. of France—History and fate of Zizim, brother of Bajazet—Cæsar Borgla, Duke of Valentino, or Valentinois—His co-operation with his father—The object of their common ambition—Probable circumstances of the death of Alexander VI.—Expressions of Guicciardini—*Pius III.* dies immediately after his election—Julian della Rovéra, or *Julius II.* unanimously elected—His policy and character—His dispute with Louis XII.—Ecclesiastical scruples of the latter—Julius resumes the possession of the States of the Church, and extends them—His extraordinary military and political talents—Encouragement of the Arts—Lays the foundations of St. Peter's—A Council convoked by the Cardinals against the Pope—Its entire failure—Julius convokes the fifth Lateran Council—Subjects discussed by it till his death—Continuation of the Council under *Leo X.*—A number of constitutions enacted by it—Its edict to restrain the Press—Its abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, through the co-operation of Francis I.—Dissolution of the Council—Observations—On the gradual degeneracy of the See—Of the Government of the successive Popes—their Nepotism—On the morality of the Conclave—Obligations undertaken there on Oath—Reasons of their perpetual violation—Ignorance of Cisalpines respecting the real character of the Court of Rome—Respectability ascribed to it through the merits of its literary Pontiffs—The great use made by the Popes at this period of the dangers of a Turkish invasion, in order to suppress the question of Church Reform.

THE council of Bâsle, after its protracted and resolute struggle with the Vatican, having at length dissolved itself, and Felix V., its creature, having resigned his ill-supported pretensions to the Chair of St. Peter, the prospects of the Court of Rome once more brightened, and its authority was again secure from any immediate invasion. As a restraint on papal despotism, a General Council was effectual, so long as the council was assembled; and even its name and the menace of an appeal to it, as a last resource, have operated, on more occasions than one, with salutary influence on the fears of an arbitrary Pope. But the power of the Monarchy was continuous; its principles were never suspended; its action was uniformly directed to the same object—whereas the controlling body, the Senate of the Church, had only an occasional and very precarious existence; and even when it was most efficaciously in action, it was liable to all the incidents which throw uncertainty into the deliberations of very large assemblies. It is true that the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Bâsle had endeavoured, by express enactments, to make their sittings periodical, so as to erect the Council General into a permanent branch of the constitution of the Church. But as the power of convoking it still remained with the Pope; as the collecting together of so large a body of prelates from all parts of Europe must always have occasioned many local evils; and as the general consent, and even private inclinations, of the more powerful sovereigns were not, under such circumstances, to be disregarded, it was easy for the Pontiff to evade an obligation which he detested. So, in fact, it proved; for when they had once shaken off the fetters that were forged for them at Bâsle, the successors of Eugenius IV. carefully abstained, for above half a century, from acknowledging any power in the Church, except their own.

The moment of the accession of Nicholas V. was even favourable to the unlimited supremacy (the high Papists called it the Independence) of the Court of Rome. The faithful children of the Church had now, for seventy years, been distracted by dissensions almost uninterrupted. The schism which had dissevered kingdoms, and dishonoured the Church, had been *seemingly* aggravated by the council of Pisa; and no sooner was it appeased, after many fierce disputes at Constance, than a third assembly succeeded, which occasioned (to all appearances) a new broil, and which ended by creating a second schism. The spectacle of a Pope and a council launching anathemas against each other was not calculated to

edify the devout Catholic, nor even to conciliate towards the council the affections of the unthinking, who form the majority of mankind. But when the Pope assembled his rival council at Ferrara, and when the two infallible antagonists interchanged the bolts of excommunication, we may fairly believe that the dignity of those venerable bodies suffered much in popular opinion, and even that their utility was made matter of serious question. Wearing by continual dissension, and disgusted by endless exhibitions of ecclesiastical discord, many were disposed to acquiesce in the unrestrained licentiousness of the Vatican, as the lesser evil.

