




Columbia University  
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



PURCHASED FROM  
THE  
WILLIAM C. SCHERMERHORN  
MEMORIAL FUND





A  
GENERAL HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN CHURCH,  
FROM THE  
FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE  
TO THE  
PRESENT TIME.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL. D. F. R. S. &c.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

---

*Nactus sum præteritos dies non solum graves, verum etiam tanto atrocius miseros, quanto longius a remedio veræ religionis alienos; ut merito hac scrutatione claruerit, regnasse mortem avidam sanguinis dum ignoratur religio quæ prohibuerit a sanguine; ista illucescente, illam constupuisse; illam concludi, cum ista jam prævalet; illam penitus nullam futuram, cum hæc sola regnabit.*

OROSIUS.

---

NORTHUMBERLAND: Printed for the Author,

By ANDREW KENNEDY.

---

1802.

Scher

931  
P933  
v.1

43-42881

---

## The DEDICATION.

---

TO THOMAS JEFFERSON,  
*President of the United States.*

S I R,

**M**Y high respect for your character, as a politician, and a man, makes me desirous to connect my name in some measure with yours, while it is in my power, by means of some publication, to do it.

The first part of this work, which brought the history to the fall of the Western empire, was dedicated to a zealous friend of civil and religious liberty, but in a private station. What he, or any other friend of liberty in Europe, could only do by their good wishes, by their writings, or by patient suffering, you, Sir, are actually accomplishing, and upon a theatre of great and growing extent.

It is the boast of this country that it has a constitution the most favourable to political liberty, and private happiness, of any in the world; and all say

*that besides your great merit with respect to several articles of the first importance to public liberty in the instrument itself, \* you have ever been one of the steadiest friends to the genuine principles and spirit of it; and to this opinion your conduct in various public offices, and now in the highest, in this free state, give the clearest attestation.*

*Many have appeared the friends of liberty while they were subject to the power of others, and especially when they were suffering by it; but I do not recollect one besides yourself who retained the same principles, and acted upon them, in a situation of actual power. You, Sir, have done more than this; having voluntarily proposed to relinquish part of the power which the constitution gave you; and instead of adding to the burdens of the people, you have endeavoured to lighten them, tho' with the necessary*

*con-*

*\* When the constitution was formed Mr. Jefferson was absent on the service of his country in Europe, but on receiving a copy of it he wrote strongly to Mr. Madison, urging the want of provision for the freedom of religion, the freedom of the press, the trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the substitution of a militia for a standing army, and an express reservation to the states of all the rights not specifically granted to the union. Mr. Madison accordingly moved in the first session of congress for these amendments, and they were agreed to, and ratified, by the states as they now stand.*

## The DEDICATION. v

consequence of a proportionable diminution of your influence. May this great example, which I doubt not will demonstrate the practicability of truly republican principles on the equal rights of all the members of a state, by the actual existence of a form of government calculated to answer all the useful purposes of government (giving equal protection to all, and leaving everyman in the possession of every power that he can exercise to his own advantage, without infringing the equal liberty of others) be followed in other countries, and at length become universal. The eyes of all the civilized, at least of all the christianized, part of the world are now upon this country; as being evidently in a state of more rapid improvement than any other was ever known to be; and I trust that, eventually, your administration will be a blessing not to the United States of America only, but to all mankind.

Another reason why I wish to prefix your name to this work, and more appropriate to the subject of it, is that you have been the strenuous and uniform advocate of religious as well as of civil liberty, both in your own state of Virginia, and thro' the United States in general; seeing in the clearest light the various and great mischiefs that have arisen from any particular form of religion being favoured by the state more than any other. In consequence of this the profession and practice of religion is here as free as that

*of philosophy, or medicine; and now the experience of more than twenty years leaves little room to doubt, but that it is a state of things the most favourable to mutual candour (which is of great importance to domestic peace and good neighbourhood) and to the cause of all truth, that of religion least of all excepted. When every thing is thus left to free discussion, there can be no doubt but that truth will finally prevail, and establish itself by its own evidence; and he must know little of history, or of human nature, who can imagine that truth of any kind will be ultimately unfavourable to general happiness. A man must entertain a secret suspicion of his own principles, who wishes for any exclusive advantage in the defence, or profession, of them.*

*Having fled from a state of persecution in England, and having been not without some cause of apprehension in the late administration here, I feel the greater satisfaction in the prospect of passing the remainder of an active life, when I naturally wish for repose, under your protection. Tho' I am arrived at the usual term of human life, it is now only that I can say I see nothing to fear from the hand of power, the government under which I live being for the first time truly favourable to me. And tho' I think it has been evident that I have never been improperly swayed by the principle of fear, it is certainly a happiness to be out of the possibility of its influence, especially*  
towards

*towards the close of life ; enjoying a degree of peace and rest, previous to the state of more perfect rest from labour in the grave ; with the hope of rising to a state of greater activity, security, and happiness, beyond it. This is all that any man can wish, or have, in this world ; and this, Sir, under your administration I enjoy.*

*With the most perfect attachment, and every good wish, I subscribe myself, not your subject, or your humble servant, but*

*your sincere admirer,*

JOSEPH PRIESTLEY.

*Northumberland, July, 1802.*

THE HISTORY OF THE

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..

## The PREFACE.

**I**N the Preface to the former part of this work, which brings the history to the fall of the Western empire, I said that I was undetermined whether I should carry it any farther, having executed what I thought to be more particularly wanted, viz. having given an account of the rise and progress of important opinions, which appeared to me to have been greatly misconceived, and misrepresented, by all ecclesiastical historians. But I intimated that if I should have leisure in the decline of life, I might resume this history, and perhaps continue it to the present time.

This leisure it has pleased a kind providence to give me, and I have endeavoured to make a good use of it, both with respect to the continuation of this work, and the composition of several others, besides attending to the business of my laboratory. I cannot be too thankful to the sovereign disposer of all things for so great a happiness. What is life without employment? And most honourable is that employment the object of

that of Switzerland Rachat; in that of France Laval, in that of England bishop Burnet, and in that of other countries the best authorities that I could procure, and which I have never failed to mention.

Tho' to persons acquainted with books the names of these writers as well as those of Fleury, Dupin, Giannone, Sueur, and Mosheim, are quite sufficient; and therefore in quoting their writings I have contented myself with mentioning their names only, yet for the sake of others I shall at the close of this Preface give the titles of some of them more at large, with an account of the editions that I have made use of.

Tho' the *facts* have been collected from the writers abovementioned, the *arrangement*, and the *colouring*, as it may be called, that is given to all the particulars, are my own, and for them I am, therefore, answerable. In these respects I shall often be found to differ from all the ecclesiastical historians that have preceded me; but I willingly submit to the judgment of the impartial, and of posterity.

Being an *unitarian*, and all the preceding general ecclesiastical historians having been trinitarians, it was impossible but that I should see many things in a very different light from them, and therefore our representations of them will be very different, when there is no dispute about the facts. Cha-

acters

characters of men, and of times, must vary with the sentiments of the writers on subjects of such importance as those in which I differ from my predecessors. Of this the reader will easily be apprized; and therefore he will make what allowance he shall think necessary on that account; and if my readers be men of candour, they will shew it on this occasion. This all protestant writers do with respect to the writings of Catholics, from whose histories they take facts of the greatest importance, when they differ from them the most with respect to their judgment concerning those facts.

The division of this part of the history, like that of the preceding, is not that artificial one by *centuries*, to which nothing in the nature of the subject corresponds, but according to important *events*, which point to natural periods in history, civil or ecclesiastical. And the sections under each period are so distinct, that a person may read what belongs to any one subject without troubling himself with what he has no occasion to attend to. To give a *general history* of any period distinct from the particulars of which it must consist, appeared to me to be superfluous, as unnecessary repetitions would have been unavoidable. But it will be found that the first section in each period relates to the subject which is most interesting in  
that

it, is necessarily connected with the ecclesiastical history of the times, and was so more especially about the time of the reformation; so that there will be no want of these separate sections of civil history. Also, all the writers of principal note had some connection with the history of the times in which lived, and therefore their names will occur in the course of the narrative. Where they do not, which is the case of the far greater number of the writers, recourse must be had to Cave, Dupin, and others who have professedly given an account of them all. In a history so general as this is in other respects, an account of them, to be at all satisfactory, would have occupied too much space.

It is certainly allowable for an historian to give his opinion concerning the events which he relates, thus discovering his own principles at the same time that it becomes him to make due allowance for those of others. But general historians, professedly avoiding minute details, are too apt to give their opinions of events instead of the events themselves, and this without any intention to mislead, desirous only of comprising as much as they can in a small compass. This fault I have endeavoured to avoid, and without ever concealing my opinion, I have given my readers a fuller detail of events on which to form their own than they would previously expect from the bounds to which I have

confined myself. I have even sometimes thought it proper, in order to give a clearer idea of the principles and spirit of particular times, and of remarkable men, to depart from the character of a general historian, and to be very particular in my recitals.

Notwithstanding what will be called my peculiar sentiments, and of course my bias in favour of them, I hope that the most prejudiced of my readers will not think me destitute of candour, even with respect to those who differ from me in the most important articles. I will even venture to say that no ecclesiastical history that I have seen is equally candid. My own observation and experience have, I hope, taught me the allowance that is due to the force of prejudice in the best disposed minds, and the absolute impossibility of access to truth in certain situations.

Who, in what are called the dark *ages*, could be expected to have the light that is now accessible to all persons, whether they take any pains in the investigation or not? They must have been men superior to most that have ever lived, if, at the time of the great schism, educated as all Catholics then were, they could have admitted a doubt of the immensity of the papal power, weak as we now see the foundations of it to have been, of the necessity

cessity of *one head* to the whole Christian church, and of that head being canonically elected.

Considering the long and almost universal prevalence of the papal power, and of popish doctrines, it could not be expected that the first reformers from popery should do more than correct the more prominent abuses in doctrine or discipline, and that such articles of the common creed as that of the *divinity of Christ*, should remain untouched by them. It was even natural that, in order to shew their unwillingness to proceed to extremities, and to carry their difference of opinion farther than was absolutely necessary, they should express more zeal than they otherwise would have done for all the doctrines which they held in common with the Catholics. By this means they thought to escape the imputation of *heresy* and *schism*, of which they appear to have had the greatest dread, always repelling the charge by declaring their assent to the decrees of the *antient councils*, as well as to the doctrine of the *scriptures*.

At the time of the reformation, tho' the papal persecutions had been so dreadful as must have led many to reflect on the subject, how few were there, even of the Protestants, who saw the impropriety of the civil magistrate interfering in the business of religion, or who did not acknowledge the obligation he was under to support what he thought to  
be

be the *cause of God*, and to punish heresy with more severity than any offence of a civil nature? Nay, strange as it may appear, the horrid mode of punishing heretics by burning them alive was practiced alike by Papists and Protestants, by Cranmer, one of the meekest of men, in England, and by Calvin, a man of a more stern temper, at Geneva. The *branch cut off from the true vine*, they thought, was to be consigned to the flames; and that without mercy.

All that we can reasonably expect of the best of men; unhappily labouring under such prejudices as these, is that they should be truly sorry to find themselves under the necessity of having recourse to these violent methods of supporting what they believe to be a *good cause*; and that they use every method of persuasion before they adopt it. This apology will not, however, apply to the case of Innocent III and his agent Dominic, to that of Philip II and the duke of Alva, or that of Gardiner and Bonner in England. These men seem to have delighted in blood and torture. If we may judge from circumstances, and the extent of their cruelties, they felt little or no repugnance to the horrid measures they entered into.

This principle will, however, I believe, go pretty far towards the exculpation of Gregory VII, and of Thomas a Becket. They really thought

in languages, difference of taste, and opportunity of education and study. And, what is of infinitely more importance, there have always been examples of the purest piety and virtue in times the most superstitious; which shews the salutary influence of Christianity in its most corrupted state. The heathen world produced no characters that can be compared with many in the most unfavourable times of Christianity. Of a principle of *piety*, the heathens must necessarily have been destitute, because they had not the very elements of it, in a knowledge of the unity, the attributes, and providence of God; and all their views being confined to this world, they could not have the comprehension and elevation of mind of those who look beyond the grave.

In all history vice and folly are the most conspicuous; but this is because they are comparatively rare. What occurs every day, as the virtues of private life, pass unnoticed by historians; in part because they are common, and in part because they are unknown. But judging of the past by the present, we may safely conclude that virtue has always been more common than vice, and that plain good sense has always counteracted the tendency of superstition.

To read the avowed principles of some Catholics, a zealous Protestant would conclude that

no crime could long burden their consciences; since their indulgences and absolutions would easily relieve them; and in too many cases this was, no doubt, the effect of the prevailing maxims with respect to them. But this could never have been the case in general. In the worst ages, I doubt not that the virtues of real piety, and extensive benevolence, accompanied with humility, and heavenly mindedness, from attending to a future state more than to the present, characterized not the greatest number, for this is not the case at present, but a very great proportion, of Christians, tho' history takes no notice of them.

Who can peruse the *Memoirs of the life of Petrarch*, who lived in an age of as much superstition as any, and by which he himself was considerably influenced (as his attendance at the jubilee of A. D. 1350 is a proof) without concluding in favour of his character, especially for the last thirty or forty years of his life, that of his numerous friends and correspondents, who were in the upper ranks in life, and consequently had had the best education their times could supply, and also that of the common unlettered peasants in the neighbourhood of Vacluse, and therefore probably of the commonalty in Christian countries in general?

Were we equally well informed with respect to other periods of history, we should, I doubt not,

be convinced of the happy influence of Christian principles on the sentiments and morals of men, tho' neither then, nor at this day, do they prevent the commission of very great crimes, by persons either know nothing of Christianity, or who give little attention to it; which, indeed, is the case of the generality of those who make profession of it. In the midst of light they walk in darkness, shutting their eyes against it.

Dark and ignorant as we esteem the middle ages to have been, they furnished abundant matter to exercise the intellectual faculties of men. The questions discussed by those who were called *schoolmen* were, no doubt, of little importance in themselves, and often excite a smile when they are mentioned, tho' they were of as much importance as many of those that were discussed in the philosophical schools of Greece, and they bore at least some distant relation to a subject of infinitely greater moment than any that ever came within the view of heathens. They reasoned about them with as much acuteness as was ever shewn by man on any occasion whatever, and they led by degrees to that system of rational *metaphysics*, which is one great boast of the present age; and especially of the English nation.

Other sciences, as those of natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, and medicine, were at the same

same time in the same low and imperfect state with that of theology; and it has been by the same slow degrees that error and prejudice have been rooted out of them all, and that good sense, aided by the labours of thousands, have contributed to their present advanced state; which, however, is but that of infancy with respect to them all. Theology, therefore, in particular has nothing to complain of, nor does any objection lie to Christianity on this account.

As it is in the order of providence, that man, and the world, should arrive at their most improved state by slow degrees, we have no particular reason to complain that this order has been observed with respect to ecclesiastical, any more than civil affairs, religion as well as science. It is, no doubt, the best plan; because it has been adopted thro' all nature by the wisest and best of beings; and as we find a state of childhood necessary to that of a full grown man, all that we complain of in the dark ages, with respect to ignorance, abuses of power, and all the astonishing corruptions of Christianity, may appear in time to have been necessary, as I observed on a former occasion, \* to

b 5

“ ment,

\* See my *Discourses on the evidence of revealed religion*. Vol. 1. p. 20.

“ment, and consequently to the happy effects of “it.” As we value health the more in consequence of experiencing sickness, so we shall, no doubt, think more highly of the value of truth, from reflecting on the gross ignorance that generally prevailed before the discovery of it; and valuing it the more, we shall be more attentive to apply it to its proper uses.

Few things more excite the wonder, and often the ridicule, of rational Christians, than the excessive mortifications to which many Catholics in the middle ages submitted. We think it strange that men of unquestionable good sense, and of the purest virtue and piety, men who had no views to this world, but had their affections wholly raised to another, should think themselves obliged not only to deny themselves the most innocent enjoyments of life, but voluntarily to inflict upon themselves every hardship that human nature could bear; and that others should hold them in the greatest admiration, while we regard them with contempt, on this account.

But the opinion, originally heathen, tho' adopted very early by Christians, that the mortification of the body was of eminent use to purify and exalt the soul, and also that the more we suffer in this world the more happy we shall be in another, took an early and a deep root in their minds; and those

those austerities certainly argued a great command of the natural passions, especially with respect to sensual indulgence, such as the generality of mankind are altogether unequal to. They who practiced those austerities were, therefore, very naturally the subject of great admiration to others; and consequently their voluntary sufferings were a source of complacency to themselves. We also find, what was not unnatural, that Christians thought it a shame that some heathens should make greater sacrifices of their ease and pleasure to their false religions than they to the true one.

We sometimes meet with the most exalted sentiments of virtue and devotion, tho' bordering on extravagance, in the writings of those who in other respects adopted the most absurd opinions and practices. I read with admiration, and I hope some improvement, many things not only in Fenelon, Madame Guyon, and Thomas a Kempis, but even in Teresa, and Gregory Lopez.

That those who had been guilty of great crimes should have recourse to these austerities, by way of atonement for their offences, is not at all extraordinary. For it was easier for a man to fast, to wear hair cloth next to his skin, to go on a pilgrimage barefoot, or to scourge himself, &c. than to govern his passions, and correct bad habits,  
especial-

especially such as had their seat in the mind, as envy, malice, and revenge.

We shall think less unfavourably than we should otherwise be apt to do of the understandings of men who could adopt opinions so extravagantly absurd as that of transubstantiation and others, which are held as the most important articles of faith in the Catholic church, when we accurately trace, and duly attend to, the rise and progress of them, as I have endeavoured to do in my *History of the corruptions of Christianity*. And certainly the ingenuity that has been shewn in the defence of such absurd doctrines is truly wonderful, and shews that it was not owing to any deficiency in the natural powers of the mind that led to the adoption of them.

It will be happy if temperate and just reflections on the subjects of ecclesiastical history should teach us that *candour* which the events recorded in it will shew us to have been too often banished from the Christian world, and at the same time lead us to admire the plan of divine providence in conducting men by due degrees from error to truth, and from vice to virtue. The view of past events ought also to make us thankful that we live in an age in which we see the gradual diffusion of intellectual light, and a better aspect of things in a moral respect than has ever appeared in the world before.

before. It is a promise of greater improvement in succeeding ages, and of the fulfilment of the prophecies which announce a state of great and permanent felicity in the *latter days* of the world, when *nation shall not lift sword against nation, when men shall learn war no more,* and when the whole earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.

But the most important reflection that the contemplation of the dark ages suggests to a Christian is, that his religion has survived all the abuses under which it has so long laboured. Had it not been *founded upon a rock*, such a tempest would have certainly overthrown it; and the revival of literature, and the present age of rigorous inquiry, would have been the utter extinction of it. No other religion ever had, or could have supported, such a trial; but to rational Christianity it has only been a furnace that has burned away its dross, and exhibited it in a purer state than before. After this its friends cannot have any thing to fear for it.

Some unstable minds have, no doubt, been shaken, and many of those who never knew, or felt, its value have rejected it; but tho' there have been among them some men of great ability, and science, and not destitute of many good qualities, the generality of unbelievers are evidently profligate, persons to whom the maxims of the gospel  
mult

must be ungrateful ; and few, if any, of the more learned among them appear to have given sufficient attention to the subject, or to have been possessed of that kind of literature that is peculiarly requisite for the investigation. In others of them self conceit, and a wish to be thought free from vulgar prejudices, have evidently given them a bias of the force of which they were not themselves aware.

Thro' the whole of this part of the history, as well as the former, I have had a view to the instruction of young persons, by giving them an idea of the great value of Christianity, shewing its influence on the minds of those who have received it, and how nobly it has led them to act, and think ; raising them above the world, and all the honours and emoluments of it ; especially how for the *great hope that it set before them* they cheerfully submitted to bear the loss of all things, and made light of the pains of death in every mode of torture. With this view I then dwelt more largely on the history of *martyrdoms* than Mosheim, and others whose histories are, like this, professedly only *general*. The same view has led me to be as particular with respect to the persecution of the reformers from popery in all ages ; and the examples of Christian fortitude which they exhibited are no less striking and instructive than those of the primitive Christians in the times of heathenism. Here I will

will take the liberty to recommend to my readers my edition of the *sufferings of Mr. Marolles and Le Fevre*, at the revocation of the edict of Nantes in France, as furnishing one of the most remarkable and interesting histories of the kind.

N. B. This Preface I wrote after the printing of the first of these additional volumes. I do not suppose that I shall have occasion to add any thing further to the next volume, but I probably shall to the last, as the peculiar state of things at that time may require it.

*Northumberland, July 3, 1802.*

---

THE TITLES OF SUCH BOOKS AS ARE QUOTED  
BY THE NAMES ONLY OF THE WRITERS.

Giannone's History of Naples, translated by James Ogyvie, 2 Vols. folio. 1729.

Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, in his Works, 2 Vols. folio. 1726.

Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries, in English, 4 Vols. folio. 1720.

Robinson's Ecclesiastical Researches, 4to. 1792.

Sueur's Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire, 7 Vols. 4to, Amsterdam. 1730.

— Do. la Continuation par B. Pictet, 3 Vols. 4to, Amsterdam. 1782. Len-

Lenfant's Histoire du Concile de Pise, 2 Vols. 4to, Amsterdam. 1724.

— du Concile de Constance, 2 Vols. 4to, Amsterdam. 1727.

— De la guerre des Hussites, et du Concile de Basle, 2 Vols. 4to, Amsterdam. 1731.

Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History by Maclaine, 5 Vols. 8vo. 1774.

Laval's History of the reformation in France, 6 Vols. 8vo. 1737.

Crantz's History of the Bohemian brethren, by B. La Trobe, 8vo. 1780.

Beaufobre's Histoire de la Reformation &c. 4 Vols. 8vo. Berlin. 1785.

Neal's History of the Puritans, by Dr. Toulmin, 5 Vols. 8vo. 1793.

Fleury's Histoire Ecclesiastique, avec la Continuation, 33 Vols. 12mo. Bruffels. 1723.

Basnage's Histoire des Juifs, 15 Vols. 12mo. La Haye. 1716.

Williams's History of Church music, prefixed to his Psalmody.

Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England, abridged, 3 Vols. 12mo. 1728.

# The CONTENTS

OF THIS

VOLUME.

## PERIOD XIV.

|  |          |              |
|--|----------|--------------|
| <b>F</b> ROM the Fall of the Western empire in<br>A. D. 475, to the Rise of Mahometanism in A. D. 622. | -        | 1            |
| Section I. <i>The History of Eutychianism in this Period,</i>  | - -      | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Sect. II. <i>Of the Controversy relating to the three Chapters,</i>                                    | - -      | 26           |
| Sect. III. <i>The History of Arianism in this Period,</i>  | - -      | 42           |
| Sect. IV. <i>The History of the Monks in this Period,</i>  | - -      | 54           |
| Sect. V. <i>Of the state of Heathenism, Judaism, and various Sects of Christians in this Period,</i>   | - -      | 72           |
| Sect. VI. <i>Of the Progress of Christianity in this Period,</i>                                       | - -      | 81           |
| Sect. VII. <i>The History of Persecution in this Period,</i>   | - -      | 86           |
|  | <i>c</i> | <i>Sect.</i> |

|  |   |   |     |
|--|---|---|-----|
| Seçt. VIII. <i>Of the state of Superstition in this Period,</i>  | - | - | 88  |
| Seçt. IX. <i>Of the Power of the Popes in this Period,</i>   | - | - | 97  |
| Seçt. X. <i>Some Particulars relating to the Clergy, Churches, &amp;c. in this Period, and other Articles of a miscellaneous Nature,</i> |   |   | 109 |

## PERIOD XV.

|  |   |   |              |
|--|---|---|--------------|
| From the rise of Mahometanism in A. D. 608 to the Establishment of the Western empire under Charlemagne in A. D. 800,  |   |   | 119          |
| Seçt. I. <i>Of the controversy occasioned by the Monothelites,</i>   | - | - | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Seçt. II. <i>Of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism,</i>   | - | - | 141          |
| Seçt. III. <i>Of the Controversy relating to the Worship of Images,</i>  | - |   | 149          |
| Seçt. IV. <i>Of the Controversy occasioned by the Opinion of Elipand of Toledo, and Felix of Urgela, concerning the Sense in which Christ is the Son of God,</i> | - |   | 167          |
| Seçt. V. <i>Of the Progress of Christianity, and the state of Heathens, Jews, and Sectaries. in this Period,</i>   | - |   | 173          |
| Seçt. VI. <i>Of the Power of the Popes, and of the Bishops. in this Period,</i>  | - |   | 184          |
| Seçt. VII. <i>Of the Monks in this Period,</i>   |   |   | 197          |
| Seçt.  |   |   |              |

|             |  |   |   |     |
|-------------|--|---|---|-----|
| Sect. VIII. | <i>Of the disorderly State of this Period,</i> | - | - | 207 |
| Sect. IX.   | <i>Miscellaneous Articles,</i>                 | - | - | 214 |

## PERIOD XVI.

|  |  |   |   |              |
|--|--|---|---|--------------|
| From the Reestablishment of the Western empire in A. D. 800 to the raising of Otho to the Imperial Throne A. D. 936. 224 |  |   |   |              |
| Sect. I.   | <i>Of the Intercourse between the Greek and Latin Churches on the Subject of the Patriarch Photius, which led to their final Separation from each other,</i> | - | - | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Sect. II.  | <i>The Sequel of the History of Image-worship,</i>   | - | - | 246          |
| Sect. III.   | <i>Of the Controversy occasioned by Goteschalchus concerning Predestination,</i>   |   |   | 256          |
| Sect. IV.  | <i>Of the Propagation of Christianity in this Period,</i>  | - | - | 264          |
| Sect. V.   | <i>Of the State of the Jews and Christian Sectaries, and of the Rise of peculiar Opinions, within this Period,</i>   | - | - | 269          |
| Sect. VI.  | <i>Of the State of the Clergy in this Period,</i>  | - | - | 277          |
| Sect. VII.   | <i>Of the Popes in this Period,</i>  |   |   | 294          |
| Sect. VIII.  | <i>Of the Monks in this Period,</i>  |   |   | 310          |
| Sect. IX.  | <i>Of the Superstitions of this Period,</i>  |   |   | 318          |
| Sect. X.   | <i>Of the disorderly State of this Period,</i>   | - | - | 323          |
| Sect. XI.  | <i>Miscellaneous Articles,</i>   | - | - | 330          |
|  |  |   |   | PERIOD       |

## PERIOD XVII.

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| From the Accession of Otho in A. D. 936<br>to the Conquest of Jerusalem by the<br>Crusaders in A. D. 1099. -   | 337          |
| SECT. I. <i>Of the State of the Papacy in this<br/>Period, - - -</i>   | <i>ibid.</i> |
| SECT. II. <i>Various Instances of the claims of<br/>the Popes in this Period to Ecclesiastical and<br/>Civil Power, and of the Opposition that<br/>was sometimes made to them, -</i> | 364          |
| SECT. III. <i>Of the Character of the Clergy in<br/>this Period, - - -</i>   | 375          |
| SECT. IV. <i>Of the Monks in this Period,</i>  | 402          |
| SECT. V. <i>Of the Progress of Christianity, and<br/>of the State of the Jews and Christian<br/>Sectaries in this Period, - -</i>  | 417          |
| SECT. VI. <i>Of the Intercourse between the<br/>Greek and Latin Churches in this Period.</i>   | 440          |
| SECT. VII. <i>The History of the first Crusade,</i>  | 446          |
| SECT. VIII. <i>Articles relating to the public<br/>Offices, and Discipline, -</i>  | 460          |
| SECT. IX. <i>Miscellaneous Articles, -</i>   | 468          |

---

THE  
HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

---

PERIOD XIV.

FROM THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE  
IN A. D. 475, TO THE RISE OF MA-  
HOMETANISM IN A. D. 622.

---

---

SECTION I.

*The History of Eutychianism in this Period.*

NOTHING can well be more uninteresting, or disgusting, to an intelligent Christian at this day than the histories of the controversies that were in this, and the following periods, carried on in the East, on account of the extreme absurdity, and insignificance of the opinions con-

tended for, and the violence with which the contests were conducted, the emperors always interfering in the disputes of the theologians. It is not, however, unpleasant, or uninstruative, to see that mere *authority* was often unable to contend with *opinion* when it was generally prevalent. The throne itself was frequently hazarded, and sometimes lost, in the contest.

A detail of even the leading facts in the course of this history is exceedingly tedious, but as without this no just idea can be formed of the real state of things in those times, the recital is absolutely necessary; but I shall make it as brief as distinctness will allow. Judging by myself, I conclude that no person can long retain in memory the chain of the events that I shall lay before my readers, but a general impression will remain of their *nature*, and *consequences*; and this is, in fact, all that is of much real use, not only in ecclesiastical, but even in civil history.

We have seen many examples of the little power of mere *authority*, either that of emperors, or of ecclesiastical councils, to settle articles of faith, when the general acceptance of them was not favoured by particular circumstances. In this period we have another, as remarkable as any of the preceding, viz. in what remains to be related of the history of *Eutychianism*, after the solemn

## SEC. I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

condemnation of it in the general council of Chalcedon. It was then determined that there are "two natures in Christ, united in one person;" whereas the Eutychians held that the human nature is so absorbed in the divine, that he cannot be said to have more than *one nature*. It was only by the authority of the emperor Marcian that this doctrine was condemned in that council; and when other emperors favoured it, we find it, or some modification of it, again triumphant. So deeply was it rooted in the minds of many people, especially in Egypt, that neither the imperial nor the papal authority could entirely suppress it. According to custom also, too prevalent in all ages where men interest themselves in any thing, the contest on this subject was often marked with shocking cruelties, of which it is saying very little to pronounce that they were unworthy of any that bore the name of Christians.

After the death of Marcian, and the accession of Leo, symptoms of a strong attachment to the principles of Eutyches appeared in Egypt. Timothy surnamed *Ælurus*, or the *Cat*, a priest who had separated from the Catholics after the council of Chalcedon, took violent possession of the great church at Alexandria, and got himself ordained

bishop, when the Catholic bishop \* Proterius, being obliged to hide himself, fled into the Baptistery. Thither he was pursued, and being apprehended, was put to death with great marks of cruelty.

On this Timothy openly anathematized the council of Chalcedon, pope Leo, and all the Catholic bishops. On the other hand the pope was not backward to exert himself in defence of the council; and writing to the emperor, and the bishops in the East, he earnestly exhorted them to support him. The orthodox clergy of Alexandria likewise applied to the emperor, and the friends of Timothy did the same. In consequence of this, the emperor appointed Anatolius bishop of Constantinople to assemble his clergy, and give his opinion; which was, that the ordination of Timothy was null, and that the council of Chalcedon ought to be supported. Not satisfied with this, Leo desired all the greater bishops to assemble their suffragans which they did, to the number of  
 sixty.

\* In order to procure the deposition of Proterius, he is said to have gone in the night to the cells of the monks, calling upon each of them by name; and when he was asked who he was, he answered that he was an angel, sent to warn them not to communicate with Proterius, but to chuse Ælurus for their bishop. *Theodorus Lector. Lib. 1. C. 1.*

sixty. He likewise consulted three famous saints of that age, the principal of whom was Simeon Stylites, mentioned before, as having lived many years on a pillar, exposed to all the inclemencies of the weather. All the answers were in favour of the council, and against the ordination of Timothy. In consequence of this, Timothy was banished, and another person of the same name, but surnamed *Solofaciolus*, was substituted in his place.

At Antioch, where the principles of Eutyches had not taken such deep root, Peter Fullo who had distinguished himself by adding to the Trifagion the phrase, *who was crucified for us* (thus ascribing real passion to one of the persons in the trinity) and who rejected the council of Chalcedon, divided the people on the subject; and having insinuated himself into the good graces of Zeno, the Emperor's son in law, he gave the bishop Martyrius so much disturbance, by accusing him of Nestorianism, that he resigned the bishopric, and this Peter was chosen in his place. The election, however, being irregular, Leo sent him into banishment, and one Julian was ordained his successor.

Zeno abandoning the empire, was succeeded by Basiliscus brother of Verina, the widow of the emperor Leo, and his wife Zenodia having engaged him to take part with the Eutychians, he re-

called Timothy Ælurus to the see of Alexandria, after having been exiled eighteen years, his rival retiring to a monastery. P. Fullo also made his appearance, and returned to Antioch, his rival dying of grief; and all the enemies of the council of Chalcedon, being now under no restraint, freely censured its decrees. At the instigation of Fullo the emperor condemned the council, all the favourers of it, and the letter of pope Leo. At the same time he condemned all those who did not acknowledge that the son of God was truly made man. About a hundred bishops joined in this condemnation.

This conduct of the emperor was by no means universally approved, and he had a powerful opponent at Constantinople itself, in Acacius the bishop of that see. He, being joined in his opposition by D. Stylites, the emperor was obliged to fly from the city. But T. Ælurus, after his return to Alexandria, having called a council at Ephesus, the bishops assembled there exhorted the emperor to keep firm to his purpose. Tho' Ælurus condemned the council of Chalcedon, he rejected the doctrine of Eutyches, maintaining that the flesh of the incarnate word was consubstantial with ours.

Basiliscus, terrified at the opposition he met with, and at the report of the return of Zeno, made

## SEC. I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

made a public retraction of his decree against the council of Chalcedon; but it did not avail him. Zeno returned, and Basiliscus being driven into banishment to Cappadocia, was starved to death. Zeno deposed Fullo, and at length banished him to Pontus. Ælurus prevented his deposition by death, which was said to have been voluntary, and was succeeded by Solofaciolus, who was said to be a man of so much moderation, that even they who could not communicate with him could not help loving him. The friends of Fullo at Antioch appear to have been numerous, and no less violent. For Stephen, who had succeeded him, was murdered by his opponents in the church itself, his body dragged thro' the streets, and then thrown into the Orontes.

Zeno was afterwards, with the approbation of Acacius of Constantinople, induced to favour the election of Peter Mongus to the see of Alexandria. By the same Acacius, and with a view to unite all parties in the profession at least of the same faith, he was also persuaded to publish a decree of union called the henoticon, which P. Mongus was to subscribe. It condemned alike the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, but without expressing any approbation of the council of Chalcedon. This edict was received by all parties in Alexandria: But P. Mongus proceeded farther. He anathe-

matized the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of pope Leo. He also took from the diptychs \* the names of Proterius, and T. Solofaciolus, and inserted those of Dioscorus and T. Ælurus. He even took up the body of T. Solofaciolus, and threw his bones into a desert place. But on receiving letters from Acacius, who was alarmed at his violent proceedings, he denied that he had done so. He also wrote to Pope Simplicius, to assure him that he approved of the council of Chalcedon.

This inconsistent conduct led many of the church of Alexandria to separate themselves from him; and having no person at their head, they were called *Acephali*, tho' in reality they were Eutychians, or differed but little from them. Others say that, dividing into many parties, and having, of course, no single head, their enemies gave them all that denomination. *Sueur* A. D. 475. The Patriarch, willing to bring them back to his com-

\* Diptychs were, as the term imports, a twofold catalogue preserved in churches, and recited at the communion service, one of bishops who were living, and the other of those who were dead, respected by the church, and considered as in communion with them. Consequently to strike the name of any bishop out of the diptychs was equivalent to the excommunicating of him.

## SEC. I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

communion, afterwards openly anathematized the council of Chalcedon, but it was without effect.

The pope did not fail to be exceedingly offended at the conduct of both Acacius and the emperor Zeno; but he dying, his quarrel was taken up by his successor Felix, who wrote expostulatory letters to them both; and two bishops, whom he sent with these letters, having been gained by the emperor, and having moreover communicated with Acacius, and acknowledged P. Mongus for the lawful bishop of Alexandria, they were on their return excommunicated, in a council which pronounced sentence against P. Mongus as a heretic. Another expostulatory letter was also written by the pope to Acacius, but without any effect. On this another council was held at Rome, A. D. 484, in which Acacius was solemnly excommunicated, the sentence being signed by sixty seven bishops. At this time Odoacer the Arian was king of Italy, which shews that he allowed the Catholics the full exercise of their religion.

Acacius did not suffer these proceedings to pass without shewing his resentment; and being supported by the emperor, he made little account of the pope's excommunication. He even left his name out of the diptychs of his church; and proceeding farther, he deposed a great number of bishops who differed from him, and among the

rest Calendion bishop of Antioch, tho' he had been ordained by himself, because he continued to hold communion with pope Felix, and John Talaiia the deposed bishop of Alexandria, and in the place of Calendion succeeded P. Fullo, who had been frequently condemned by Acacius himself.

P. Fullo followed the example of Acacius, and banished many bishops in his diocese, and among them Cyrus of Hierapolis, and put in his place Xenias, who is said to have been the first who declared against the use of pictures and images. Angels he said were incorporeal, and therefore could not be drawn in a human form; that to honour the images of Christ was not to honour *him*, but that he was to be honoured in spirit and in truth; that to draw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, which he only assumed at one particular time, was a childish imagination. Accordingly, he effaced many images of angels, and hid those of Jesus Christ in a separate place. *Fleury. Vol. 7. P. 34.*

P. Mongus also resented the conduct of the pope. He even anathematized the letter of Pope Leo, and the council of Chalcedon, and all those who received the writings of Dioscorus and T. Ælurus. Many of the monks he engaged to join him, and those whom he could not persuade he expelled from their monasteries. Zeno, however,

ever, being informed of this proceeding, and offended at the disturbance which it occasioned, caused the monks to be restored.

On the death of Acacius, A. D. 489, the pope would not acknowledge his successor Flavita, unless he would reject the names of Acacius and P. Mongus; and on the death of Flavita, he would not communicate with his successor Euphemius, because he would not erase from the diptychs the names of Acacius and Flavita.

Anastasius, who succeeded Zeno in A. D. 491, was suspected of heresy from the beginning of his reign; so that the patriarch Euphemius objected to his coronation, till he gave him a confession of his faith in writing, by which he acknowledged the council of Chalcedon. However, he allowed intire liberty of conscience; in consequence of which some bishops in the East received this council, and others rejected it; but he banished those who changed from one side to the other.

In A. D. 508 the emperor Anastasius, excited by Xenias, would oblige Flavian of Antioch to sign the heroticon of Zeno. On this occasion Flavian assembled a council of his bishops, and published a large synodical letter, in which he expressed his receiving the three councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, but made no mention of that of Chalcedon. He moreover condemned

demned the writings of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose sentiments were thought to have been too favourable to Nestorianism. In this John bishop of Alexandria joined him. To give the emperor all the satisfaction that he could, he farther informed him, that he received the henoticon of Zeno. All this, however, not satisfying Xenias, by whose opinions the emperor seems to have been governed, he separated from the communion of Flavian and Macedonius of Constantinople. This patriarch resisted all the attempts of the emperor to make him abjure the council of Chalcedon. He even anathematized those who did not receive it, and in this he was joined by the people of Constantinople.

In these circumstances, the emperor, in order to carry his point, encouraged a number of monks, headed by Severus, to come to Constantinople. But these singing the Trisagion with the addition of the clause *who was crucified for us*, a tumult was excited; in consequence of which the emperor was obliged to shut himself up in his palace, and even to make some seeming submission to the patriarch. The emperor, however, not forgiving him, made an attempt to get him condemned in a council; but that measure not succeeding, he had him seized by force, on the pretence of his being guilty of an unnatural crime, and also of heresy,  
and

and sent him to Chalcedon, in order to his being sent to Paphlagonia, and procured one Timothy to be appointed in his place.

With a view to get the council of Chalcedon condemned, the emperor had one called at Sidon in A. D. 511; but this measure not appearing likely to answer his purpose, the bishops separated by his own direction.

The eastern church being torn by these schisms, many of the bishops applied to pope Symmachus, intreating him to receive them into his communion, tho' they could not join him in his anathema of Acacius. But the pope declared himself not satisfied without the express condemnation of all those whom the apostolic see (as, exclusive of all others, he denominated that of Rome) had condemned.

In A. D. 511 the emperor shewed his determination to favour the Eutychian sentiments, by encouraging the singing of the trisagion with the clause *who was crucified for us*; but the people opposing it, a tumult arose in the church, and several lives were lost. The disturbance extending thro' the city, houses were burned, and more lives lost. The people were so much inflamed, that they even called for another emperor, so that he thought proper to conceal himself. But afterwards

wards making his appearance, and yielding to their demands, quiet was restored.

The emperor, provoked at the ill success of the council of Sidon, which he attributed to Flavian of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem, determined to banish them both. But Xenias and his monks coming to Antioch and endeavouring to force him to anathematize the council of Chalcedon, the people rose upon them, and killed a great number. Other monks coming, and taking his part, more mischief was done; and this served as a pretence for banishing the bishop to Petra, and the monk Severus was put in his place, A. D. 561. Severus was a pure Eutychian, not even receiving the henoticon of Zeno. In his synodical letters he even anathematized the council of Chalcedon, but they were not received by many of the churches of his diocese.

In the mean time count Vitalian, one of the imperial generals, availing himself of the unpopularity of the emperor, on account of his religious opinions, put himself at the head of the disaffected party, and made great progress in his revolt, conquering all Thrace and Mysia, and advancing to the very gate of Constantinople; when the emperor, seeing his affairs growing desperate, yielded to the demands of Vitalian, which were to recall Macedonius and Flavian, and also to convoke a  
gene-

general council, at which the pope might be present, in order to examine into the injuries done to the Catholics.

In consequence of this, the emperor wrote to pope Hormisdas, A. D. 515, excusing his former conduct in not writing to him before, and requesting him to appease the insurrection which had arisen in Scythia. Vitalian also, and Theodoric king of the Goths in Italy wrote to the pope at the same time. On this he sent a deputation to Constantinople, of which Ennodius was the chief. But he insisting upon the excommunication of Accacius and all his followers, and the emperor not acceding to this, the pope sent a second embassy, tho' with no better success.

Elias bishop of Jerusalem refusing to communicate with Severus of Antioch, the emperor banished him, and put John the son of Marcion in his place. But he also, by the persuasion of Sabas (a monk of great celebrity in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and of great zeal for the orthodoxy of those times) and others, refusing to communicate with Severus, and receiving the council of Chalcedon, was by the emperor's orders put into prison. But, seeming to comply with the emperor's demand, he was set at liberty, and then being joined by the monks, a remonstrance was sent to the emperor; and Vitalian at the  
same

the same time, recommencing the war against him, he was content to allow John to continue in his see.

The patriarch of Constantinople dying in A. D. 517, John of Cappadocia was chosen in his place, having before his ordination condemned the council of Chalcedon, tho' the people insisted upon his anathematizing Severus.

John Niceotis patriarch of Alexandria dying in A. D. 517, Dioscorus, a younger nephew of Timothy Ælurus, was chosen in his place. But the people rose on the occasion, and having killed a son of the governor, he put to death as many of the murderers as he could apprehend, and the patriarch himself thought proper to go to Constantinople to appease the emperor. This was not the only mischief occasioned by these unhappy disputes. In this same year the monks of second Syria wrote to the pope, complaining of great violence offered to them by the connivance of the emperor, as they were going to the monastery of St. Simeon Stylites, in which three hundred and fifty men were killed, and many wounded. The pope, in answer, only exhorted them to continue firm in the faith.

A. D. 518 Anastasius died, and Justin, a mere soldier who could not even read, but who was of the orthodox faith, was chosen in his place. En-

couraged by this circumstance, the people of Constantinople insisted upon their patriarch anathematizing Severus, and with this he thought proper to comply. Also a council being called in this city, the same was done by all the bishops assembled on the occasion. By the accession of this orthodox emperor, the church of Constantinople was reconciled to that of Rome, after a separation of fifty-three years; the patriarch having signed the formula prescribed by the pope, in which the condemnation of Acacius and his followers was a principal article. The common people of Constantinople expressed the greatest joy on the occasion. But it was not without much difficulty that the church of Antioch could be reconciled to the new system, and to the new bishop that was appointed on the occasion. Severus, making his escape to Alexandria, was well received by Timothy the patriarch of the place.

Notwithstanding all that had passed on the subject, the legates of pope Hormisdas in A. D. 519 found Constantinople warmly agitated by a dispute with the monks, protected by count Vitalian, tho' opposed by his rival Justinian, who sung the trisagion with their addition, implying that one of the trinity was crucified, and maintained that they did it agreeably to the doctrine of the Fathers, and in opposition to Nestorius and

Theodore of Mopsuestia. The monks receiving no satisfaction in a conference with the pope's legates at Constantinople went to Rome, but being as much dissatisfied with their reception there, they returned to Constantinople. Also a great number of the Eastern bishops would not consent to the condemnation of those who died after Acacius. No threats or punishments they declared should induce them to strike the names of their bishops from their diptychs.

John Maxentius, the most learned of the monks who went to Rome, wrote on the occasion, maintaining that whoever did not say that *one of the trinity, not one person in the trinity* (for there was artifice, he said, in that form of expression) was crucified for us, was a heretic, and a Nestorian, tho' it should be the pope himself.

Justinian, who succeeded Justin in A. D. 527, like him; made profession of the strictest orthodoxy. Yet in the confession which he gave of his faith at the commencement of his reign, he said that one of the trinity was incarnate, tho' he had before blamed the monks of Scythia for using that expression.

In A. D. 533 there arose a schism among the Eutychians, Severus, the exiled patriarch of Antioch, maintaining that the body of Christ was corruptible; since, otherwise, there could be no real

suf-

suffering, which is Manicheism; whereas Julian of Halicarnassus, who had likewise taken refuge in Egypt, maintained that, according to the genuine principles of Eutychianism, the body of Christ was incorruptible; since, otherwise there would be a distinction between the body of Christ, and the logos, and consequently two natures in Christ. "Why else," said he, "do we reprobate the council of Chalcedon?" Those two leaders of the opposite parties wrote against each other. The disciples of Severus were by their opponents called *Corrupticoles*, or worshippers of what was corruptible, and the other were called *Incorruptibles*, or *Phantasiastes*.

Timothy, the patriarch of Alexandria, dying at this time, the partisans of Severus, the clergy, and also the imperial ministers, joined in the choice of Theodosius, a man of letters. But the monks and the populace chose Gajanus a disciple of Julian. Theodosius, however, having the countenance of the imperial party, Gajanus was banished. Notwithstanding this, few would communicate with Theodosius, and many persons being killed in a tumult which arose on this occasion, he fled to Constantinople; but not promising to receive the council of Chalcedon, he was banished to the distance of six miles from the city.

The emperor, willing to reconcile the Severians to the Catholic church, appointed a conference for that purpose at Constantinople, in A. D. 532. On this occasion these Eutychians made no difficulty of saying that Eutyches himself was a heretic, but they disapproved of the council of Chalcedon, as having introduced a new phrase viz. that of *two natures in Christ*; whereas they maintained that after the union of the logos with the body of Christ, they made but one nature. They also complained that Theodoret and Ibas were then received as Catholics. In the last day of this conference the emperor himself attended, and after much argumentation brought over some of the Eutychians, but not all of them.

About this time some monks of the monastery of Acemites, and Hypatian, archbishop of Ephesus, being sent by the emperor, met at Rome, to consult the pope on the propriety of two forms of expression introduced into the controversy, viz. whether these monks did right to say that "the virgin Mary was properly the mother of God," and that "one of the trinity was incarnate;" the emperor having published an edict in which they were condemned. Ferrand, a deacon of the church of Carthage, and a disciple of Fulgentius, who was then dead, being consulted, approved of the expression "one of the trinity suffered;" provided

it was properly explained, and it was understood that he suffered *in the flesh*.

Fulgentius himself having been consulted on the subject of the incorruptibility of the body of Christ, gave it as his opinion, that during his life time it was so far corruptible, as to be subject to the infirmities of other men ; but that it was incorruptible after his death ; and also that during his life he was not subject to those passions which disturb the exercise of reason.

Pope John, not being able to bring the monks who had gone to Rome to hear what he thought to be reason, excommunicated them, as they had been before by the patriarch of Constantinople. On this occasion the pope expressed his approbation of the edict of the emperor, and he wrote to the senate of Rome to explain his principles and conduct.

On the death of Epiphanius of Constantinople, Anthemus bishop of Trebisonde was chosen in his place, and both he and the empress Theodora were enemies of the council of Chalcedon. This encouraged the Acephali to come to Constantinople and among them Severus late patriarch of Antioch ; and there they not only held assemblies in private houses, but also baptized. Pope Agapit coming to Constantinople at this time, on an embassy from king Theodoric, was so much offend-

ed at this, that he not only refused to communicate with Anthimus, but get him deposed; when he retired to a place where he was under the protection of the empress. Anthimus was succeeded by Mennas of Alexandria, who received the council of Chalcedon. In execution of the sentence of the council by which Anthimus was deposed the emperor forbade him, and also Severus, Peter of Apamea, and Zoara a monk of Syria to reside in Constantinople, or any considerable city. He also ordered the writings of Severus to be burned, and that whoever copied them should have his thumbs cut off.

Pope Agapit dying at Constantinople, the empress got Vigilus to be made pope, and Silverius who had been chosen banished. Vigilus, however, only in secret appeared to favour the views of the empress; as in all his public edicts he was sufficiently Catholic.

We now find the council of Chalcedon, being favoured by the pope, and the emperor, universally received. Theodosius of Alexandria, where it had long been reprobated, being banished, Paul, who declared his approbation of the council, was chosen in his place; and Paul being deposed for certain offences, was succeeded by Zoilus, who also received the council.

Theodosius, late of Alexandria, being at Constantinople, maintained that Christ was not ignorant of the day of judgment, not even *as the son*, using the language of the Catholics, tho' an Eutychian. He even wrote against those who held the contrary opinion, calling them, in contempt, *Agnaites*, which from this time became another distinction among the Eutychians.

About this time Philoponus of Alexandria, maintaining that there was no difference between the terms *nature* and *hypostasis*, was charged with admitting *three natures* in the trinity; and, allowing, as they say, the consequence he was deemed a *tritheist*.

The controversy about Eutychianism was but little heard of in the West. However, at the second council at Seville in A. D. 619, there was present a Syrian bishop of the sect of the Acephali, denying the distinction of two natures in Christ, and maintaining that the divinity was passible; but with some difficulty he was brought to renounce those offensive opinions.

Notwithstanding all that Justinian had done in favour of the council of Chalcedon, and against Eutychianism, such hold had the principles of this sect taken on the minds of numbers, and, as it should seem, of the more zealous Christians, advocates for the highest honours of Christ, that tow-

ards the end of his reign he himself was much impressed by them. The empress Theodora, as well as Theodore of Cappadocia, was an advocate for them; and in addition to their influence which was probably considerable, he is said to have learned something of this kind from some Originists, who, we shall find, became very considerable at this time. It is certain that Justinian adopted the opinion that the body of Christ was incorruptible, that after it was formed in the womb of the virgin it so far partook of the properties of divinity, as to be incapable of change, even with respect to the natural and innocent affections of humanity, as those of hunger and thirst; so that even before his death, as well as after his resurrection, he ate without necessity.

As all the emperors wished to think for their subjects as well as for themselves, Justinian was not satisfied without endeavouring to make his sentiments the standard of faith in the whole empire; and for this purpose he had recourse to the universal argument of sovereign princes. He began by publishing an edict on the subject, designed to gain the bishops; but it had little effect. The patriarch of Constantinople, Eutychius, was so far from subscribing to this edict, that he remonstrated against it, maintaining that on the emperor's principles the incarnation was only imaginary, and that it

was

was in no other sense true than that the body of Christ was incapable of any stain of sin, and was not corruptible in the grave.

The emperor was so much provoked at this opposition, which, coming from the patriarch of Constantinople, was likely to have a great effect, that he had him dragged by force from his church, and confined to a monastery. He was afterwards removed from place to place, and at last to Amasa in Pontus. John the Syrian, surnamed Scholasticus, was made patriarch in his place.

This opposition to the views of the emperor was not confined to the patriarch. Many other bishops refused to subscribe to his edict. Of those the principal was Anastasius of Antioch. The emperor used all his endeavours to gain him, but these being without effect, he would have been banished, like the patriarch of Constantinople, if the emperor himself had not died before it could take place.

Justin II, the nephew of Justinian, who succeeded him in the empire, recalled all those exiles, except Eutychius. This emperor, like his predecessors, thought proper to publish a confession of his faith, and one by which he hoped to unite all parties; but it was without effect, as he only proposed that all things should remain on their an-

cient footing. Just before the death of Justin, and the succession of Tiberius, Eutychius was recalled, after passing twelve years in a monastery at Amasa in Pontus, and he entered Constantinople in triumph, riding on an ass, in imitation of our Saviour, to the great joy of the people.

I shall conclude this section with observing that from a disciple of Severus called Jacob Zanzales, or Bardai, a Syrian monk, the Eutychians in general came to be called *Jacobites*. And these about this time usually called their opponents *Melchites*, on account of their receiving the council of Chalcedon, imposed by royal authority, and in this it will have been seen there was too much of truth.

---



---

## SECTION II.

*Of the Controversy relating to the three Chapters.*

**N**OWWITHSTANDING the suppression of unitarianism in a variety of forms, we find it appearing again in others, or other doctrines bordering upon it. The Nestorians were but little different from unitarians with respect to their doctrine concerning the person of Christ, tho' they held a trinity in the godhead, and they were treated

as such by their adversaries. And whenever the Eutychians, or those who secretly favoured their opinions, prevailed, every person was considered as heretical, and was charged with Nestorianism, who scrupled to adopt the very highest language concerning the person of Christ in all its parts, without excepting what related to his humanity. Also, in order to revenge themselves for their disappointment in the council of Chalcedon, they were eager to censure many of the eminent bishops who lived at the time of that council, for language which had passed without any censure when it was used; and the circumstances of the times favouring them, great disturbance was given to the whole Christian world on this account. The bishops who by their writings were particularly obnoxious to the favourers of Eutychianism were Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edeffa, and Eutherius of Tiana, all then dead.

That some of these persons enjoyed a high degree of popularity, at least in their own churches, is evident from the distinguished honours paid to the memory of Theodoret by Sergius one of his successors. For in A. D. 519 he carried his image mounted on a car into the church, where it was received with singing of psalms. He afterwards instituted a festival in his honour, and that of Diodo-

Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. And had it not being owing to private pique, these men might have enjoyed their honours undisturbed, and unenvied, to the latest posterity.

The first time that we find the names of any of the persons abovementioned made use of for any invidious purpose, was by Xenias, who had been made bishop of Hierapolis, whose sentiments were of the Eutychnian cast. Being at variance with Flavian bishop of Antioch, he accused him of Nestorianism. To ward off this accusation, Flavian did not hesitate to anathematize Nestorius himself, and his doctrine. But this did not satisfy Xenias, who farther required him to anathematize all those who had been suspected of holding the same principles, naming Theodoret, and the other persons abovementioned.

This, however, was nothing more than an altercation between these two bishops. The Christian world became interested in the question by the artful management of Theodore of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, then in the court of the emperor Justinian, who like several of his predecessors, and the succeeding emperors, busied themselves more about matters of theology than affairs of state. This Theodore was a favourer of the sentiments of Origen, (against which Theodore of Mopsuestia had written) and one of the Acephali, and he had  
a dis-

a dispute on these subjects with Pelagius, when he was sent from Rome on an embassy to Constantinople. Theodore, finding the emperor writing against the Acephali, and in defence of the council of Chalcedon, persuaded him that he would reconcile the Acephali to the council (which had given offence to many by the seeming approbation of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a letter of Ibas to Maris a Persian heretic, which he said were evidently Nestorian) if he would procure the condemnation of those writers, and that by this means, uniting the different sects of Christians, he would gain immortal glory. The emperor, not perceiving his secret views, undertook to do this, adding to the two writers abovementioned what Theodoret wrote in answer to the twelve anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria. Abandoning, therefore, his design of writing against the Acephali, he composed another work, in condemnation of those three writings, usually denominated *the three chapters*. This piece of the emperor's was in the form of an edict, or letter addressed to all the churches, and bore the title of a confession of faith. In this he anathematized not only the three chapters, but, as was usual in those times, all who defended them. This was in A. D. 546.

All the bishops were required to subscribe to this confession of faith, tho' Mennas patriarch of Constantinople made some difficulty of doing it, on account of its implying some reflection on the council of Chalcedon. Ephrem of Antioch did not do it till he was threatened with expulsion from his see. Peter of Jerusalem also made his objections, but nevertheless complied with the imperial requisition, and many entered their protests against the subscription. The bishops who complied were rewarded, and they who persisted in refusing to do so were banished. Zoilus bishop of Alexandria complained afterwards to the pope, that he also had been compelled to subscribe.

These compulsive measures had less effect in the West. Four hundred bishops in Africa could not by any means be brought to condemn, as they declared, persons who were dead; especially considering that in condemning them they might, in effect, approve of Eutychianism; and they remonstrated on the subject to the emperor.

The pope, Vigilius, was by no means disposed to join with the emperor in these violent measures. Being at Constantinople, he refused for some time to communicate with the patriarch Mennas, because he had concurred in the condemnation of the three chapters. He even passed a sentence of condemnation against the empress and the Acephali.

At length, however, being hard pressed, he was induced to join in the condemnation of the three chapters; but, as he added, "without prejudice to the council of Chalcedon," and he charged all persons to forbear discussing the subject by speaking or writing.

This conduct of the pope gave no satisfaction to either of the two parties, and gave great offence to the advocates for the three chapters, who were very numerous, and even to some of his own clergy, especially Rusticus and Sebastian, who maintained, in a publication on the subject, that the pope had abandoned the council of Chalcedon. The pope, however, acted with spirit on the occasion, and in a strong remonstrance, in which he charged those two presbyters with gross inconsistency, he pronounced them excommunicated.

The advocates for the three chapters in the mean time were not inactive. For they held a council in Illyricum in A. D. 550, in which they condemned their enemies, and addressed a letter to the emperor. The year following the bishops of Africa proceeded still farther; and being assembled in council, they excommunicated pope Vigilius, as having condemned the three chapters.

After the pope had published his piece, which he intitled *Justificatum*, Facundus, a distinguished African bishop, then also at Constantinople, wrote

in

in defence of the three chapters, addressing his work to the emperor. In it he defended every article in all the three chapters at great length, and admonished the emperor not to interfere in ecclesiastical matters, as the emperor Zeno had done by his *henoticon*, which was the occasion of much disturbance in the church. The emperor, however, paid no regard to this well meant and sensible admonition, but continued to employ more of his time in adjusting ecclesiastical controversies than in the great business of the war, which, under the conduct of the great Belisarius, he was at that time carrying on in Italy.

The pope, sensible of the offence that he had given by his *Justificatum*, and perceiving the attachment of the Western bishops to the three chapters, urged the emperor to call a general council, which, without any regard to what had passed, should decide upon the question, and that in the mean time all private discussion of it should be suspended. To this proposal he acceded, and the pope formally withdrew his *Justificatum*.

Notwithstanding the imperial prohibition, not to discuss the question of the three chapters, the pope was strongly urged to join the Greeks in the condemnation of them, even tho' the bishops of Africa, Illyricum, and Dalmatia refused to do it; and persisting in his refusal so much open violence

was used to him, that he thought it necessary to take refuge under the altar in the church; and from this sanctuary he was dragged by his hair, beard, and feet. In the struggle some of the pillars of the altar were broken, so that the holy table would have fallen upon him, but that some of the clergy supported it, and at length the people, rushing into the church, put an end to the indecent contest.

In consequence of this violence, the pope prepared a sentence of condemnation against Theodore of Cæsarea, the author of the disturbance in A. D. 551; tho' it was not to be published but in case of farther violence, or his own death. After this, a kind of treaty was entered into between the pope and his adversaries; but not being observed, and fearing farther violence, the pope made his escape from the place of his residence, by getting over a wall, and flying to Chalcedon, where he took refuge in the church of St. Euphemia. From this asylum the emperor was desirous of drawing him; but he refused, and the clergy of Italy, taking his part, drew up a spirited remonstrance on the occasion. At length Theodore made satisfaction to the pope, still confined at Chalcedon, by declaring his acceptance of the four general councils, and Mennas and the other principal bishops of the East joined in this acknowledgment.

At length, in A. D. 555, the council, for which so great preparation had been made, was held at Constantinople. At the first session, or conference, there were one hundred and fifty-one bishops, among whom were only five from Africa, and no other from any part of the West. The issue of this council, as of all the preceding, might have been conjectured from the manner in which it was opened by Theodore, on the part of the emperor, explaining the motives of his conduct. He observed that “the Nestorians, no longer able to boast of Nestorius himself, had introduced his master, Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had advanced blasphemies even worse than his, as also the impious writings of Theodoret against Cyril, and the detestable letter of Ibas, pretending that it had been approved by the council of Chalcedon, which” he added, “they did, not for the sake of defending that council, but that under its authority they might defend their own impiety. To oppose this design,” he said, “the emperor had first consulted them at their respective sees; but since, notwithstanding, there were those who still persisted in maintaining those three impious chapters, he had convened them that they might declare their joint opinion. Pope Vigilius,” he said, “had condemned those chapters several times, as also Rufinus, and Sebastian, who had once defend-

“ed”

“ ed them ;” and he concluded with saying, that  
 “ they who deferred giving their opinion would  
 “ be considered as renouncing the profession of the  
 “ truth, and that they who should answer most  
 “ readily would be most agreeable to God.” This  
 speech was a sufficient indication of the disposition  
 of the emperor, if it had not been known before ;  
 and therefore judging from the history of former  
 councils, it was easy to foresee what would be the  
 issue of this.

The pope, tho’ then in Constantinople, and  
 also some bishops of Illyricum, declined attending  
 this council, alledging that there were too few  
 bishops from the West, and said that they would  
 give their opinions separately afterwards. The  
 Eastern bishops, therefore, sat without them.

At the first session some writings of Theodore  
 of Mopsuestia were read, as particularly objection-  
 able, and it must be acknowledged that they favour  
 strongly not only of Nestorianism, but of down-  
 right unitarianism. In them it was advanced,  
 that “ when Thomas said, *My Lord and my God*,  
 “ he did not mean Christ, but God the Father,  
 “ whom he praised for raising up Christ ; that per-  
 “ sons are baptized into the name of Christ as the  
 “ Israelites were into that of Moses ; that Christ  
 “ being the image of God, is to be honoured as  
 “ the image of a prince is honoured ; that he is

“ the adopted son of God, as other persons are ;  
 “ that the 21st and 68th psalms did not refer to  
 “ Christ but to David, and that the angels attend-  
 “ ed upon Christ as the friend of God.” On the  
 bare recital of those passages, without any discus-  
 sion of them, all the bishops cried out aloud  
 “ *Anathema to Theodore and his writings.* This  
 “ is contrary to the church, contrary to the faith,  
 “ this is impiety. One Theodore, one Judas.”

They prefaced this decree of condemnation  
 with observing, that, since the followers of Nesto-  
 rius supported their impiety by the authority of  
 these three chapters, they were assembled to pre-  
 vent that abuse. “ by the will of God, and the  
 “ command of the emperor.” In fine, they con-  
 demned all the three chapters in the strongest  
 terms, anathematizing the writers of them, and all  
 their defenders. No person appeared in defence  
 of any of the three chapters, or opposed Theodore  
 of Cæsarea in any thing, so that the decree of this  
 council cannot be considered as any thing else  
 than the act of the emperor. This council began  
 its sittings on the 4th of May, and ended the 2d  
 of June the same year.

After the first day’s session, the pope gave his  
 opinion, in a writing entitled *Constitutum*, address-  
 ed to the emperor, in which he joined the bishops  
 of the council in their condemnation of the *writings*  
 of

of Theodore, but not in that of his *person*, as being dead, which he maintained to be contrary to the custom of the church. He observed the same distinction with respect to Theodoret and Ibas. Sixteen bishops subscribed this writing of the pope, and also three deacons of the church of Rome. But the emperor was so much offended at this conduct of the pope, that he ordered his name to be struck out of the diptics of the church of Constantinople; observing, however, that he preserved his union with the Apostolic see.

The pope had not the firmness to continue his opposition; but being borne down by the violence of the court, he acknowledged that he had done wrong in absenting himself from the council; and he even signed his condemnation of the writers of the three chapters, and the defenders of them, as well as of the writings themselves; retracting whatever he had ever said or done in their defence. Having done this to gratify the emperor, he obtained of him, in return, a large constitution in favour of Italy, confirming all the donations that had been made to the church of Rome by Alaric and others.

The reception this council met with shews in what light such assemblies of bishops were considered; for it was of the same extent as the authority of the emperor, who directed its proceedings.

ings. It was received by all the bishops of the East, except Alexander of Abyla, who for his contumacy was deposed. But in the West, which was farther removed from the seat of power, many openly rejected this council, thinking that its decrees affected those of the council of Chalcedon, and the variations in the opinion of the pope contributed not a little to weaken his authority in this case. This diversity of opinion in the West occasioned a schism which continued more than a hundred years. The deacon Rusticus even wrote against the decrees of this council, and for this he was banished to Thebais. Thither he was accompanied by several persons from Africa, where, as we have seen, many had entertained sentiments unfavourable to this council. Facundus, persisting in his defence of the three chapters, was also banished. There were other schismatics in Gaul, in Illyricum, and in Ireland.

Pope Pelagius, who succeeded Vigilius, punished the schismatics of Italy by means of Narses, who governed there for the emperor; and it is curious to observe in what manner he thought to escape the charge of *persecution* on this account. Writing to Narses on the subject, he exhorted him not to be moved by the “vain discourses of those who say that the church persecutes, when it only punishes crimes, and seeks the salvation  
“ of

“ of souls. They only persecute,” he says, “ who  
“ compel to do what is evil. But schism is an  
“ evil, which ought to be repressed by the secular  
“ power; and whoever is separated from the  
“ apostolic see is unquestionably in schism.” He  
therefore desired him to send all who were refract-  
ory to the emperor; for that schismatics ought to  
be punished, not only with exile, but by confisca-  
tion of goods and severe imprisonment. The  
schismatics, however, were so far from being inti-  
midated by these rigorous proceedings, that they  
excommunicated even Narses himself.