Again, the formidable successes of the Turks, and their near approach to the capital of the East, diverted the attention of men from their spiritual grievances to a more sensible object; and the zeal which Nicholas displayed in that, the common cause of all Christendom, reconciled many to an authority, so earnestly exercised in so holy a cause. Above all, the personal character of that Pope was of great use in conciliating the disaffected, and rallying them under the pontifical banners. His reputation, his talents, his pursuits, were in accordance with the spirit, which, in Italy, at least, so peculiarly prevailed at that time, for the cultivation of ancient literature. His gradual ascent from an inferior origin to the highest dignity was truly ascribed to his literary genius and accomplishments; and having attained that eminence, he surrounded it—not with sensualists or sycophants,—but with men of study and erudition, whose society he loved, and whose affection he obtained. A multitude of transcribers and translators were continually in his employment; and the learning of the Greeks was placed within the reach of an ordinary education. He founded the Vatican library, and sent his messengers into every country for the collection of rare and valuable manuscripts; and while he sought to amass the most precious treasures of profane lore, he exerted even greater zeal to multiply authentic copies of the sacred writings.

But neither was his polite taste, nor the profusion of his liberality, confined entirely to literary objects. His patronage was bestowed on the arts, and especially on that of architecture. He embellished his capital with several superb edifices; many churches, which had fallen into ruins during the schisms and disorders of preceding generations, were now restored to more than their ancient splendour; and the ground was prepared, and the foundations traced out, on which the least unworthy temple which man has ever dedicated to Omnipotence, was destined to rise. The talents of Nicholas were illustrated by private as well as public virtues*. He discouraged the practice of Simony, so long habitual to the Court of Rome; and the records of his history permit us once more to associate the word ‘charity’ with the character of a Pope. Such were purposes

* We may be allowed to cite (from Platina) a part of his epitaph, because the praises it offers were really well founded:—

Hic sita sunt Quinti Nicolai Antistitis ossa,
 Aurea qui dederat sæcula, Roma, tibi.
 Consilio illustris, virtute illustrior omni,
 Excoluit doctos doctior ipse viros.
 Abstulit errorem, quo Schisma infecerat orbem.
 Restituit mores, mœnia, templa, domos.
 Attica Romanæ complura volumina linguæ
 Prodidit—en tumulo fundite thura sacro.

on which the revenues of the Church were honourably employed, and for which they were less reluctantly contributed; and such the character which, being raised at that moment to the pontifical chair, conciliated minds already weary with dissension, and seduced them into a temporary acquiescence in acknowledged abuses.

When the Cardinals went into conclave, on the death of Eugenius, nothing was farther from their intention, or from general expectation, than the election of Nicholas. Prosper Colonna was the person on whom the choice was expected to fall; and though the common proverb was not then forgotten, 'that he who enters the conclave Pope, comes out Cardinal,' (*chi entra Papa, esce Cardinale*) still among the names at all connected with success Thomas of Sarzana was not mentioned. Eighteen Cardinals were present; and, after two or three scrutinies, eleven were united in favour of Colonna; one only was wanting to give him the requisite majority. At that moment the Cardinal of St. Sixtus is reported to have turned suddenly to Sarzana, and said to him, 'Thomas, I give my vote to you, because this is the eve of St. Thomas!' It was, in fact, the eve of St. Thomas Aquinas. The rest of the college immediately followed the example, and Thomas of Sarzana was unanimously elected*.

One of the first acts of Nicholas was, to sign a Concordat with the German Church. Its provisions did not extend beyond the subject of patronage; and it was arranged that the Pope should appoint to all great benefices of every description which should become vacant *in curia*; to all vacated by Cardinals, or other officers of the Roman Court; and to all inferior benefices which should fall during six alternate months of the year. The rest appear to have been left at the disposal of the Ordinaries; all (except the smallest) being liable to the payment of Annates, according to the tax of the Apostolical Chamber; and all to Papal confirmation. This Concordat, properly considered, was the substantial effect produced by the Council of Basle upon the constitution of the Church of Germany; it was for this end that the labours of so many pious prelates and learned doctors had been exhausted! Yet even this result, as we shall presently see, was not such as to secure the satisfaction or bind the faith of the Court of Rome.