The bishops of Sulcany were so much dissa-  
tisfied with the conduct of the pope on this occa-  
sion, that they struck his name out of the diptychs  
of their churches, which was a virtual excommuni-  
cation of him. And this spirited conduct of theirs  
seems to have made some impression on him; for  
in a letter which he addressed to them on the oc-  
casion, he gave a confession of his faith, which he  
concluded with saying, that “ he honoured as ca-  
“ tholic the venerable bishops Theodoret and  
“ Ibas.” He also sent a confession of his faith,  
with an account of the controversy, to king Chil-  
debert in Gaul.

The bishops of Istria, with Elias patriarch of  
Aquileia at their head, being particularly obstinate  
in this schism, pope Pelagius addressed three let-

tiers to them; but it was without effect. Afterwards the exarch compelled the successor of Elias to enter into communion with John of Ravenna, who condemned the three chapters; but the people and the other bishops were so offended at their conduct, that they considered them as apostates. The schism in Istria continued to the time of Gregory the Great. This pope who took great pains to put an end to it, held a council at Rome, for the purpose in A. D. 591, and particularly invited the bishop of Aquileia to attend it. But the bishops of the province held a separate council, when they wrote to the emperor, referring themselves to his judgment, but refusing that of the pope, as a party in the cause. Maurice was then emperor, and he was so much moved by this letter, that he intreated the pope not to give them any molestation till Italy should be at peace. Some persons, however, in Istria abandoned the schism, and Gregory wrote in their favour to the exarch, and the bishop of Ravenna, to prevent their suffering in consequence of it; which implies that the country in general were favourers of this schism.

Theodelinda wife of Agilulf king of the Lombards in Italy was so zealous in favour of the three chapters, that because Constantius, bishop of Milan, did not expressly take the same part, she separated from his communion, and three of his  
bishops

bishops joined her in it. Pope Gregory, writing to her on this question, and merely mentioning the *fifth general council*, which had condemned the three chapters, Constantius did not even think proper to present the letter; and in consequence the pope wrote another letter, in which he made no mention at all of it; so far did this great pope think it necessary to temporize in this business. Farther than this, when the bishops and citizens of Brescia required Constantius to declare that he had never condemned the three chapters, the pope advised him to do what his predecessors had done before him, and abide by it; but, to satisfy the people, he wished him to declare that he did not deviate from the council of Chalcedon.

It appears from the letters of Gregory, that there were schismatics also in Gaul, who withdrew from the communion of the church, on the pretence of adhering to the council of Chalcedon. Syangrius of Autun, who was sent to Rome to receive the pallium from the pope, with the recommendation of the king, was of this number.

At length, in A. D. 603, Firmus bishop of Istria renounced the schism, and wrote to pope Gregory to acknowledge it, notwithstanding the utmost endeavours of Severus bishop of Grada to prevent it. Maximus bishop of Salonæ renounced the schism in A. D. 599. It appears there were

some remains of this schism in the church of Aquileia in A. D. 606, one of the bishops of that diocese, named John, being supposed to defend the three chapters. Also Agrestus, who separated from the monks of St. Columban, went into this schism.

---

### SECTION III.

#### *The History of Arianism in this Period.*

WE have seen that almost all the barbarous nations bordering on the Roman empire were converted to christianity by unitarians, or Arians, especially the latter, when they were sent into banishment by the orthodox emperors. This was the case with the Vandals, who, after traversing Gaul and Spain, seized upon a great part of Africa. Unfortunately these Arians, having been persecuted by the Catholics, became persecutors in their turn. This, at least, appears to have been the case with Genferic, the first king of the Vandals in Africa, and his successors. For other Arian princes, we shall find, were remarkably tolerant.

Genferic began with forbidding the ordination of any Catholic clergy in the Proconular province,

vince, and in Zeugitana, so that from being sixty-four in number, they were, at the end of thirty years, reduced to three. He then obliged the Catholic clergy to deliver up their sacred vessels, and their books. He also allowed none but Arians to attend upon himself, or any of his children, and at length he shut up the Catholic church at Carthage, and banished the clergy: for at that time there was no bishop of the place.

This prince dying in A. D. 477, was succeeded by his son Huneric, who at first behaved towards the Catholics with much moderation; but afterwards became a most cruel persecutor of them, and not of them only, but also of the Manicheans, many of whom he caused to be burned, and others banished. The behaviour of the Catholics, however, furnished some excuse for this severity of Huneric. For the Catholic church of Carthage having been without a bishop twenty-four years, he permitted the ordination of another, at the request of the emperor Zeno, on condition that the Arians in his empire might have the liberty of exercising their religion, than which nothing certainly could be more reasonable. Notwithstanding this, the Catholics replied that on those terms they chose rather to have no bishops, but leave the government of the church to Jesus Christ. The commissary, however, took no notice of their protest,

protest, and Eugenius, who had distinguished himself by his exemplary conduct, particularly by his charities, was appointed bishop, to the great joy of the Catholics, especially the young people, who had never seen any bishop in that see.

Lest any of the Vandals should attend divine service in the Catholic church, it was ordered that no person in any other habit than that of a Roman, should be present; and to enforce this order, persons were appointed to attend at the door, who were directed to tear the clothes of, and otherwise abuse, those who attempted to enter in disobedience to it. In the next place, he took away the pensions of the Catholics who were about the court, and obliged them to perform harvest work, and other laborious services in the country. He then discharged all Catholics from serving in any public office, and banished them to Sicily and Sardinia. He ordered that the goods of the Catholic bishops should be confiscated after their deaths, and that no person should be chosen to succeed them till they had paid a large fine. But apprehending that the Arian bishops in Thrace, and other places, would be treated in the same manner, he revoked this order. At length, however, he banished all the Catholic bishops to the number of four thousand nine hundred and seventy-six, without any regard to the age, or the infirmi-

firmities of many of them. Those who either would not, or could not, go, he ordered to be sent into the desert; and previous to this they were all assembled at Sicca, and Lasea, and put into a close prison, where they were subjected to the most distressing and disgusting inconveniencies. After this they were driven, like so many beasts, into the desert, where they had for some time an allowance of barley, but it was afterwards withdrawn.

At length, in A. D. 483, the king sent notice to the bishop Eugenius, that finding that many, contrary to his order, had celebrated the Lords supper in the country possessed by the Vandals, to their seduction, with the consent of his own bishops, he ordered him to prepare for a public disputation on the subject of their differences. The Catholics, foreseeing that this measure was only a prelude to some farther persecution, wished to decline it, but proposed that, if it should take place, they might be assisted by the Catholic bishops of other countries. To this the king paid no regard; but on the contrary he took occasion to banish several of the most learned of the Catholic bishops in Africa.

On the first of February, the day appointed for the conference, ten persons were chosen on each side to conduct it. Various difficulties arising, the Catholics gave in a confession of their faith, with

with the reasons on which it was founded. This was on the 20th of April. But instead of any other answer, the king, after complaining of their behaviour, made an order that every thing belonging to the churches of the Catholics, or to the bishops, should be given to the Arian clergy. He gave them to the first of June to make their submission, and after that he banished them from Carthage, stripped of every thing belonging to them, and with a prohibition to every body to supply them with necessaries. In this distress they applied to the king in person; but instead of giving any attention to them, he ordered his horsemen to disperse them, and several old and infirm people were wounded. After this they were ordered to meet some commissioners from the king, who informed them that, if they would take an oath to maintain the succession of the next heir to the crown, and not write to their friends in other countries, they should have their churches and houses restored to them. For, having been in power, it was highly probable that they had corresponded with the popes, and the emperors, in order to bring about a revolution, and of course a change in their favour. Those, however, who took this oath were sent into the country to cultivate the ground like slaves, and the rest were banished to Corfica, to cut wood for ship building. The per-

persecution then became avowed, and general; and it was conducted with all the cruelty with which the Heathens had acted towards the Christians, neither age nor sex being spared. It is to be observed, however, that we have no account of this persecution except from the Catholics.

Among those who were banished on this occasion, was Vigilus of Thapsus, who wrote many things in the name of Athanasius, and others of the Christian fathers on account, as he alledged, of his situation, not daring to write in his own name. Those writings of his under borrowed names long passed for the production of an earlier age, especially the famous *creed* which he ascribed to Athanasius, and which still bears his name. Vigilus, however, going to Constantinople, wrote in his own name against Eutychianism.

Among other barbarities exercised on those African Catholics, the king ordered the tongues of some of them to be cut out. But it is said that, notwithstanding this, they continued to speak as well as ever. Victor of Vita, who relates this, says "If any person will not believe this, let him go to Constantinople, where he may see one of them, Reparatus, a subdeacon, who now speaks without difficulty, and who is on this account held in great honour by the emperor Zeno."

Considering the many miraculous circumstances, evidently fabulous, that are inserted into the account of this persecution, this particular circumstance would not be entitled to any credit, had not a Platonic philosopher, Æneas of Gaza, said that he himself had seen these martyrs, and heard them speak; and that he wondered not only that they should be able to speak, but even to live. This, however, must be an exaggeration, for if they had had no part of the tongue left, they could not have had the power of swallowing, and therefore without a constant miracle must have died; and as this philosopher did not see them till long after the operation, they might have acquired some power of articulation with a very little tongue. The narrative adds, that two of these confessors having had to do with a common prostitute, lost the power of speaking; and that one of them, who had never spoken from his birth, even when he had a tongue, began to speak after it was cut out. Such an account as this certainly does not add to the credibility of the story.

I have omitted the mention of many improbable circumstances in the relation of this persecution; but I shall notice one, as, like the rest, it may shew us in what light other particulars in the narrative may be considered. Seven monks were ordered to be put into a vessel filled with small dry wood,

wood, to which fire was to be set when they were at sea. But it was found impossible to fire this wood. The king, it is said, seeing this, and being in a rage at it, ordered their heads to be broken with a bar of iron, and their bodies to be thrown into the sea.

After so evident a miracle in favour of those martyrs, it is not to be believed that even a Heathen persecutor would have persisted in his purpose. Had Jesus actually descended from the cross, and presented himself before the Jewish rulers, they surely would not have made any other attempt on his life.

A famine and a plague with which Africa was afflicted was considered as a divine judgment on account of this persecution, and so was the death of Huneric in A. D. 485; his body being eaten of worms and falling in pieces, which, it is something remarkable, was the case of several other persecutors. The emperor Zeno sent an embassy to Huneric on the subject of this persecution, but without any good effect.

This persecution ceased on the succession of Gontamond. He recalled from exile Eugenius bishop of Carthage. In the third year of his reign he restored to the Catholics of that city the burying ground of St. Agileus, and in his tenth year he allowed the opening of all their churches. His

brother Trafamond, who succeeded him in A. D. 496, endeavoured to gain the Catholics by rewards; but this not answering his purpose, he forbade the election of bishops to their vacant sees. Little regard, however, was paid to this order; and among others Fulgentius was ordained bishop of Ruspé, but he was immediately banished to Sardinia. After this the king sent for him, and proposed to him some difficulties, and tho' he gave the king no satisfaction, the Catholics of Carthage triumphed not a little on the occasion. The king sending him other queries, he answered them in a treatise which is still extant. After this he was remanded to the place of his exile.

On the death of Trafamond in A. D. 523, his successor, Hulderic, recalled all the Catholic bishops, and permitted them to open their churches. They were received with great joy by their Catholic friends, and especially Fulgentius.

The Catholics had little reason to complain of persecution to which they were always sufficiently inclined themselves, and when the Donatists recovered their liberty under the Vandals, it gave them great offence. The emperor Justin having ordered all their churches to be taken from the Arians, Theodoric king of Italy threatened to treat the Catholics in the same manner, and obliged the pope, who was his subject, to go in person

son to the emperor at Constantinople, to get the order revoked, which he did, and succeeded.

On this occasion, as well as on many others, religion was too often made a pretence for political measures. Clovis king of France made war on Alaric a Gothic king in Spain, with a view, as he said, to extirpate Arianism; but no doubt to enlarge his dominions.

The Vandal princes were not, however, the only Arian persecutors of the Catholics. Evaric, the Gothic king of Spain, persecuted them, forbidding to ordain any bishops in the place of those who were deceased. He also banished some of them, so that many of their churches went to ruin. Levigild, king of the Visigoths in Spain, was exceedingly provoked that his son Hermenigild was made a Catholic by his wife. He banished, and put to death, many Catholics; and at length proceeded to this extremity with his son, after promising him his life, but without effect, if he would consent to receive the communion at the hands of an Arian bishop. He also persecuted the Suevi who inhabited Galicia on their becoming Catholics. Afterwards he repented of the murder of his son, whom he did not long survive, and even became a Catholic himself. He durst not, however, acknowledge it, for fear of his subjects. But his son and successor Ricared,

openly avowed himself a Catholic, and the conversion of the whole nation followed soon after. Thus ended the reign of Arianism in Spain.

Ricared became a Catholic, held a council at Toledo in A. D. 589, in which the king and all the bishops solemnly abjured all heresy, acknowledging the authority of all the general councils, and expressly rejecting the decrees of a former council held at the same place; and that at Rimini in Italy. And whereas the Arian bishops had been married, this was on this occasion forbidden to the Catholics. At a council held at Narbonne in Gaul, where were several of the same bishops who attended this council of Toledo, it was ordered that, after the recitation of every psalm in the public worship, the *gloria Patri* &c. should be sung, as a profession of faith, against Arianism. This was universally adopted by the Catholics, and it is in the liturgy of the church of England to this day.

In general it is acknowledged that the Arian princes were tolerant. Odoacer shewed the Catholics of Italy all possible indulgence, and so did Theodoric after him. Had he been a Catholic himself, he could not have behaved to the bishops and clergy of Rome with more equity and generosity. Also, while Trasamond was persecuting the Catholics in Africa, Alaic king of the Visigoths

goths in Spain, tho' an Arian, treated them with the greatest humanity.

It is remarkable that, tho' all the nations that conquered, and settled in, the Roman empire were at that time Arians, they all afterwards, chiefly by the influence of the popes, became Catholics; and it is no less remarkable, that in many of the cases women were the chief instruments in effecting the change.

In A. D. 516 Gondebold, the Arian king of the Burgundians, was succeeded by his son Sigismund, and he was converted to the Catholic faith by Avitus bishop of Vienne. In A. D. 562 the Suevi of Spain became Catholics. In A. D. 591 Theodelinda the wife of Agiluf king of the Lombards in Italy, converted her husband; and eventually all Lombardy became Catholic.

Tho' these northern conquerors are in general called Arians by historians, it is evident that there were many proper unitarians among them; and for any thing that certainly appears, the majority may have been such. Of the Burgundians, whom St. Patient took much pains to bring over to the Catholic faith, it is expressly said that they were *Photinians*. Also Chilperic king of the Franks was a Sabellian. This prince made an order that, instead of the term *trinity*, the word *God*, without any hint of distinction of persons, should be used.

But being opposed by Gregory of Tours, and other bishops, he dropped that design.

When these kings found it convenient to become Catholics, the people did not always follow their example; and when we consider the sensible reasoning of the Arians on the subject, we cannot but be satisfied that the conversions were not the effect of argument. When Avitus addressed Gondobald king of the Burgundians, and exhorted him to return, as he said, "to the law of God," and that then he would have peace with all his enemies, he replied "Because I will not acknowledge three Gods, you say I will not acknowledge the law of God. I never read in the scriptures that there are more gods than one." When he afterwards became a Catholic, he durst not make open profession of his faith, tho' urged to it by Avitus, for fear of his people, who were still zealous Arians.

---

#### SECTION IV.

*The History of the Monks in this Period.*

WE have seen in former periods of this History what deep root the principles of the monkish system had taken in the minds of the generality of Christians. Unfortunately, they had learned

learned of the Heathens that they were to recommend themselves to the deity by austerity, and abstract contemplation; that by these methods they attained the highest pitch of excellence to which human nature could arrive, every other attainment being of far inferior value. On those principles many thousand persons, in all Christian countries, had secluded themselves from the world, and consequently from all the duties of social life, to employ themselves in prayer and meditation, and in circumstances in which life could barely be supported; thinking that the soul was elevated and refined by the mortification of the body.

But hitherto this business had not been reduced to any uniform plan. They who adopted the monkish life, tho' they retired from the world, mixed with it again whenever they thought proper, and voluntarily conformed to whatever mode of living they most approved, and these were very various. This continued to be the case in the East; but in the West we now find a more regular system adopted, the monks binding themselves by solemn oaths to devote their whole lives to their profession, to conform to a system of rules, and to obey a superior. In consequence, too, of the monks forming themselves into more regular bodies, under a few heads, we shall find them acquire more influence, and gradually obtaining ex-

emptions from the authority of the bishops in whose dioceses they lived, tho' as yet this was little compared to what they obtained in later periods.

This change in the affairs of the monks was made by *Benedict*, and his rules being universally adopted in the West, it may be proper to give some account of the man, and his previous history.

Benedict was born in A. D. 480, of a good family, at Nursia in Italy, and educated at Rome. Being offended at the wickedness of the times, he passed three years in retirement, unknown to any person, except one Romanus, who supplied him with viſuals, while he lived in a cavern in a rock. By degrees, however, he became known to the neighbours, who supplied his wants, and received his instructions. His fame extending itself, many persons put themselves under his conduct; and for some time he undertook the charge of a monastery at Vicovarro. But the monks not liking his severe discipline, he left them, and went back to his former retirement. Becoming more and more distinguished, he built twelve monasteries, each consisting of twelve monks, and a superior. At length, however, giving way to the envy of a priest, whose name was Florentius, he abandoned all his monasteries, and removing from place to place, came at last to mount Cassin in the country of the antient Samnites, on the declivity of which  
there

there was a small town. Here he demolished an antient temple of Apollo, to whom the people then offered sacrifices, and built two oratories, one to St. Martin, and the other to St. John; and in A. D. 529 he founded there the monastery which was afterwards so famous. The following is an abstract of Benedict's principal rules.

He had fixed times for public prayers, and they varied with the seasons of the year. One of these times was in the night, as well as early in the morning. At these meetings for prayer the psalter was recited every week, which he thought very moderate, as he said their fathers repeated the whole every day with fervour. After these public prayers each monk prayed by himself, and the time that was not spent in prayer was employed in working or reading; and he ordered that there should be seven hours for working, and two for reading, every day. If the harvest required it, they worked more hours. The work was not, however, left to their choice, but was enjoined by the superior; and from the nature of this work it appears that the majority of Benedict's monks were artisans; and those of better condition among them were required to employ themselves as the rest did.

With respect to their diet, they were not allowed either flesh meat or fish, but they were not forbidden a moderate use of wine. They all per-

formed the servile offices of the family, such as preparing the victuals in their turns. Their dress was that of the poorer people of the country, without any regard to the colour or length of their garments ; but they had them out of a common stock at the discretion of the superior.

All the monks slept in separate beds, ten or twenty in the same room, or dormitory, in each of which was one elderly person to observe the conduct of the rest ; and that they might always be able to attend the public prayers, they slept in their clothes. No speaking was allowed in the dormitory, and but little in the course of the day. Nothing of recreation is mentioned in Benedict's institute ; but after supper, while the rest of the monks were seated, one person read to them in the lives of the saints, or some other book of edification. These original Benedictines were all of the laity, Benedict himself not being in orders, tho' he preached. If any priest joined them, he was to be subject to the same rules with the other monks, except that he was seated next to the Abbot. They received the communion only on Sundays. They had no occasion to learn Latin, as that was still the vulgar tongue in Italy.

If any monk went out of the monastery, which could not be done without leave from the abbot, he

he was forbidden to speak of any thing that was transacted without it.

Strangers were received into the monastery, and treated with great hospitality ; and for this purpose the abbot had a table separate from that of the monks.

The abbot was chosen by the monks, though sometimes the neighbouring bishops interfered, to prevent an improper choice ; and when he was chosen, he was ordained by the bishop of the diocese. He might consult with the monks, but all the power was in his own hands. Under the abbot was a prior, and several deans, each having the inspection of ten monks. These were appointed by the abbot, and were not independent on him ; as the in other monasteries. There were also other officers, as in other great families.

A novice was not received till after a year's probation, and upon admission he surrendered every thing that he was worth to the monastery, or to the poor.

These rules were so much approved, that they were adopted by all the monks of the West. As the religious life of Benedict began, so it ended, with the superstition of the times. When he found himself on the point of death, he caused himself to be carried into the church, and expired there.

There

There were in these, and especially in later times, many other examples of this superstition.

Among those who distinguished themselves as founders of monasteries in this period, were J. Gildas of Scotland, and S. Columban from Ireland. Gildas was born A. D. 484, and preached in the northern parts of Great Britain, then in Ireland, whence he passed into Gaul, where he established himself near the city of Vannes, and built the monastery which still bears his name, and of which in after times the famous Abelard was abbot.

Columban went from Ireland to preach to the northern Picts, but before this he erected a monastery at Dermach which became very famous, and another of still greater celebrity at Ily or Iler in the north of Ireland. In these monasteries Easter was not celebrated in the manner of the church of Rome. He lived thirty-four years after he left Ireland, and died A. D. 598.

S. Gal, the companion of Columban, established a monastery which was called after his name in Swisserland, and was afterwards very famous. The abbots of it erected it into a sovereignty, which continues to this day, and it is confederated with the Swiss cantons. *Sueur*, A. D. 612.

The most distinguished of the monks in the East in this period was Sabas, the great and active supporter of the Catholic faith. He found-  
ed

ed several monasteries in Palestine, the rules of which he left in writing. He was famous for his austerities and his miracles ; but the truth of them is rendered suspicious by the manner in which they are recorded by his panegyrist St. Cyril, who wrote his life. Ib. A. D. 530.

The first monastery for women, called in English *nunneries*, was founded in this period by queen Radegonda at Poitiers. She made her sister Agnes the abbess, and the institution was confirmed at the second council of Tours A. D. 567, when an anathema was pronounced against any who should leave the monastery, or those who should marry any of the women who entered it. Before this many young women had made vows of chastity, but they had lived with their parents, attended public worship in the churches, and even received visitors, only distinguishing themselves by a veil, which was given them by the bishop of the place. Ib. A. D. 567.

Fleury, in his observations on the state of monkery in this period, in which the monks worked, but did not beg, when they were subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese, and did not make a distinct order of men, says that " their life was the model of Christian perfection." Vol. 8. p. vi. This shews how far his ideas were from the genuine standard of Christianity. No doubt  
much

much more reasonable maxims prevailed in this period than such as were adopted in later, and more corrupt, times. In all the monasteries the article of labour was more or less attended to. At the second council of Seville, A. D. 619, the monks were enjoined to work six hours in the day, and to read three. Their work was for their own subsistence, as well as for the poor. It was chiefly, however, in the garden, while the slaves were employed in the more laborious works of husbandry and building, &c.