In the year 1450 the avarice of the Roman Clergy and people was again nourished by the celebration of the jubilee; and so vast were the multitudes which on this occasion sought *Jubilees*, the plenary indulgence at the tombs of the apostles, that many are said to have been crushed to death in Churches, and to have perished by other accidents †. Nevertheless, as there were still many devout persons, particularly in the more remote countries of Europe, who were precluded from reaping the promised rewards by personal disabilities, Nicholas, in imitation of the abuse of his

* The Roman people were allowed to retain (in return, perhaps, for their long-lost share in the election) the licentious privilege of plundering the mansion of the Pope elect. On this occasion it happened, that Prosper Colonna, as first Deacon, had the office of communicating the election from the window to the assembled populace. Now the people, knowing him to be the favourite, thought no other than that he had appeared to announce his own election. Consequently they rushed, without further inquiry, to his magnificent palace, and stripped it bare. After they had learnt their mistake, they proceeded to atone for it by plundering Sarzana also; but he was a scholar, and had little to lose.

† Ninety-seven pilgrims, for instance, were thrown at once by the pressure of the multitude from the bridge of St. Angelo, and drowned.

predecessors, afforded them facilities to redeem their omission. To the Poles and Lithuanians a private jubilee was accorded, on the condition, that every pious person should pay for his indulgence only half of the money which the pilgrimage to Rome would have cost him; but through some sense of shame, as is said, at the enormous sums which would thus have been raised, the proportion was finally reduced to one quarter. Of the proceeds, which were still considerable, half was consigned to the King of Poland, for the prosecution of the holy war, a fourth to the Queen Sophia, for charitable uses, and a fourth for the *reparation* of the Roman Churches. In this instance we have the unusual consolation of believing, that the money thus levied upon superstition, and levied, too, chiefly upon the superstition of the poor, was applied, for the *redemption*, to the purposes professed. There are shades in the colours of religious imposture; and the sin of deluding a credulous race would have been still blacker, had it been followed by perfidy, or had its fruits been expended in pampering the profligacy of the Court of Rome.

In the year, also, died the Cardinal of Arles, the same who had succeeded Jerome Cesarini as the President of the Council. *The Cardinal of Basle* put the history of that eminent ecclesiastic did not terminate at his death. On the interment of his body at Arles, many extraordinary miracles were performed at his tomb; and their fame spread so widely, and with such assurance of truth, that the partizans of the rival Council of Florence were struck with confusion. This Prelate had been excommunicated by Pope Eugenius, and stigmatized as the author of schism, the child of perdition, the nursling of iniquity; he had been condemned by two General Councils for rebellion against the Church, and degraded and deprived of all his dignities. He had continued, notwithstanding, in the exercise of his episcopal functions at Arles; and so lasting was the impression of his sanctity—founded on his charitable disposition, and other Christian excellencies—and so pressing was the importunity of his devotees, who had even anticipated in their prayers the determination of the Vatican, that at length Pope Clement VII. published (in 1527) the Bull of Beatification; and by that act exalted among the holy mediators the denounced, anathematized foe of Pontifical corruption and despotism.

If Nicholas V. had made some ineffectual exertions to preserve the Eastern empire, while there seemed yet some hope of its preservation, he redoubled his efforts where the shadow of a hope no longer existed. The fall of Constantinople, though long foreseen, fell like an unexpected bolt upon the nations of the West; and it was quickly perceived that the capital of the ancient Empire, the throne of the Christian religion, the opulent palaces and cities of Italy, presented peculiar temptations to an ambitious, unbelieving depredator. Accordingly numerous religious persons began to preach a new crusade; and while Æneas Sylvius was astonishing the Princes of Germany by his polished eloquence, a simple Monk, a hermit of St. Augustine, was exerting a more successful influence over the republics of Italy. His name was Simonet; he was destitute of all acquirements; but his natural address won the confidence of those who listened to him. He traversed the country, in repeated journeys, with unwearied activity. At Venice, at Milan, at Florence, he reiterated his counsels and his arguments. The orator was disinterested, and his object was the concord of his hearers. It was by such simple machinery, that he prevailed in effecting an union among those powerful cities. Yet the practised states-





BR
162
W3

Waddington, George
A history of the church,
from the earliest ages to
the reformation

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