It is evident from the accounts we have of the discipline of monasteries in this period, that there were great disorders in many of them; many persons being admitted who were by no means prepared for that mode of life. To correct these disorders recourse was had to corporal punishment; and among other punishments that of flagellation seems to have been most common. In the rule of St. Columban the usual discipline was six strokes of the whip for light offences, and for others in proportion, as far as two hundred, tho' never more than twenty-five at one time. Sometimes the monks were enjoined silence, or extraordinary fasting, but very frequently the repetition of certain psalms.

Some care, however, was taken to prevent the introduction of improper persons into monasteries, and

and more especially nunneries. At the council of Agde in A. D. 506, women were forbidden to take the veil under forty years of age. The emperor Maurice made a law forbidding soldiers to become monks, probably supposing that it usually arose from a desire to change a laborious and hazardous life for an idle and secure one. But pope Gregory did not approve of the regulation. Writing to him on the subject, he says that "by that means" he would shut the gates of heaven to many persons: for that numbers could not be saved without quitting the world altogether." This shews how prevalent were false rules of Christian duty in this period.

The number of monks we have seen to have been very great in the preceding periods of this history, but from the increasing superstition, and the increasing violence, of the times, which led many to retire from the world, their numbers were more considerable in this. Mention is made of not less than three thousand and five hundred in two lauras, or places appendant to monasteries at Scetis. (*Fleury* Vol. 8. p. 243.) and it appears from the letters of pope Gregory, that in A. D. 599, there were near three thousand monks in Rome only.

Sacred as monasteries were generally considered in these times, they often suffered greatly from the depredations of their neighbours, especially of the  
Heath-

Heathens. The monasteries of the East were laid waste in the Persian war in the time of Heraclius, and in A. D. 577 the monastery at mount Cassin was plundered, and broken up by the Lombards. As monasteries became wealthy, they were often too tempting an object to Christian princes and lords in those times. On this subject we shall find many complaints in the subsequent periods of this history.

Tho' M. Fleury praises the state of monkery in this period, from the monks not being exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, it was only so in general. In A. D. 599, at the request of the patriarch Theodore, who resigned the church of Constantinople, the monastery to which he retired was exempted from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, except that of the church of Constantinople. In the third council of Arles, A. D. 461, assembled to determine a dispute between the bishop of the diocese and the monastery of Lerins, it was settled that the clergy and ministers of the altar should be ordained by the bishop; but that the laity of the monastery should not be subject to any jurisdiction besides that of the abbot.

Monks, and especially those of the clerical order, were not so strictly confined to their monasteries in this period but that, at the call of the prince, they would quit them. For we read that

Clo-

Clothaire demanded of his bishop Sulpicius to do the duty of abbé in his army, which implies that monks were usually employed by him there.

That, in general, monasteries were well conducted in this period, and favourable to such kind of piety as was held in veneration at this time, I have no doubt. But these places of retreat from the world, did not even then exclude ambition, and even such as prompted to gross violence, especially when persons of rank were members of them. This is evident from the following account given by Fleury from Gregory of Tours.

Chrodilde daughter of king Cherebert, was member of the monastery of the holy cross in Poitiers, when Lebouere was abbess. In order to drive her from the place, and become abbess herself, she engaged in her interest her cousin Basire, daughter of king Chilperic, and left the monastery with forty other nuns, notwithstanding the endeavours of bishop Merowee to detain them. The complaint they made was that they were not treated as became the daughters of kings; but as slaves; and they likewise accused their abbess of several crimes. Having quitted the monastery, they travelled on foot in the month of February A. D. 589, and in very bad weather. They were, however, persuaded to wait till the next summer at Tours, where they arrived the first of March. Then applying

plying to king Gontram, he appointed an assembly of bishops to judge of the affair. They not coming, Chrodielde and her companions returned to Poitiers, and assembling a company of robbers, and debauched people, fortified themselves in the church of St. Hilary, and declared they would not return to the nunnery till the abbess was expelled. So far were they from paying any regard to the remonstrances of the bishops in the neighbourhood, who pronounced a sentence of excommunication against them, that the banditti, entering the church in which they were assembled, knocked them down on the pavement, and broke the heads of some other clergymen who were present on the occasion; so that they were obliged to fly as well as they could.

After this Chrodielde seized upon the lands of the monastery, threatening that if she could get into the place, she would throw the abbess over the wall. The rigour of the next winter obliged these rebellious nuns to separate, when Chrodielde and Basire quarrelled, the latter saying that she was a princess as well as herself.

The year following, in A. D. 590, Chrodielde; always surrounded with her troop of banditti, ordered them to enter the monastery by night, and drag the abbess out. She, having the gout, could only get herself conveyed into the church, and  
thither

thither the banditti followed her with torches and arms ; but some friends of the abbess extinguishing the torches, they could not find her. The next morning, however, they seized her, and put her in prison ; and the night following they plundered the monastery, leaving nothing that they could carry away.

Being again threatened by the bishops, Chrodielde again assembled her banditti, and ordered them to kill the abbess, if any attempt should be made to rescue her by force. However, she was rescued, and took refuge in the church of St. Hilary. But the sedition continued, and some murders were committed even before the shrine of the holy cross.

At length, by the interference of the princes, these banditti were overpowered, and brought to punishment, some having their hands cut off, and others their noses. And the bishops being once more assembled on this occasion, all the complaints of Chrodielde and Basire were declared to be groundless. Yet when they were ordered to make their submission, and were threatened with excommunication till they should do it, they haughtily refused, and still threatened to kill the abbess. The bishops, therefore, pronounced the sentence of excommunication. This measure had, at length, the desired effect ; for both these ladies made their

submission at the council of Metz, and obtained absolution. This history will serve to give some idea of the disorders of those times, with respect to civil as well as religious matters.

Austerity being now considered as essential to Christian perfection, several persons went far beyond the monks in this respect; and as a view of the extravagancies of the human mind has its use, I shall in this place relate some instances of it that occurred in this period; observing, however, that I do not vouch for the literal truth of every part of the narrative, tho' seemingly pretty well attested, considering that the accounts are from friends.

The most antient of these lovers of mortification that I shall mention is James the Syrian. He lived on a mountain, at a small distance from the city of Cyr, well known by Theodoret having been bishop of that place. He passed all his time in the open air, exposed to all the inclemency of the weather, sometimes burning in the sun, and sometimes found buried under the snow. Under his clothes he had heavy chains of iron. He did not make any use of fire, even to dress his victuals, which were only pulse and water.

Another was Baradat, who after living some time in a hut, ascended a rock, where he shut himself up in a kind of box, in which he could just stand upright, but exposed to the weather. After-

terwards he lived in the open air, with his hands continually stretched towards heaven, and so covered with a skin, that only his eyes and nose were visible.

But the most celebrated person in this way was Simeon, surnamed the *Stylite*, of whom a slight mention was made in the preceding part of this work, and who got that appellation from living on a pillar at a considerable distance from the ground. After living two years in one monastery, and ten in another, where he went beyond all his companions in his austerities, eating only twice a week, and distinguished by other mortifications, some of which are without the bounds of credibility, especially his pretended fast of forty days, in imitation of Moses and Christ (which it is, however, said that he repeated every year for twenty years together) he went to pass his whole time upon a pillar, at first six feet high, eating only once a week, and not at all during lent. He had no covering but a skin, which reached to his feet. Here he was much resorted to, and even by the emperors Marcian and Leo, and by the king of Persia. Thus he lived thirty-six years on columns of different altitudes, the last of which was thirty-six cubits high, and died in A. D. 462, at the age of sixty-nine.

After the death of this Simeon, who properly comes within the former period of this history, one Daniel undertook to follow his example. He was born near Samofata, and at the age of twelve years retired to a neighbouring monastery. But accompanying his brother in a journey to Antioch, he saw Simeon on his pillar; and being permitted to go up to him, he received his benediction. On his death he fixed himself on a similar pillar at Anaplus, near the mouth of the Euxine sea. The situation of this place, subject to severe storms of wind and rain, made his mode of life a harder discipline than that of his predecessor. One winter he was nearly carried away by the wind. It stripped him of his clothes, and he remained almost dead with cold. Notwithstanding this, he lived in this manner to the age of eighty. In this situation he was ordained a priest by Gennadius patriarch of Constantinople, who went up to him on his pillar to give him the communion. The emperor Leo often visited him, and shewed him great respect. He even built a monastery for his disciples near to his pillar, and a place to receive those who came to visit him, and also an oratory in which to deposit the remains of Simeon, which Daniel had got translated from Antioch. Gubar, king of the Lazi, having come to renew his alliance with the Romans, the emperor took him to Daniel,

niel, as the most extraordinary person in his empire, when the king prostrated himself with tears before the column, and the Stylite was made arbitrator of the terms of the treaty. This prince never afterwards sent any message to Constantinople, but he desired the prayers of Daniel.

Near Egina in Cilicia there were two stylites, one a Catholic, and the other a Severian, and one Valliliac lived upon a pillar for some time near Freves in Gaul; but so severely did he suffer from the cold, that several times his nails fell off. At length, however, he was persuaded by the bishops of the neighbourhood to come down from his pillar, and live in a monastery with his disciples below. This was the only example of *stylitism* in the West.

Some monasteries, however, in this period were sufficiently severe in their discipline. The nuns of La Baumé in France were so strictly confined, that they never went out but into the church yard; and tho' any of them had a son or a brother in the monastery at Lauconne, which was very near to them, they never saw them, nor heard any thing more of them than if they had been dead.

Aurelian, who founded a monastery at Arles in A. D. 548, ordered that his monks should never go out of the monastery, or receive any laymen except in the parloir. Women they could never

see at all. They were not even allowed to speak to one another in private. The eating of flesh was forbidden, but fowls were allowed to the sick, and fish to all on certain days. Here we first find, says Fleury, a distinction between the flesh of fowls and grosser meat.

---

### SECTION V.

*Of the state of Heathenism, Judaism, and various Sects of Christians in this Period.*

**T**HO' the emperors had now for a long time been Christians, there were many remains of paganism within the bounds of the Roman empire, as appears by the laws and regulations that were made to suppress them. Cæsarius preaching against the vices of the times, A. D. 506, particularly enlarges on the observance of auguries, the honours paid to trees and fountains, and other remains of paganism. These things were also forbidden by the fourth council of Orleans, A. D. 541. Also several pagan customs having been kept up on the Christian festivals, which had been instituted to take place of them, they were forbidden by the council of Tours, A. D. 566, as they also were at the council of Toledo, A. D. 589.

The

The opposition which the Jews had made to the propagation of Christianity was never forgotten or forgiven; and the Christians now having the power, cruelly retaliated upon them, tho' there were some instances in which the Jews still exerted what power they had in the persecution of Christians. In A. D. 522 Dunaan, a Jewish prince of the Homerites, cruelly persecuted the Christians in his dominions; and on taking the place, the inhabitants of which were all Christians, he burned all the monks and nuns. But the year following he was attacked by Elefbaan, a christian king of Ethiopia, assisted by the Greek emperor; when he was taken, and put to death, together with his principal relations. In A. D. 610, the Jews made a tumult at Antioch, and killed the patriarch Anastasius.

But the severities exercised upon the Jews were far more numerous than those that were exercised by them, and both the Romans and the barbarian Christians were equally hostile to them. The emperor Heraclius drove all the Jews from Jerusalem, and ordered them not to approach within three miles of it. In A. D. 556 St. Ferreol drove from the city of Uzes, and all the diocese, the Jews who would not become Christians. At the council of Toledo, A. D. 589, Jews were excluded from all public offices, forbidden to have

christian slaves, or to marry christian women. Sisebat, king of the Visigoths in Spain, is said to have converted all the Jews in his dominions, except such as fled into France, which sufficiently implies that force was used in their conversion. Ricared, another king in Spain, made an ordinance against the Jews ; and being offered a great sum by them, in order to obtain the repeal of it, he was commended for his refusal of it by pope Gregory ; and yet this Gregory forbid the use of force in the conversion of Jews. In Sicily, however, he promised them a diminution of the rent they paid to the see of Rome if they would become christians. He acknowledged on this occasion that these conversions might not be very sincere ; but he said the children would by this means be baptized, and have a better disposition. In France and other places, force was used in the conversion of the Jews, and they were banished, if they refused to be baptized.

But little mention is made of *Unitarians* in the history of this period. But it is evident from the remarkable passage in Facundus, quoted by me in the *History of early opinions concerning Christ*, vol. 3, p. 334, that they were numerous among the common people in the time of Justinian. They who were called *Bonofians* were unitarians, and they

they existed in the time of pope Gregory. This pope, in giving directions in what manner to receive heretics, says that if they had been baptized in the name of the trinity, they should be received without baptism, on their simple profession of the Catholic faith; but that the *Bonofians*, who did not believe that Jesus Christ was God, must be re-baptized.\* I have observed before that though the nations that invaded the Roman empire are generally stiled *Arians*, they were not universally so. For according to Gregory of Tours, Childebert king of France was a Photinian. And Chilperic wrote a treatise in defence of Saballianism, which he shewed to Gregory and the other bishops, hoping to have their approbation of it; but not succeeding in this, he suppressed it. *Sueur*, A. D. 582

The Novatians were not yet wholly extinct. For Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, who died A. D. 600, wrote against the Novatians and other heretics.

The Pelagian controversy was never wholly dropped from the time of the Austin to the reformation.

\* Bonofus was bishop of a church in Macedonia. He held the same sentiments with Photinus; and his followers and those of Photinus were numerous in Spain. Baronius says that between the Priscillianists and the Arians the Catholics were a small number, bearing no proportion to the heretics. *Robinson*, p. 213.

mation. The more rigid doctrines of Austin were always objected to by many persons in Gaul, and a council of bishops joined in the condemnation of them. At a council in Arles, one Lucidus, a priest, was obliged to retract them, particularly the following viz. that they who perished had not the power to save themselves, that Christ did not die for all, and that God predestinated any person to damnation.

At the council of Orange, A. D. 528, it was decreed that the sin of Adam affected all his posterity, so that every thing that is good in man comes from the grace of God, and not from nature, but that all who are baptized can, and ought, by the cooperation of Jesus Christ to accomplish every thing that is necessary to his salvation, and that no person is predestinated to evil by God. Gennadius, a priest of Marseilles, and a considerable writer, did not approve of the doctrine of Austin concerning grace. Fulgentius distinguished between sin and the punishment of it with respect to God; saying that it was the latter only that was predestinated, tho' the former was foreseen.

Pelagianism flourished much in Dalmatia, and Picenum in Italy, which was opposite to it. There an old man, of the name of Seneca, taught that there was no such thing as original sin, that infants dying unbaptized would not be damned, and that  
man

man by the use of his own free will might be saved. He said that the clergy and monks might live with nuns, having nothing to fear if they lived innocently. This old man was brought before pope Gelafius, but the arguments of his holiness made no impression upon him.

Notwithstanding all the attempts that had been made by argumentation, and (what had unhappily been often had recourse to) by force, the *Donatists* still continued in Africa. Pope Gregory, writing to a bishop of that country, complains that that sect was much increased, and that they not only rebaptized many Catholics, but expelled bishops from their sees; so that this pope wrote to desire that the laws might be enforced against them. However, the orders of the emperor Maurice to that purpose were ill executed. There were even of the clergy who suffered their children, or slaves, to be rebaptized by them.

Persecution had also failed to exterminate the *Priscillianists*. At a council of Braga, A. D. 563, decrees were made against the remainder of this sect. One of the priests of Gregory of Tours denied the resurrection, which proves that he had embraced their opinions. And by the permission to abstain from flesh and wine, in the rules that Isidore composed for the regulation of his monastery, it appears that there were *Priscillianists*

at

at that time in the country, and that their prejudices were respected.

That *Eutyichianism* was far from being suppressed by the council of Chalcedon, we have sufficiently seen in a preceding section, and *Nestorianism* was in some measure revived by those who defended the *three chapters*; tho' it was peculiarly offensive to the church at Constantinople. In order to vex the emperor Heraclius, Chosroes king of Persia compelled all the Christians in his dominions to embrace that sect.

Besides the continuance, or revival, of old sects in this period, we find one new one, and what was peculiar to it, the founder, as he was called, of it had been long dead. This was that of the *Origenists*; the numerous writings of Origen continuing to be read, and admired by many, especially among the monks, who had leisure and a turn for speculation. It was during the reign of Justinian that the controversy on this subject broke out, the peculiar opinions of Origen being embraced by the monks of Palestine, at the head of whom was Nonnus. This doctrine spreading into many monasteries, complaint was made of it to the emperor, who joined in the condemnation of it. It consisted of six heads, whether justly imputed to Origen or not, viz. "that the Father is  
" greater than the son, and the son than the holy  
" spirit ;

“ spirit; that God could create only a certain  
“ number of spirits, and a certain quantity of  
“ matter; that the souls of men preexisted, and  
“ were confined to bodies for a punishment; that  
“ the sun moon and stars are animated; that, at  
“ the resurrection, the human body will be of a  
“ round figure; that future punishment will not  
“ be eternal, and that even that of the dæmons  
“ will have an end.” The patriarch of Constantinople, and the pope, joined in the condemnation of these and some other errors, especially that of “ the preexistence of the soul of Jesus Christ, “ that his body was formed in the womb of the “ virgin before its union with the logos, and that “ in a future age Christ will be crucified for the “ dæmons, as he has been for men.”

Nonnus and his party were so much offended at this condemnation of the Origenists, that they separated from the communion of the Catholics; and having induced the patriarch to acknowledge that anathemas not agreeable to God were null, they returned to their monasteries. But retaining their zeal for their opinions, they preached publicly; and the controversy between them and their opponents growing warm, they came to blows in the city of Jerusalem, and in the monastery itself, on which occasion one Theodulus, a Catholic, received

ceived a wound of which he died. In the end all these monks voluntarily or otherwise declared themselves Origenists, and got possession of all the monasteries in the neighbourhood.

After the death of Nonnus the Origenists were divided into two sects. The chief of one of them was Isidore, and Theodore of Cappadocia, who was powerful at court, was at the head of the other. Isidor finding that he could not resist the power of Theodore, joined himself to Conon abbot of the laire of Sabas.

While preparation was making for the council on the subject of the *three chapters*, and when the proper business of that council was concluded, the emperor, having been urged by the deputies of the patriarch of Jerusalem, sent to the bishops an account of the errors of Origen, as maintained by the monks, in which he says, "We exhort you to assemble, and read carefully this account, and to condemn each article of it, with the impious Origen, and all those who shall be of the same sentiment." The bishops, obedient, as usual, to the wishes of the emperor, unanimously condemned Origen and his followers. Theodore of Cæsaria would have prevented this condemnation, but he had lost much of his credit, after the death of the empress Theodora. The monks of the new laura of St. Sabas, not approving of this condemnation

nation of Origen, separated from the communion of the church, and in consequence of it were banished from the province.

Gregory, afterwards pope, being at Constantinople, had a dispute with Eutychius, then restored to the church of Constantinople, who retaining some remains of Origenism, maintained that after the resurrection, the body of Christ was impalpable. These two prelates not being able to agree, Gregory refrained from communicating with Eutychius. On this the Emperor Tiberius summoned them before him, and thought of burning the book of Eutychius on the subject; but presently after the patriarch died. However, as he declared in dying, that he expected to rise again *in that flesh*, it was supposed that he had changed his opinion.

---

## SECTION VI.

*Of the Progress of Christianity in this Period.*

**C**ORRUPT as Christianity was now become, it made some progress in this period, but not by the fairest means. The apostles and primitive Christians never addressed themselves in the first instance to princes, but to those persons in the middle classes of life to whom they had the easiest

access, and on whom they thought their arguments were likely to have a good effect. But in this period, and ever after, the popes and emperors applied in the first instance to kings, and other persons in power; and these being gained, fear or interest brought over those who were subject to them.

Justinian persuaded the king of the Heruli, and also a son of the king of the Huns, to embrace Christianity; but the latter was put to death by his father for it. In one case the resentment of the people against their king operated to produce the same effect. In A. D. 542, the Abages, a people inhabiting near mount Caucasus, embraced Christianity, because their king used to take beautiful children from their parents, and make them eunuchs, in order to sell them; and this practice was forbidden by Justinian.

The Axumites, an Ethiopian nation, also embraced the Christian religion, on their conquering the Homerites in Arabia, whose king had put to death some Christians who went thro' his country to trade in Ethiopia. After this their king sent to Justinian for clergy to instruct the people; and he giving them the choice of a bishop, they took John of the church of Alexandria. Naaman, an Arab chief, was converted to Christianity

tianity about the year A. D. 593, but in what manner this was brought about is not said.

The Sardinians were chiefly pagans in the time of pope Gregory. He ordered that if any peasant belonging to the church should not be converted he should be taxed so high that he should be compelled to it.

St. Amand procured orders from Dagobert king of the Franks to compel the people about Ghent to be baptized, which Fleury says was the first example of compulsory conversion with respect to the pagans; tho' it had been used with respect to the Jews, Vol. 8. p. 292. This Dagobert ordered all his subjects to be baptized, tho' pope Gregory had said that all conversions should be voluntary. St. Amand met with much difficulty in his undertaking, being insulted by the women and peasants.

The conversion of the Saxons in England being more interesting to those for whom this history is principally written, I shall dwell a little longer on the circumstances of it. It is said that Gregory, afterwards pope, seeing some handsome slaves exposed to sale at Rome, inquired of what country they were, and being informed that they were from England, he expressed his admiration of their persons, as not *Angli*, but *angeli*, not English but angels, and also his concern that a na-

tion so well formed in body should not have their minds enlightened with the knowledge of the gospel, but remain under the power of the devil; and as soon as he had an opportunity, he sent Austin the monk to attempt their conversion. This was in A. D. 595.

Austin and his companions, to the number of about forty, landed in the isle of Thonet in A. D. 597, about a century after the arrival of the Saxons in Britain, when they were received by Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert king of Kent, and daughter of Cherebert king of France. She being a Christian had stipulated for the free exercise of her religion, and accordingly had brought with her a bishop of the name of Levidard. The king having received these missionaries in the open air, and allowed them to reside in his capital city, which was Canterbury, they entered in a solemn procession. By their strict lives they soon converted many of the inhabitants, and at length the king himself, who gave them funds for the endowment of an episcopal church. Austin going to France was ordained bishop of England at Arles, and returning to England baptized more than ten thousand at the festival of Christmas in A. D. 597. He then sent to acquaint the pope with the success of his mission.

In order to draw the Saxons to the christian churches, Gregory advised Austin to make use of the heathen temples, and even their festivals; but instead of sacrificing to demons, to kill the beasts as usual, and eat the flesh in thanksgiving to God; that "by leaving them," as he said, "these sensible joys, he might more easily insinuate into their minds the joys of eternity." This, he said, should be done more particularly on the anniversaries of the dedication of churches, and the festivals of the martyrs.

Austin found the antient Britons, who were Christians, not at all disposed to conform to the usages of the church of Rome. They celebrated Easter on the 14th day of the moon, and they administered baptism in some different way. He had two solemn conferences with their bishops on the subject, but he could not make any impression upon them.

Austin not being able to prevail upon these antient British Christians to acknowledge the supremacy of the church of Rome, and conform to its ritual, excited a cruel persecution of them by means of the king of Northumberland, who was induced by the king of Kent to send an army into Wales; when the historian says that twelve hundred of them were crowned with martyrdom. *Sueur.*  
A. D. 600.

The conversion of the other Saxons in England was, in general, brought about in a manner similar to this by Austin, the kings being gained in the first place, and frequently by means of their wives. Thus Edelburge, a daughter of the king of Kent, marrying the king of Northumberland, introduced the Christian faith into that part of the country.

---

## SECTION VII.

*The History of Persecution in this Period.*

**I**N the preceding periods of this History we have seen the beginning of the accomplishment of our Saviour's prediction, that he came *not to send peace on the earth, but a sword*. After the cessation of pagan persecution by the emperors becoming Christians, it was resumed by the Christians themselves in the time of Constantine. It has continued with more or less violence to this day, and will continue till the complete downfall of Antichrist, or that power, temporal or spiritual, which is contrary to that *kingdom of peace and righteousness*, which will be finally established by the universal prevalence of the genuine gospel of Christ.

The

The severe edicts of Constantine and Theodosius being continued, the particulars under this head that deserve to be recited, as *new*, are not many. The emperor Leo ordered that no person should act as an advocate in any tribunal, but a Catholic. Pope Gelasius banished some Manicheans from Rome. Justinian took from the heretics all their churches, and gave them to the Catholics, in the third year of his reign. He also confiscated their property, as he did that of the pagans, allowing them three months for their conversion. The churches of the Arians were very rich, and many poor persons, even of the Catholics, were maintained out of them. On this several, out of despair, put an end to their lives, and some Montanists, shutting themselves up in their churches, and setting fire to them, burned themselves along with them. The severity of this emperor to the Samaritans made them revolt, and commit several outrages; but they were subdued with great slaughter.

Pope Hormisdas, who died A. D. 523, whipped, and banished, the Manicheans. At the same time the emperor Justin ordered that they should be banished, and punished with death. He took from the pagans, the Jews, and all heretics, every public employment, excepting only the Goths, for fear of offending Theodoric. At the same time

they met with much worse treatment from Cavades king of Persia. He first made them believe that he would encourage their doctrine, and having assembled them, and their bishops, he ordered them all to be put to death.

---

### SECTION VIII.

*Of the state of Superstition in this Period.*

**T**HAT superstition should be found among Christians, especially in this period, is not to be wondered at, when we consider that it is universally the offspring of ignorance; and tho' the light of revelation tended to banish it from both Judaism and Christianity, its principles were not always sufficiently attended to. Events in which men are much interested they will always be apt to ascribe to wrong causes, and it is in this that the essence of superstition consists.

From habits of long continuance, a prejudice even for heathen customs remained a long time among Christians. In the time of pope Gelasius the senator Andromachus, and others, wanted to restore the *Lupercalia*, one of the most extravagant and indecent of all the heathen ceremonies; imagining the omission of this festival to have been  
the

the cause of a public malady with which the city of Rome had been afflicted. But the pope addressed a letter to them on the subject, and so far was he from being of the same opinion with them, that, with equal superstition, he ascribed the fall of the empire to the Christian emperors not having abolished those things before.

The privileges of sanctuaries were introduced from heathenism into Christianity; but as yet this abuse was very moderate. The emperor Leo ordered that no person should be taken from a church, or have any claim on the bishop or the clergy for the debts of persons who took refuge in them, as had been ordered by Arcadius. They were answerable, however, to their creditors, and effects deposited in the churches were to be given up.

Divination by lots was a common heathen practice, and this also was copied by Christians. And with them the favourite mode of prying into futurity was by opening a Bible at random, and reading the first passage that presented itself, as applicable to the circumstances in which they were. This mode of superstition was forbidden by the council of Agde in A. D. 506; but this was far from putting a stop to the practice. When the emperor Heraclius marched against the Persians, in A. D. 622, he took in his hand an image of some saint, said not to have been made by human

hands, and swore to his troops to fight even to death; and returning from his victory he cast lots by the scriptures about the place where he should pass the winter.

The ordeal, especially that by fire, was sometimes used by Christians. At the council of Saragossa in Spain, when Arianism was suppressed in that country, it was ordered that the relics which had belonged to Arians should be tried by fire, on the idea that true relics could not be burned. What was the issue of this trial we are not told. It should have been extended to all relics alike.

The greatest and best men of this age did not escape the superstitious veneration for relics. The empress Constantina, having written to pope Gregory for some part of the body of St. Paul, in order to its being deposited in a church erected to his honour, the pope wrote in answer, that the bodies of the apostles were so dreadful for their miracles, that no person durst approach them, that several persons only digging near them had been terrified by apparitions, &c. and that their custom was to lay pieces of linen cloth near their bodies, and then enshrine them, and that these had the same virtue with the bodies of the saints themselves.

S. Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Noyon was famous for the discovery of the bodies of saints. It was he who found those of St. Quintin, St. Plato,

Plato, St. Crispin, St. Crispinian, St. Lucian, and many others. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 21.

Having found prejudices in favour of antient heathen customs among Christians, we shall less wonder at finding some in favour of Jewish ones, especially in transferring the sabbath from saturday to sunday. This was the less extraordinary, as both these days having been used for the purpose of public worship, it was not unnatural to give them the same uses in all respects. Constantine, however, who made the first ordinance on the subject, made the proper distinction between them, allowing the labours of husbandry on sundays. But these were forbidden by the third council of Orleans in A. D. 538. Childebert also forbid all labour on that day, except what was necessary to procure subsistence. At the council of Macon, in A. D. 585, it was forbidden to fight on sundays, this being classed among works of labour. It would have been happy for the Christian world, if this ordinance had been observed. Some persons observing both saturday and sunday as days of rest, pope Gregory reprov'd the superstition of those who observed the former, at the same time that he enjoined rest from all labour on the latter.

Of superstition with respect to baptism we have seen a great deal in former periods of this history.

A curious case relating to it occurs in this. A per-

son

son having made profession of the Christian faith, so as to be prepared for baptism, having been rendered incapable of making the proper responses at the time, by a disease of which he died presently after, and another person making the responses for him, as for infants, a question arose whether his baptism would avail for his salvation. Ferrand of Carthage thought it would not, since he had actual sin, tho' it would suffice in the case of infants, who had only original sin. "Besides, is it not an inquiry," said he, "to children if they die after they have been baptized, but before they have received the Lord's supper." Fulgentius, however, maintained that, as this man was converted, having really changed his opinion before his illness, he was safe, and that they who are baptized begin in reality from that time to feed on the body and blood of Christ, even without receiving the outward elements; an idea which gradually led the church to omit the communion of infants, especially as the idea of the sanctity of the elements was advanced, and infants were liable to receive them in what was thought to be an irreverent manner.

That bread actually consecrated for the purpose of communion should be regarded with superstitious respect we do not wonder at. But that which had only been presented at the time, tho'  
not

not consecrated, was considered as something *facred*, and the partaking of it a kind of communion. These loaves were called *eulogies*. King Mero-væus demanding those eulogies was for some time refused by Gregory of Tours, till he remonstrated that he ought not to be suspended from communion, but by the consent of the other bishops.

As it was thought to be wrong to wash immediately after baptism, or to eat before communion; it was also thought to be improper to bathe presently after communion. Theodore Siceota reproved those who did it; saying that they who were perfumed did not bathe, lest they should lose the grateful odour of the perfumes.

It had been well if superstition among Christians had ended with the mere folly of it; but it has generally been the substitute for substantial virtue. In the delineation of a good Christian by Eligius, or Eloi, above mentioned, nothing is said of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or of justice, benevolence, or charity towards men; but the whole of religion is made to consist in going often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in consecrated places, and such like vain services.

*Mosheim* Vol 2. p. 22.

Even in this early period the obligation of an oath was thought capable of being dissolved by  
the

the authority of a Christian priest. The army of the emperor Maurice having revolted, and bound themselves by an oath that they would no more obey his general Philippicus, Gregory, bishop of Antioch, who had persuaded them to return to their obedience, told them that, by the power which he had from Christ, to *bind and to loose*, he could absolve them from their oath, and this satisfied them. We shall see more instances of this flagrant violation of morality hereafter.

The progress of vice generally keeps pace with that of superstition; and as this was an age in which the barbarous nations made the greatest irruptions into the Roman empire, we cannot wonder at the many accounts of rapine and violence that we meet with. The desolation of Italy by Christian invaders in the time of pope Gregory was dreadful. In the anarchy of ten years, which took place in Italy after the death of the Lombard king Clephis, the churches were stripped, the bishops murdered, cities ruined, and the people exterminated. In the history of Gregory of Tours there are many examples of bishops and priests dragged from their churches, loaded with chains, beaten and insulted various ways. In the civil wars in France, A. D. 573, the churches suffered more says Gregory of Tours, than in the persecution of Dioclesian. Theodebert son of Chilperic laid waste the Limousin,

fin, and le Quercé, burning churches, seizing sacred vessels, killing the clergy, driving away the monks, and ravishing the nuns.

Another consequence of the disorders of those times was the injury that was done to ecclesiastical discipline. Many of the clergy adopted the licentious manners of the secular princes. The bishops became too much addicted to the pleasures of the world, when the empire became Christian, and for the purposes of ambition they had gone to Constantinople more than the duty of their office admitted. On this account Justinian thought it necessary to forbid their going thither without leave. By another ordinance of Justinian, in A. D. 541, the clergy were forbidden to play at dice, even to look on while others played, or to be present at any public spectacle, under the penalty of three years suspension. At the council of Epaone, in A. D. 517, the clergy were forbidden to keep hounds or hawks. At the council of Macon, in A. D. 585, bishops were also forbidden the same things. At a council of Chalons in A. D. 579, two bishops, Salonicus and Sagittarius, were deposed, and among other enormities it appeared that they fought in person, and killed people with their own hands. At a council of Macon in A. D. 583, bishops were forbidden to bear arms.

With

With so many incentives to ambition, we do not wonder at the factious disposition of so many bishops of this period. Egidius, bishop of Rheims, at the council of Metz in A. D. 590, charged with conspiring against the life of king Childebert, at length confessed that he had always acted against the interest of the king and his mother, and that it was by his advice that the wars which had been the cause of the ravages in Gaul had taken place. In consequence of this, he was deposed, and banished to Straßburgh. So general was the suspicion of the superior clergy living disorderly lives, that at a council held A. D. 503, on occasion of the pope Symmachus being charged with adultery, or some other heinous crime, it was ordered that all bishops, priests and deacons, should have persons of approved virtue to live with them, and be witnesses of their conduct. These guardians of the virtue of the clergy were called *Syncelli*.

Bishoprics being of so much value in a temporal respect, and giving men so much power, we cannot wonder at improper methods being used to get them. It is observed by Fleury, under the year A. D. 534, that in France a custom was introduced of the kings selling bishoprics. At the council of Clermont in A. D. 535, an attempt was made to put a stop to this abuse, by ordering that all bishops should be chosen by the clergy and people;

people; and that if any person obtained a benefice by means of caballing at court, he should be deprived of communion with that church. By a law of Justinian simony was so strictly forbidden and guarded against, that Fleury observes it must have been very common. Vol. 7. p. 338.

The interest which the founders of churches had in appointing the clergy to officiate in them was, of course, very great, and this was a motive with wealthy persons to build and endow churches. But in A. D. 538 the emperor Justinian made a constitution, by which the founders of churches were prohibited from appointing the clergy to serve them. They could only present them to the bishop of the diocese. Here, as Fleury observes, we see the origin of patronage. Vol. 7. p. 371.

---

## SECTION IX.

*Of the Power of the Popes in this Period.*

WE have seen the great extension of the authority of the bishops of Rome in consequence of the law of Valentinian Vol. 2. p. 545. During the subsequent troubles of Italy, in which the influence of the popes was of particular consequence

sequence to the emperors residing in the East, their power kept gradually extending itself, tho' in this period it was far short of what it came to be afterwards. What is most astonishing to a person acquainted with the preceding history, is the impudence of the claims of the popes of this period. But the times were favourable to them, and not to any rigorous inquiry into the foundation of their pretensions.

Pope Gelafius asserted the authority of the popes to receive appeals in all cases of heresy. "The canons," he says, "have ordered that all appeals be made to the see of Rome, and that there be no appeal from it." With respect to Eutychianism, about which he was writing, he says, "Timothy of Alexandria, and Peter of Antioch, were deposed by the sole authority of the apostolic see, and Acacius himself is witness of it, seeing he was the executor of their judgment; so that he himself was condemned in the same manner when he joined in communion with them." Writing to the bishops of Dardania, A. D. 495, he says, "It belongs to the apostolic see to confirm the acts of councils by their authority. All acknowledge," he says, "now that the see of St. Peter has a right to absolve from the judgment of all the bishops, and to judge the whole church, without any person having a right to arraign

“arraign their decision, since” as he observed before, “the canons order that appeals may be made “to that see from all the world, and no appeals “from it.” Now the only authority for this was a council held at Rome in A. D. 378, consisting of national bishops, in which they thank the emperors Gratian, and Valentinian, for the authority they had given to the see of Rome. But this was far from being a general council, admitting the decrees of such a council to bind the whole Christian church.

However, in a synod held at Rome in A. D. 494, consisting of sixty-six bishops, this pope declared that the church of Rome is to be preferred to all other churches, not by the constitution of councils, but by the voice of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, when he said to Peter *Upon this rock will I build my church*, which places the authority of the popes on a foundation quite different from that of the councils. *Sueur.* A. D. 494.

The same pope, writing to the emperor Anastasius, says, “There are two methods by which “the world is governed, the sacred authority of “the bishops, and the royal power. The office “of the bishops is the greater, because they are “to give an account to God, even of kings. For “tho’,” he adds, “your dignity raises you above “the rest of mankind, you bow to the prelates,

“ you receive the sacraments at their hands, and  
 “ follow their judgment in matters of religion.  
 “ And if the faithful in general ought to be sub-  
 “ ject to the bishops, how much more ought they  
 “ to be subject to the bishop of that see which God  
 “ has established above all the bishops, and which  
 “ has always been acknowledged as such by the  
 “ whole church.”

The government of the church having by this time been pretty well established, by which bishops and metropolitans had a certain jurisdiction, the popes did not directly make any innovations in that. In the time of pope Gregory, Fleury says, the pope had a proper jurisdiction over the sees that were termed *suburbican*, over which he was the regular metropolitan, that is, over the southern parts of Italy, where he was the sole archbishop; also over Sicily and the other islands, tho' they had their respective metropolitans. But he did not exercise the same power in the provinces immediately dependant on the sees of Milan, and Aquileia, or in Spain and Gaul, tho' he had his vicars in Gaul, and in Illyricum. \* He also extended his care to the churches in Africa, so far as  
 to

\* The bishops of Milan were never ordained by those of Rome, but by the bishop of Aquileia. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 347.

to direct councils to be held, and see that the canons were observed. He had no jurisdiction at all over any of the churches in the East, and took no notice of their conduct, except on extraordinary occasions.

But tho' the authority of the popes was in some measure limited in those provinces in which the Christian religion had been long established, and in which a certain discipline had prevailed, it was unbounded in those countries in which it was then first received. On the mission of Austin to England, Gregory, by his own authority, appointed what bishoprics should be created, and the manner in which they should be subordinate to one another.

Of the abject submission to the popes by those whose interest led them to yield it, we have too many instances in this period of our history. The bishops of Dardania, writing to pope Gelasius, call him the *father of fathers*, and say that they will obey his orders in every thing; and that as soon as they received them, they renounced the heresy of Eutyches, of Acacius, and his followers.

Ennodius said of pope Symmachus, that he was constituted judge in the place of God, which he filled as vicegerent of the most high. *Mosheim*, Vol. I. p. 443. In one of his works he even maintained that all who were raised to the dignity of

pope, either were then saints, or became so; that men may judge other men, but that the judgment of the pope was reserved for God only; since Jesus said to Peter only, *Thou art Peter*.

It was from the emperors of the East that the popes borrowed their extravagantly high titles. Under Theodosius the younger it became customary to ascribe to the Christian emperors the titles of *divinity*. This emperor and Valentinian gave each other the title of *eternally august*. Then the bishops, and among the rest those of Rome, and the councils, gave them these titles. They often called Marcian *most divine emperor*, *most divine Augustus*, and *eternally August*. Every thing that came from them was termed *sacred*, *celestial* and *divine*. Then they were called *adorable*, and *for ever adorable*; and in addressing them they said that they laid themselves at their feet, and when they came into their presence they kissed their feet. When the emperors were driven out of Rome, and the bishops became masters of it, they claimed the same honours. *Sueur. A. D. 549. 550.*

Even the Arian princes found it their interest to favour and extend the authority of the popes, so much did they see it to be in their power, by means of the influence they had with other bishops, and the people at large, to disturb their government. In A. D. 528 Athalaric king of the Goths in Italy,  
ordered

ordered that no action should be brought against any of the clergy of Rome before the cause had been carried to the pope.

The churches of Africa in this period shewed an implicit deference to the authority of that of Rome. It was consulted with respect to the treatment of those who yielded to persecution in the time of the Vandal princes. A synod was called on this occasion by Felix bishop of Rome. It consisted of thirty-eight bishops, when various decrees were made respecting the different cases, as of clergy and laity, &c. and in this decision the churches of Africa acquiesced. *Sueur.* A. D. 487.

There are examples even in Eastern churches of extraordinary power being allowed to the bishops of Rome. Pope Gregory absolved John of Chalcedon of heresy, tho' condemned by the judges appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople; and the patriarch made no opposition to it.

When other bishops, however, made any pretensions which tended to exalt them over their brethren, none were so ready to repress that aspiring spirit as the popes. This was remarkably the case with Gregory with respect to the title of *œcumenical*, or *universal*, *bishop*, which had been given by way of compliment to several patriarchs, as to Dioscorus of Alexandria, (*Sueur.* A. D. 595.) and was first assumed by John the patriarch of Constanti-

nople. On this occasion Gregory wrote to him to reprove him for it, as a thing that “scandalized all his brethren.” A title, he says, “full of extravagance and pride, and that tho’ the same title had been offered to the bishops of Rome at the council of Chalcedon, it was rejected by them.” He also wrote to the empress, and to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria on the same subject. All these letters are dated A. D. 595. Farther to reprove the arrogance of this patriarch, Gregory assumed the title of *servus servorum Dei*, the *servant of the servants of God*, which has been retained by the popes to this day. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 225.

This John, tho’ seemingly so ambitious, was so exemplary for his mortifications (which was the great test of virtue in this age) that he obtained the surname of *the Faster*. Notwithstanding the remonstrances of Gregory, John would not give up his title, nor would his successor Cyriacus, which added to the resentment of Gregory. He did not, however, break communion with him on this account, but he exhorted him to renounce so profane a title.

Afterwards he seems to have repented it still more. For when he sent his nuncio to Constantinople, he ordered him not to communicate with the patriarch, unless he would renounce that title, and he gave his reasons for this to the emperor and

to the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. They advised him not to cause a scandal for a thing of nothing; but the pope would not yield; saying the assumption of this title by the patriarch of Constantinople would tend to corrupt the faith of the whole church; since several of the bishops of Constantinople had been heretics. He even added that, whoever should assume that title of *universal bishop*, was the forerunner of Antichrist, by placing himself above others. In order, probably, to depress the see of Constantinople, he maintained that Peter, the prince of the apostles, had his church in three places, the chief at Rome, where he died, another at Alexandria, whither he sent Mark the evangelist, and the third at Antioch, where he lived seven years.

As good a man as pope Gregory appears to have been, these pretensions of the bishop of Constantinople, which interfered with his own dignity, were much upon his mind, and he omitted no opportunity of protesting against them. A council being about to be held at Constantinople, he wrote to the Oriental bishops to warn them not to consent to the title of universal bishop being given to the patriarch of Constantinople, on that occasion, and in general to guard against any incroachment on the rights of other churches.

This pope seems not a little inconsistent with himself when he thought it necessary to express his humility as a Christian, at the same time that he would abate nothing of his pretensions as bishop of the Apostolic see. He even reproved the bishop of Alexandria for using, in a letter to him, the expression *as you ordered me*; saying that he was “his brother by his rank, and his father by his virtue.” “Let us,” says he, “forbear expressions which puff up vanity, and hurt charity.” On another occasion he says, “All bishops are subject to the papal see when they commit faults, tho’ all are equal according to the law of humility. No one doubts” he says, “but that the church of Constantinople is subject to the holy see, as the emperor and the bishops of that city declare continually.”

This very same title, however, which gave so much offence to pope Gregory, when assumed by the bishops of Constantinople, was sought after, and accepted, by pope Boniface, when it was given him by the emperor Phocas; who being an usurper, might think it necessary to secure the favour of the pope. He also wished by this means to mortify Cyriacus the patriarch of Constantinople, with whom he was at variance. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 225. The Catholics pretend that nothing was then meant by this title besides that just superiority

ty

ty to, which the church of Rome was intitled above that of Constantinople. But why then did Gregory reject it; and condemn it universally?

The bishops of Constantinople discovered as much ambition as those of Rome, but circumstances were not so favourable to them. After the emperors became Christian, and resided in that city, the bishops began to extend their authority; first emancipating themselves from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Heraclea, to which the church of Byzantium was originally subject. They then extended their authority in Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, and then over the three original patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. *Giannone* Vol. I. p. 168. In the time of Leo Isauricus the patriarch of Constantinople claimed the jurisdiction of Illyricum, Epirus, Achaia, and Macedonia, and also of Sicily, and many parts of Magna Græcia. *Ib.* p. 171.

Such was the situation of the bishops of Rome at this period, that much business of a civil nature was devolved upon them. Gregory complains of this in a feeling manner. Writing to a friend on his election he says, "There is so much of temporal business in this dignity that I find myself almost separated by it from the love of God. I have more temporal concerns than when I was a layman." Writing to Leander in Spain, he says,

says, that "he was continually plunged in low thoughts, so that he could hardly have a moment for contemplation, being obliged to apply to terrestrial things."

At this time the popes were by no means temporal princes, yet the urgency of the times led them sometimes to act as such. Thus, thro' the negligence of the Exarch, pope Gregory appointed a commander to act against the Lombards. The great wealth of the bishops of Rome contributed much to their power. When Trafimond king of the Vandals in Africa banished two hundred and twenty bishops pope Symmachus caused all of them to be furnished with every thing necessary to their subsistence. *Giannone* Vol. I. p. 183.

The power of the popes being so great in this period, we cannot wonder at the eager contests there sometimes were for that dignity. In the schism between Symmachus and Laurentius, A. D. 501, there was much violence, and many murders committed, and among the rest several priests lost their lives.

The popes, like other bishops, were originally chosen by the clergy and the people jointly; but the votes of the people were gradually excluded, and at length those of the ordinary clergy. In a council held by pope Symmachus, A. D. 499, it was ordained that when any pope died before any pro-

provision could be made for a successor, he should be appointed who had the majority in the votes of the clergy.

---



---

### SECTION X.

*Some Particulars relating to the Clergy, Churches, &c. in this Period, and other Articles of a miscellaneous Nature.*

**T**HE state of the clergy in this period was not materially different from what it was in the former. But the following circumstances of a miscellaneous nature deserve to be noticed.

1. There was no place of clerical education, besides the churches and the houses of the bishops, who directed the studies of particular persons. This was the more easy, as profane science was not thought necessary to the functions of the clergy. There were, however, larger schools for catechumens in some places, especially that at Alexandria, where Origen had taught; but these were not for the use of the clergy as such. All the knowledge required of them was that of the scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the canons of the church, which in time came to be an intricate but lucrative study, like that of the civil law. Pope Gregory

gory forbid even the teaching of Grammar, because in the Grammar schools use was made of profane authors, at the hazard of teaching idolatry. This apprehension, tho' well founded, is thought to have contributed to the extinction of liberal knowledge in general among the Romans.

2. Bishops were always chosen from the inferior clergy belonging to the see, and by the people; the metropolitan and the neighbouring bishops giving their approbation by ordaining him. It was only in the greater sees, after the emperors became Christian, that they interfered in the choice of bishops, The priests always performed the duty of the bishop in his absence or illness, and this seems to have been arranged among themselves. But pope Gregory appointed that, in case of the sickness or incapacity of the bishop, a particular person should be fixed upon to do his duty, with a view to succeed him, and this was the origin of *coadjutors* in the Catholic church.

3. The habit of the clergy began to be distinguished from that of the laity at the time of the irruption of the Barbarians into the Roman empire, the clergy keeping to the Roman dress, which consisted of a large flowing garment, very different from the close dress of the northern nations.

At the council of Narbonne in A. D. 589 the use of the surplice was enjoined, but only during divine service.

4. Cardinal bishops, priests, and deacons in the time of pope Gregory were, according to Fleury, those who were attached to particular churches, distinguished from those who served them only by commission. Vol. 8, p. 36. Giannone says they were strangers in the churches in which they were appointed to officiate, said to be *incardinate* into them, or depending upon them as the door upon their hinges, whence the term. They had not, he says, any peculiar dignity or superiority. Vol. 1, p. 232. But Sueur says the term *cardinal* seems to have been used in different senses by antient writers, many of them for the *principal*, agreeable to the use of the word on other occasions, as the *cardinal points* in the heavens, the *cardinal virtues*, &c. Thus the church in which baptism was administered was called the cardinal or principal church; and the clergy who officiated in it the cardinal clergy. A. D. 964.

5. It appears that at Alexandria there were of the clergy who were both married and artisans, for mention is made of one who maintained himself, and many relations, by his labour.

Justinian was the first emperor who enlarged the cognisance of the bishops in ecclesiastical causes,

es, and granted them the privilege of not pleading before lay judges, and that civil actions of the clergy and monks should be decided by the bishops. But they had not as yet any prisons, nor could they inflict corporal punishment, or impose a fine. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 181.

6. By an ordinance of Justinian in A. D. 471, bishops, before their consecration, were to recite their formulary for communion, for baptism, and other solemn prayers; from which it may be inferred, that tho' those forms might be precomposed, they made no use of books for that purpose, but repeated *memoriter*, if they were not capable of officiating *ex-tempore*.

7. It is evident from the New Testament that in the primitive times there was no precomposed form for public worship among Christians, tho' there probably was among the Jews. They met to read the scriptures, sing psalms, administer the Lord's supper, and exhort the people as there was occasion. As our Lord *gave thanks* at the institution of the Eucharist, this was gradually extended to a considerable length. It is probable there was much uniformity in the subject of it, but every bishop acquitted himself in this respect as he was able, ( $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$ ) as Justin Martyr says. Some persons, however, being, in process of time, less qualified to do this to the satisfaction of the  
assembly,

assembly, forms were gradually introduced; but they were different in different places. In this period pope Gelafius composed one for the use of the church of Rome; and he is the first who is said to have done this.

But the person to whom the church of Rome is still more indebted in this respect was pope Gregory. In A. D. 599 he reformed the offices of this church, adding to what had been done by Gelafius, and altering many things. At the same time all the other great churches had their own offices, and not only those in Greece, and the East, but the Latin churches in Africa, Spain, Gaul and Milan. Gregory also regulated the singing, and established a school for teaching it. Austin, when he went to Britain, took persons from this school, who instructed also the Gauls in psalmody.

8. At the council of Braga in A. D. 562, bishops were forbidden to use the form *pax vobiscum*, *peace be with you*, in blessing the people, but to say *nobiscum*, *peace be with us*, which was required of priests. But notwithstanding this the distinction prevailed, and is still kept up in the church of England.

9. One bishop having been originally appointed for one city or district, when there was only one congregation of Christians in it, the same continued to be the case after they became numerous, and were therefore obliged to meet in se-

parate places. In this case the bishop preserved his superiority over the whole, and the inferior clergy officiated in the subordinate ones. This accounts for the great number of priests and deacons in such churches as those of Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria. By a law of Justinian the great church at Constantinople was to have sixty priests, one hundred deacons, forty deaconesses, eighty subdeans, and twenty-five chanters; so that all the clergy were four hundred and twenty-five, and one hundred porters. These, however, served ten other churches united to the cathedral.

10. At the council of Macon in A. D. 585, *tithes* were ordered to be paid to the ministers of the church, under pain of excommunication. This, says Fleury, is the first mention that is made of tithes. Vol. 7. p. 526.

11. The first instance of a *general confession*, Fleury says, was made in this period by St. Eloi, who confessed all his sins from his youth to a priest, and imposed upon himself a severe penance. Vol. 8. p. 294.

The ignorant clergy of this period received very seasonable assistance in the discharge of their duty by the *Penitential* of Theodore, who, from being a Grecian monk, was advanced to the see of Canterbury. It contains the definition of all sins, and the

the proper penances to be appointed for them, with the forms of absolution and exhortation. This work was universally received in all the Western churches; but in the eighth century this discipline, which was agreeable to the antient canons of the church, grew into disuse, being supplanted by the new canon of *indulgences*. *Mosheim* Vol. 2. p. 25.

In A. D. 509 at Epone in France a council ordered that no altars should be consecrated but such as were made of stone. Before this they were in the form of tables; but now they had that of an altar, supported either on one foot, or a pillar, or erected like a tomb. *Bingham* p. 302.

In the council of Agde in A. D. 506 is the first distinct account of the consecration of altars, where the ceremony of chrism was added to that of sacerdotal benediction. *Ib.* p. 328.

12. Mention is made of four altars in the church of Saintes in this period. But Fleury says we are not to conclude that they were all used at the same time. Vol. 8. p. 103.

It was first determined in the council of Agde, in A. D. 566, that all Christians should communicate at the three great festivals, under the penalty of not being considered as Catholics. At the council of Lateran, under Innocent III, it was made necessary only at Easter. *Bingham* p. 829.

In the time of pope Gregory there were no private masses, or masses without communicants, which were in after times recited for particular purposes, as the delivery of persons from purgatory. And all who assisted at the service partook of the Lord's supper. *Sueur* A. D. 600.

13. At the council of Braga in A. D. 563, it was forbidden to bury the dead in churches.

14. In A. D. 607 the Pantheon at Rome was converted into a Christian church, dedicated to the virgin Mary, and all the saints. Then also was instituted the festival of *All Saints*.

15. In this period we find the first mention made of the *Interdict*, which in later periods was a thing so much dreaded by the Christian world; and it is amusing to observe from what causes things which had so great an influence on human affairs arose. On the murder of Prætextatus bishop of Rouen in A. D. 586, the church was shut up, and all divine service omitted till the murderer could be discovered. This and some other instances of interdicts are recorded by Gregory of Tours.

16. Superstition with respect to baptism could not have been quite so great in this period as it came to be afterwards. For it was celebrated only two days in the year, tho' there was much preparation for it. But when children were in danger  
of

of dying this ordinance was administered out of the usual course. It appears from the liturgy of pope Gelafius, that the majority of baptized infants were the children of Christians.

17. Advent was a festival which began to be observed in this period.

In the fifteenth year of Justinian the Latins began to celebrate the festival of the *purification of the virgin* on the 2d of February. Before this time, the Greeks had celebrated a festival called *the meeting*, viz. that of Simeon with Mary, when he took the child Jesus in his arms and blessed him. But they did not then invoke the virgin, nor light up candles in honour of her, from which this festival obtained the appellation of *Candlemas*. *Sueur* A. D. 442.

18. The first council of Orleans in A. D. 511 ordered three days before the ascension to be kept as a fast, after the manner of lent, with rogations and litanies; and that on those days servants should rest from their labours, keeping to the old rule of the church, not to fast in the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. By an order of the council of Girone those litanies, and this fast, were put off till the week after Whitsuntide. *Bingham*, p. 560.

19. It is still a doubt with many persons, whether the obligation to refrain from eating blood, and animals that have been strangled, does not continue on the authority of the apostles. It is strictly observed in the East to this day. In the second council of Orleans in A. D. 525 they were excommunicated who ate of animals killed by beasts, those that were strangled, or that died of any disease.

20. Among the other miscellaneous articles in this period, it is worth noticing that in A. D. 591, a person pretended to be Jesus Christ, and was accompanied by a woman who was called Mary. He had more than three hundred followers, who were guilty of great outrages. As he was going to attack Aurelius a bishop in France, some of the bishop's friends met him, and pretending to do him reverence, stabbed him, on which his followers were dispersed.

21. As Christians will feel themselves interested in every thing relating to Judaism, I would observe that when Belisarius conquered Carthage in A. D. 534, he brought away the sacred vessels which had been in the temple at Jerusalem. They had been carried to Rome by Titus, and thence to Carthage by Genferic. Justinian sent them to the church at Jerusalem.

## PERIOD XV.

FROM THE RISE OF MAHOMETANISM IN  
A. D. 608 TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF  
THE WESTERN EMPIRE UNDER CHARLE-  
MAGNE IN A. D. 800.

---

## SECTION I.

*Of the controversy occasioned by the Monothelites.*

THERE is not, perhaps, in the whole compass of ecclesiastical history, a more melancholy example of the mischief that may arise from metaphysical subtleties, and at the same time from the improper interference of the civil magistrate to direct the faith of mankind, than in what relates to the *Monothelites*. And this controversy, like all the preceding ones of any note, related to the ideas which Christians entertained concerning *the person of Christ*, a subject which has been the principal cause of division among Christians from the first propagation of Christianity to the present time.

Tho' the doctrine of the distinction of the two natures in Christ was established at the council of Chalcedon, many of the bishops who received it

still maintained that, in consequence of the unity of the person, there ought not to be ascribed to him more than *one will*, and *one operation*; and by moderate men it was hoped that the acknowledgment of this would unite the two parties into which the Christian world had long been divided. Theodore bishop of Pharan in Arabia is said to have been the first who advanced this opinion; but it was received by Sergius patriarch of Constantinople, who, it is observed, was born of Eutychian parents, and therefore might be supposed to have a leaning to an opinion which favoured of that heresy, which this doctrine of monothelitism did.

Sergius pretended that this doctrine had been maintained by Mennas, a former patriarch of Constantinople, and, hoping to heal the divisions in the Christian church, he wrote to several persons of eminence on the subject, and among others to George surnamed Arsan, a Paulianist, or Unitarian, to whom he expressed his hope of a good effect from it. Indeed with the Paulianists, who were probably pretty numerous at this time, Fleury observes he could not but find approvers. For, believing Christ to be a mere man, they could not attribute to him more than one will and one operation. The patriarchs of Alexandria being generally opposed to those of Constantinople, John, who

who then occupied the former of these sees, was so far from concurring with Sergius in this measure, that he would have proposed the deposition of him on account of this letter of his to George, but that an incursion which the Persians then made into Egypt prevented it.

The emperor Heraclius, seeing his dominions suffer so much by divisions among Christians, eagerly joined with Sergius in this scheme of uniting them; and with this view held a conference with the chief of the Severian Eutychians in Armenia, and with the concurrence of Sergius he wrote to Arcadius archbishop of Cyprus on the subject. This letter he read to Cyrus bishop of Phasis, and metropolitan of that country. But Cyrus, not entering at that time into the emperor's views, answered him by appealing to the celebrated letter of pope Leo at the time of the council of Chalcedon, which he said evidently indicated two operations in Christ. But not chusing to say any thing more in opposition to the emperor, he wrote to Sergius on the subject, and his letter is dated A. D. 626. Sergius replied that the council had not determined any thing definitively on the subject, which was not then agitated, but that Cyril had advanced that there was only one vivifying operation in Christ, and he denied that the letter of Leo favoured the contrary opinion. He also said that he did not know

that any of the Fathers had maintained the doctrine of two operations, and that we ought to conform to their doctrine, without making any innovations,

The Eutychians were as much inclined to monothelitism as the Unitarians. For to acknowledge but one will in Christ was to acknowledge, as they thought, but one nature. On this principle, Athanasius patriarch of the Jacobites, being promised by the emperor to be made bishop of Antioch if he would acknowledge the council of Chalcedon, consented, and in this Cyrus then concurred; and George patriarch of Alexandria dying at that time, Cyrus succeeded him, and joined Theodore bishop of Pharan in the profession of the same sentiments.

By means of this new doctrine Cyrus succeeded in reconciling the Theodosian sect of the Eutychians, which was very numerous. This union took place at Antioch A. D. 633, all these sectaries entering the great church of that city, and receiving the communion in it. But they boasted that it was not they who had received the council of Chalcedon, but that the council had come over to them; for that by acknowledging but one operation in Christ, it was acknowledged that he had only one nature. Sophronius, a monk of great celebrity in those parts, and afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, remonstrated strongly against the articles of this union,

union, both with Cyrus and Sergius, but without effect. He will appear to have been the principal promoter of the opposition that was made to the new measures.

In order to gain pope Honorius, Sergius wrote to him on the occasion, giving him a history of what had passed in the East with respect to it, mentioning the letter of Mennas to pope Vigilius, and professing to have no opinion of his own on the subject. He mentioned with regret the opposition of Sophronius to the union that had taken place with the Eutychians, which he thought a happy event, and stated the metaphysical difficulties which occurred on the question, and which he thought it best to avoid by general expressions.

The pope in his answer expressed himself pleased with the letter of Sergius, commended him for his endeavours to prevent disputes about novel expressions, which he said might scandalize the simple, and that he acknowledged but one will in Christ, because the divinity had taken not our sin, but our nature only, as it was created before the fall, and which could, therefore, (we may suppose he would have said,) have no will different from that of the divinity. He farther said that he did not see that either the councils, or the scriptures, authorized us to say that there was either one or two operations, and concluded with stating  
the

the difficulty of insisting on either of these expressions, lest the one should be construed into Nestorianism, and the other into Eutychianism.

Sophronius, on being made bishop of Jerusalem, in the confession of his faith which it was then usual to make on those occasions, said that there was in Christ a *theandrique operation*, or something of a middle nature between the divine and the human. On this Honorius wrote to him, and also to Cyrus, expressing his disapprobation of the new terms, of one operation or two, as novelties which might obscure the doctrine of the church. Sophronius, in his answer, complied so far as to promise that he would not speak of two operations, provided that Cyrus would cease to speak of one. At least his deputies promised this for him. This, however, had no effect. On the contrary, Sophronius continued to oppose the Monothelites, and collected in two volumes six hundred passages from the Fathers to confute them. But this only irritated them the more. Perceiving that he gained nothing by this means, he sent Stephen bishop of Dora to Rome, in order to procure a formal condemnation of this new doctrine; and notwithstanding the attempts of the Monothelites to prevent him, the bishop arrived at Rome, but probably not till after the death of Honorius. However, Sophronius himself died first a short time after the  
taking

taking of Jerusalem by the Saracens in A. D. 636.

The emperor Heraclius, willing to prevent the rising storm, published what was termed an *ecthesis*, or exposition of the Christian doctrine on this subject, composed by Sergius, in which he disclaimed the terms one operation or two, but maintained that in Christ there was only one will, saying that, if even Nestorius, who admitted two natures, yet acknowledged only one will, much more ought the Catholics; and that the flesh of Christ animated by a rational soul had never any natural motion separate from, or contrary to, that of the *logos* which was united to it. This *ecthesis* was adopted by a council held at Constantinople, and was received by all the bishops of the East. It did not, however, give the same satisfaction at Rome, where a council was held under John IV, which condemned it. And then the emperor, perceiving the offence it had given, disclaimed being the author of it, and ascribed it wholly to Sergius.

Since, however, his predecessor Honorius had appeared to favour the Monothelites, pope John thought it necessary to write to the emperor in his vindication; saying that, tho' he denied two contrary wills in man, or the human nature of Christ, which other men derive from Adam, he maintained only one will of the humanity, and one of the

the divinity. "If," says he, on this occasion, "we maintain that Christ had only one will, we must deny either his divinity, or his humanity; and if the two natures have but one will, we not only confound the wills, but the natures too."

From this time the popes were uniformly zealous against the Monothelites, and pope Theodore wrote to Paul the patriarch of Constantinople, who had succeeded Sergius, requesting him to hold a council for the purpose of condemning the *ecthesis* of Heraclius; but little attention was given to this demand. However, Sergius the metropolitan of Cyprus, wrote to the pope to express on this occasion his submission to the holy see, as founded on the power given to Peter. Stephen bishop of Dora also wrote to complain to the pope of the conduct of Paul, in consequence of which the pope made him his vicar in Palestine, with power to regulate all ecclesiastical matters, and especially to depose the bishops whom Sergius had irregularly ordained. Accordingly Stephen acknowledged none to be lawful bishops but those who renounced the *ecthesis* of Heraclius. But many churches appointed no other bishops in the place of those whom he deposed. The bishops of Africa also wrote to the pope, declaring against the Monothelites.

In this controversy, as well as that which followed on the subject of image worship, the monks took a part opposite to that of the court of Constantinople, and the same with that of the pope; and the person who distinguished himself the most in this business was Maximus, some of whose writings are come down to us. Being in Africa at the same time with Pyrrhus, who had retired from the see of Constantinople, they had a conference on this subject, in which Pyrrhus maintained the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Maximus the contrary. On this occasion Pyrrhus acknowledged a compound will in Christ. But this would not satisfy Maximus, who maintained that, tho' Christ had the affections of hunger and thirst, &c. it was not necessarily, but voluntarily. The essential properties of humanity, he said, prove his human nature, but the manner of his holding them proves the mystery of the union. On this Pyrrhus advised to drop these subtleties, which he said the common people would not understand, and content themselves with saying that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, without troubling themselves any farther, and also with the decrees of former councils, which said nothing about one will or two. But this would not satisfy Maximus; who said that, as a proof that there may be two distinct operations in the same substance, a hot knife

knife both cuts and burns at the same time. In the issue Pyrrhus yielded, or seemed to yield, to the reasons of Maximus, and afterwards went to Rome to make his retraction before the pope, and on this the pope acknowledged him for the lawful patriarch of Constantinople.

This retraction of Pyrrhus was the occasion of several councils being held in Africa, the decrees of which were all against the Monothelites, and were calculated to induce Paul, who held the see of Constantinople, to conform to what they called the doctrine of the church. Fortunius, however, the bishop of Carthage was a Monothelite, and joined Paul at Constantinople.

Paul, pressed by these remonstrances, and especially in his controversy with the pope's legates, wrote to the pope an explanation of his opinions, alleging that the reason why he allowed only one will to Christ was not to ascribe to him any contrariety or difference of will, and thus introduce two persons. But his letter gave no satisfaction at Rome, or to the bishops of Africa, and those of the West in general, who held with the pope.

It appearing necessary, however, to do something to content the Africans, then invaded by the Saracens, the emperor Constans, who had succeeded Heraclius, thought proper to recall the *ecthesis* of his predecessor, and by a new *edict* to order that  
there

there should be no more disputing on the subject, but that all persons should abide by the decisions of the five general councils, and the language of the Fathers, without particular explanations. This edict was called the *Type*, or *formulary*.

Pope Theodore, seeing that neither his letters nor his legates had any success to bring back Paul of Constantinople to the Catholic faith, pronounced against him the sentence of deposition. This was probably in a council convened for the purpose, and in the same he condemned Pyrrhus; who having gone from Rome to Ravenna there renewed his profession of Monothelism, having been probably gained by the exarch with the hope of his succeeding to the see of Constantinople. Paul, hearing of his deposition overturned the altar which the pope had at Constantinople in the oratory of the palace, forbade his legates to celebrate mass there, and even persecuted them, and other Catholic bishops, some with imprisonment, some with banishment, and others with corporal punishment.

Martin, who succeeded Theodore in A. D. 649, immediately on his accession called a council, which consisted of one hundred and five Italian bishops, and after five solemn sessions, in which he had inveighed bitterly against the Monothelites, as Acephali; and Apollinarians, and against the

conduct of Paul and Pyrrhus, sentence of condemnation was passed on all those who held that in Christ there was only one will and one operation. They included in their anathemas Paul, Pyrrhus, and in general all those who received either the ecsthesis of Heraclius, or the impious type of Constans.

As the writings of the Catholic Fathers were admitted as authorities in the proceedings of this council, and the spurious ones of Dionysius the Areopagite were not then questioned, the pope was at much pains to explain the phrase *theandrique operation*, which occurs in it, as signifying in reality not one, but two operations, viz. of the God, and of the man. All the discourses delivered at this council, Fleury observes, were probably precomposed; few persons being at that time qualified to speak extempore, as in the former councils; and the Latin tongue being much corrupted, they were ashamed to write as they spake. Vol. 8; p. 417. It must be added that Paul bishop of Thessalonica, appearing to favour the principles of the Monothelites in his synodical letter, was excommunicated by the pope.

Tho' the pope carried every thing thus triumphantly in the West, what he did there had no effect in the East. On the contrary, the emperor was so provoked at his conduct, that he sent orders

to the exarch Olympius to oblige all the bishops and landholders in his jurisdiction to subscribe his *type*; and if he was sure of the army, to seize the pope himself. This order was given before the emperor had heard of the preceding council. Olympius, finding the council assembled, and perceiving that he could not depend upon the army, formed a design to assassinate the pope; but this scheme failing he went to Sicily to oppose the Saracens, and being defeated he there died.

His successor Theodore had the same orders to seize the pope, on the accusation of heresy, for having condemned the *type*, and not sufficiently honouring the mother of God. For by the Monothelites the Catholics were always charged with Nestorianism. He was also accused of favouring the Saracens. The exarch, having received these orders, actually seized the pope, tho' he was sick, and had his bed carried to the porch of the church of Lateran, and Eugenius was made pope by the authority of the emperor.

Martin, being thus made a prisoner, was conducted from place to place in his way to Constantinople, and spent a whole year in the isle of Naxos. At length he arrived at Constantinople in A. D. 654, where he was kept a prisoner three months, without being allowed to speak to any person, and after an irregular and insulting trial on the subject,

being accused chiefly of crimes of state, he was delivered over to the executioner, confined among the common malefactors, and treated with great inhumanity. After being kept several months in this situation, he was, at the intercession of the patriarch Paul, not put to death, but banished to Ephesus, where he complained that he was destitute of necessaries, and where he died. A. D. 655.

Paul dying, Peter the new patriarch of Constantinople sent his synodical letter, containing, as usual, a confession of his faith to Rome; but as he did not in it make mention of two wills and two operations, it was rejected by pope Eugenius and the people.

The monk Maximus having great influence in all the East, it was thought of particular consequence to gain him to the side of the court; but the methods that were taken to intimidate him were altogether unsuccessful. He underwent as rigorous an examination as the pope, and, like him, constantly refusing to communicate with the Monothelites, he, and two of his disciples of the name of Anastasius, were banished to Thrace, where they were left in a very destitute condition. Commissioners, however, were sent to hold a conference with him in the place of his exile; and after this he was reconducted to Constantinople, where still persisting in his opinions and conduct, he was exposed

posed to the grossest insults, and conducted to a prison at Perbere. After this, a council being held on the subject at Constantinople, this old man with his two disciples were sentenced to be publicly whipped, to have their tongues cut out, and their right hands cut off, then to be exposed in all the streets of Constantinople, and to be sent into banishment into the country of the Lazi; and this horrid sentence was actually executed.

In the same council pope Martin, Sophronius of Jerusalem, and all their adherents, were anathematized. Maximus was confined in a castle called Schamaki, near the country of the Alans, where he died A. D. 662. He left many writings, especially on the subject of Monothelitism, on which his mind had been so much employed. One of his disciples, Anastasius Apocrisiaire, was permitted, after much ill usage, to retire to a monastery, where, tho' he had been deprived of one of his hands, he wrote books. He died in the castle of Thascume A. D. 666.

The next emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, finding it, no doubt, to be his interest to gain the pope, without which he could not expect any aid from the West, of which the Eastern empire then stood in great need, adopted measures the reverse of those of his predecessors; and a change in the sentiments, at least in the conduct, of the bishops

immediately, as is usual, followed this change in the court; and from this time the cause of Monothelitism, which had been so triumphant, suddenly declined.

This emperor began by expressing his willingness to compose the differences that had arisen between the bishops of the East and the see of Rome, in a letter to the pope, dated A. D. 678, in which he promised a safe conduct to any bishops that should be sent to a conference or council to be held at Constantinople on the subject of Monothelitism. On this pope Agathon held a council, and in consequence of it addressed a letter to the emperor, in which he gave the reasons for the faith of the church of Rome (which he says could not err, according to the promise of Christ to Peter) in favour of the doctrine of two wills and two operations in Christ; expressing his hope that the bishops in the East would conform to it. At the same time he apologizes for the want of erudition in the persons he should send to the council, on account of the rude state of Europe at that time. The letter from the council is in the same strain, complaining of the decay of literature, (of which Fleury says their letter is itself a proof,) on account of their being to provide for their subsistence by their labour, to which they had been reduced by the devastations which the Barbarians had made in  
the

the patrimonies of their churches. But notwithstanding this they expressed the greatest firmness in the confession of their faith, and declared they should receive as brothers those who joined them in it, but should reject, and not even bear the society of, those who should renounce it.

Whatever was done at Rome was sure to be acceded to by all the churches in her communion. Theodore archbishop of Canterbury held a council in A. D. 680, on the subject of Monothelitism, in which all the bishops assembled professed to receive the five general councils, and also the late one held by pope Martin. This, being carried to Rome, gave great satisfaction.

In consequence of the measures that had been taken in this new state of things, deputies were sent from Italy to Constantinople; and on their arrival another general council, called the *sixth*, began to be held A. D. 680, and the emperor himself accompanied by thirteen of his principal officers, presided in it.

In this council the doctrine of the Monothelites was maintained by Macarius bishop of Antioch, and that of the other party by the legates from Rome, evidently favoured by the emperor, and the appeal was made to the language of the Christian Fathers. So far was there from being any freedom of debate in this assembly, that in the eighth

session Macarius was condemned and deposed, in the ninth the clergy from Rome pushed him by the shoulders out of the council, and Theophanes the abbot of Baie in Sicily, who had defended what was deemed the orthodox faith against him, was put in his place. In the tenth session, when the emperor left his seat to four commissioners, the late patriarchs of Constantinople, viz. Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, and also Honorius the late pope, were anathematized, as having held heretical and impious doctrine. Polychronius, a priest and monk, being examined before the council, acknowledged himself a Monothelite, and proposed to prove the truth of his doctrine by raising a dead man to life. But the trial being made without effect, he also was degraded and excommunicated.

Constantine, a priest of the church of Apamea, demanding to be heard, advised the abstaining from persecution on account of any opinion on the subject in question; but appearing to be in fact a Monothelite, saying that Christ divested himself of flesh and blood upon the cross, and that then he had only one will, which was that of the divinity, he was declared to be a heretic, as holding the doctrine of the Manicheans, and of Apollinarius.

In the last session the emperor attended in person, when one hundred and sixty bishops were present,

sent, tho' they were only forty at the first. He confirmed the decrees of the council, and forbade any more disputing on the subject; declaring that any bishop, clerical person, or monk, who did not conform to the acts of this council, should be deposed; that if he held any public office he should be deprived of it, and have his goods confiscated, and if he was a private person, he should be banished fifteen miles from Constantinople, or any other city.

Pope Agathon dying presently after the celebration of this council, the acts of it were confirmed by Leo, who succeeded him, and who joined in anathematizing all who had been condemned by it, pope Honorius among the rest. But when he sent an account of this council to the bishops in Spain, and mentioned the condemnation of his predecessor Honorius, it was for not having observed the apostolic traditions, which, as Fleury says, was to intimate that his offence was personal, and did not prejudice the apostolic see. But if one pope and his council might err, why might not another, and consequently all of them?

The succeeding pope Benedict took much pains to bring over to the Catholic faith Macarius the late bishop of Antioch, who lived in exile at Rome, but without any effect.

The emperor, whose object had been to conciliate the bishops of Rome, in order to pay a farther compliment to them, sent the hair of his two sons thither, and it was received by the pope, the clergy and the army, in token of their having adopted them, a custom made use of for that purpose in those times.

As no canons had been made in either of the two last general councils, another was assembled by the emperor Justinian II in A. D. 692, commonly denominated, from the place where it was convened, within the precincts of the palace, in *Trullo*. One hundred and eleven bishops met on this occasion, and enacted many canons relating to discipline, which are observed by the Greek church to this day. The principal of them were that none of the clergy might marry after their ordination, and that bishops must abstain from any commerce with the wives they had before their ordination, but that priests, deacons and subdeacons may cohabit with them, except on those days on which they approach the sacred mysteries.

The emperor sent copies of the decrees of this council to Rome; but tho' they had been signed by the pope's legates at the time, he refused to confirm them, on account, as Fleury says, of its being forbidden in them to fast on Saturdays, except on that before Easter Sunday, which was contrary to the

the custom observed at Rome, and which was expressly ordered to be corrected. The emperor was so much provoked at this refusal, that he sent to have the pope apprehended; but the officer sent to execute this commission with great difficulty escaped the resentment of the Roman populace. Afterwards, however, the emperor sent those decrees to the succeeding pope John VII in the year A. D. 705, and, with human weakness, says Fleury, he returned them without any alteration.

The archbishop of Aquileia and his suffragans held a council, in which they objected to the receiving of the fifth general council, but they were reconciled to it by pope Sergius, who died in A. D. 701.

The emperor Philippicus, who dethroned Justinian, was a Monothelite; and he reversed every thing that had been done against them; such influence had the imperial power in all these proceedings. He summoned a council in which the last was condemned, and, as far as appears, without any opposition. He expelled the patriarch Cyrus, and put in his place John, who was a Monothelistic like himself. In these proceedings he was supported by Germanus the metropolitan of Cyzicus, Andrew bishop of Crete, and many other persons of great eminence. He even persecuted those who refused to subscribe the decrees of this council, banishing

nishing some of them, and had the acts of the preceding general council publickly burned.

At Rome, however, open resistance was made to all the attempts of this emperor to enforce the decrees of this new council, and a sedition was occasioned by the sending of the emperor's letters on the subject from Ravenna, in which more than twenty-five persons were killed in the streets.

Presently after this Philippicus was deposed, and Anastasius, who was no Monothelite, succeeding him, all the bishops then present at Constantinople, and all the clergy of the place, proclaimed the sixth council. The new patriarch of Constantinople wrote to the pope to apologize for his conduct, in joining with Philippicus, as having acted by constraint.

Cosmas the Melchite, patriarch of Alexandria, abandoned the heresy of the Monothelites, which had been held by the Melchites from the time of the patriarch Cyrus. This Cosmas could neither write nor read, and was by trade a needle maker; so low was this once magnificent see at this time. Indeed the Melchites had but one small church in Alexandria, all the rest being held by the Jacobites, or Eutychians. The Nubians also were all Jacobites in A. D. 740, and so are the Abyssinians to this day.

No whole description of men continued the profession of Monothelitism except the *Maronites*, a people so called from inhabiting a district near mount Libanus in Syria, called *Maronis*, or *Maronia*. They were all avowed Monothelites till of late years, when, as it is said, they subjected themselves to the church of Rome. *Sueur* A. D. 676.

---

## SECTION II.

### *Of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism.*

**T**HIS period of our history is chiefly distinguished by the rise, and wonderfully rapid progress, of a new religion, which for some time threatened the extirpation of Christianity, and all other religions whatever. But the circumstances in which it rose, and the manner in which it was propagated, were exceedingly different from those which I have related concerning the promulgation of Christianity, and certainly much less favourable to its evidence, as will appear from the following succinct account.

The founder of this religion was Mahomet, an Arab of the tribe of Koreish, born at Mecca A. D. 568. When he was two years old he lost his father Abdalla, and the family being in low circumstances,

stances, his uncle Abutaleb took the care of his education, and employed him in merchandise; and in this capacity he travelled to Damascus in Syria. After this a rich widow, of the name of Kadijah, employed him as her factor, and then married him, when he was twenty years old, and she forty. By her he had several children, and among them a daughter of the name of Fatima.

At the age of forty Mahomet, having first prepared himself by retiring to a cave in the neighbourhood of Mecca, in the month Ramadan, began to assume the character of a prophet. His first convert was his wife, to whom he opened the secret of his mission in the cave, but it was with much difficulty, and two years after this retired and austere life, that he gained her. During four years he taught only in private, and did not advance his pretensions except to those with whom he might naturally expect to have the most influence. His second convert was his slave Zeyde, to whom he thereupon gave his liberty; and hence it became a law with the Mahometans to make their slaves free whenever they embrace their religion. His third convert was Ali, the son of Abutaleb his uncle, and the fourth Abubeker, who being a man of character and fortune, was soon followed by five others, who were afterwards the principal generals of his armies. Having gained those nine disciples,  
he

he began to preach more openly. This was in the forty-fourth year of his age; and in the fifth year of his pretended mission he had thirty-nine disciples. However the men of his tribe in general treated him as a madman, or an impostor, and continually demanded of him to prove his divine mission by miracles. But to this he always answered that God did not send him to work miracles, but only to preach; that God had worked miracles enow by Moses, Jesus Christ, and other prophets, and that if he had worked miracles they would not believe in him. At this time tho' some of the Arabs professed the Jewish religion and others the Christian; the generality were Sabians, or worshippers of the sun, moon and stars. In general they were very ignorant, and it was but a little before the time of Mahomet that his tribe had acquired the arts of writing and reading, and it is said that he himself understood neither. He pretended to have frequent conferences with the angel Gabriel, and that he dictated to him from time to time certain compositions calculated to support his mission, and encourage his disciples, mixed with precepts of morality, religion, and legislation. These being collected after his death composed the *Koran*, or the Bible of the Mahometans.

Mahomet did not pretend that his religion was new, but the same with that of Abraham and Ishmael.

stances, his uncle Abutaleb took the care of his education, and employed him in merchandise; and in this capacity he travelled to Damascus in Syria. After this a rich widow, of the name of Kadijah, employed him as her factor, and then married him, when he was twenty years old, and she forty. By her he had several children, and among them a daughter of the name of Fatima.

At the age of forty Mahomet, having first prepared himself by retiring to a cave in the neighbourhood of Mecca, in the month Ramadan, began to assume the character of a prophet. His first convert was his wife, to whom he opened the secret of his mission in the cave, but it was with much difficulty, and two years after this retired and austere life, that he gained her. During four years he taught only in private, and did not advance his pretensions except to those with whom he might naturally expect to have the most influence. His second convert was his slave Zeyde, to whom he thereupon gave his liberty; and hence it became a law with the Mahometans to make their slaves free whenever they embrace their religion. His third convert was Ali, the son of Abutaleb his uncle, and the fourth Abubeker, who being a man of character and fortune, was soon followed by five others, who were afterwards the principal generals of his armies. Having gained those nine disciples,  
he

he began to preach more openly. This was in the forty-fourth year of his age; and in the fifth year of his pretended mission he had thirty-nine disciples. However the men of his tribe in general treated him as a madman, or an impostor, and continually demanded of him to prove his divine mission by miracles. But to this he always answered that God did not send him to work miracles, but only to preach; that God had worked miracles enow by Moses, Jesus Christ, and other prophets, and that if he had worked miracles they would not believe in him. At this time tho' some of the Arabs professed the Jewish religion and others the Christian; the generality were Sabians, or worshippers of the sun, moon and stars. In general they were very ignorant, and it was but a little before the time of Mahomet that his tribe had acquired the arts of writing and reading, and it is said that he himself understood neither. He pretended to have frequent conferences with the angel Gabriel, and that he dictated to him from time to time certain compositions calculated to support his mission, and encourage his disciples, mixed with precepts of morality, religion, and legislation. These being collected after his death composed the *Koran*, or the Bible of the Mahometans.

Mahomet did not pretend that his religion was new, but the same with that of Abraham and Ishmael.

from this flight to Medina the Mahometans date their years, calling it the æra of the *hegira*. At Medina Mahomet armed his followers, and on his defeating a party of Jews and Koreshites his sect greatly increased. In the sixth year of the *hegira* he made a truce with them, and in the same year his followers swore allegiance to him as their prince and legislator, as well as prophet. As a lawgiver he allowed every man four wives, besides concubines, with the liberty of divorce; but he himself had a much greater number, which, as he said, was a privilege peculiar to himself.

The Koreshites having broken the truce in A. D. 629, he marched against them with an army of ten thousand men, and entering Mecca in triumph, his authority was acknowledged there. After this he still continued to reside at Medina, and only went to Mecca in pilgrimage in the tenth year of the *hegira*, and in the year following he died, in the sixty-third year of his age, after he had conquered almost the whole of Arabia.

Mahomet having no son, he was succeeded by Abubeker, the father of his favourite wife. He took the title of *Calif*, that is vicar, or lieutenant of the prophet. It was he who collected the chapters of the Koran, and published them in one volume. He reigned two years, and his justice and disinterestedness are highly spoken of. He defeated

two other professed prophets Armed and Mouful-lem who arose a little before the death of Mahomet, and also a third named Talitia. In his short reign his followers conquered the Arabs bordering on Persia. His successor Omar took the title of *Commander of the faithful*, which descended to his successors. In his reign of ten years he added Persia, Syria, and Egypt to his empire, and in A. D. 713 the Arabs, or Saracens, took possession of almost the whole of Spain. Then they passed the Pyrenees, and were for some time masters of nearly one half of France, when they were defeated, and driven out, by Charles Martel, mayor of the palace, and in fact king of France. In A. D. 739 the Saracens made a second invasion of France, when they took Marseilles, Avignon, and the greatest part of the southern provinces; but on the Lombards joining the French against them, they withdrew into Spain.

The Saracens plundered and destroyed many monasteries in France, and put to death several of the monks, but especially in their retreat, after being defeated.

When the bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch; and other places, could not exercise their functions after those cities were possessed by the Saracens, the council in Trullo allowed them their rank and power; and when they died others were ordained

in their place, whence came the custom of ordaining bishops in *partibus*, that is, in *partibus infidelium*.

When we consider the extreme bigotry of the Catholic Christians at the time of the propagation of Mahometanism with respect to the most prominent doctrine of the Mahometan creed, viz. that of the unity of God, in opposition to that of a trinity in the divine nature, we cannot be surprized at the offence that was taken at it, and that Mahometans in return should entertain an utter detestation of the creed of such Christians.

In the last expiring state of the Catholic churches in Africa, they obliged their converts not only to renounce Mahometanism, but to say, in their confession of faith, "I curse the God of Mahomet, who he says is one intire deity, neither begetting, nor being begotten, and like to whom there is no other Being. And I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the holy, coessential, and undivided trinity." *Robinson* p. 115. Few Christians I presume of the present age would think this conduct prudent, whether they could conscientiously adopt this language or not.

## SECTION III.

*Of the Controversy relating to the Worship of Images.*

I N the progress of superstition it was natural to expect that a particular regard would be paid to the relics of the Christian martyrs, and to any thing that could assist in recollecting their virtues, and among these *pictures* and *images* had, no doubt, their use. But from this natural and allowable, because useful, kind of respect, the transition, in this period, among people who had not lost all traces of heathenism (in which image worship was a predominant feature) to a superstitious and undue reverence, was but too easy. The common people, not content with gazing at such images, and receiving some instruction, and some good impressions, from them, which was the use that was first made of them, began to bow down before them, as if the persons whose images they were had themselves been present; and Christ being then considered as God, his picture, or image, was worshipped, as he himself was. This practice was probably encouraged with a view to draw the Heathens from the worship of their idols, on the same principle as their festivals had been kept up with a nominal change in the object and use of them.

Many persons, however, of juster views, and greater discernment, did not fail to remonstrate against this practice, and among these the persons who took the greatest offence at it in the East were Constantine, the bishop of Nacolia and the emperor Leo Isauricus, who unhappily (but as we have seen it was universally done in those times) employed power and violence to gain his purpose. The peculiar rage of the Mahometans against all image worship, as a species of idolatry, is thought to have drawn the more particular attention of the Christians of this age to the subject.

Germanus patriarch of Constantinople, as well as the populace of that city, was an advocate for the prevailing superstition. He wrote several letters now extant on the subject, especially to John bishop of Synada in Phrygia, the metropolitan of Constantine of Nacolia. In these letters he disclaims all proper worship except to God, but expresses his wishes that antient and useful customs might be kept up. He also urges the miracles that he said had been wrought by images, especially one of the virgin Mary at Sozopolis in Pisidia, which had sent a liquid perfume from her painted hand, of which he says there were many witnesses. At the same time, however, he disclaims the use of statues. He wrote also to pope Gregory on the subject, who

in

in return expressed his approbation of his sentiments.

An earthquake happening in an island of the archipelago in the tenth year of the emperor Leo, he imagined it was a judgment of God for the worship of images; and assembling the people of Constantinople, he addressed them on the subject, but in such a manner as gave them great offence. The people of Greece, and the inhabitants of the Cyclades, even made this a pretence for a revolt, and they set up another emperor named Cosmas, but their generals being defeated on their approach to Constantinople, the revolt was suppressed. Not content with what he had done himself, the emperor, in the year A. D. 730, assembled a council at Constantinople, in which a decree was made against the worship of images, and the patriarch Germanus refusing to subscribe it was deposed, and ended his days in a monastery.

The emperor pursued his purpose, and in execution of the orders of the council, began with demolishing an image of Christ within the precincts of the palace, which was famous for the miracles said to have been wrought by it. But the person who executed the order was killed on the spot by some women. In the place of the image he erected a simple cross, with an inscription, to shew that the image had been removed. The women who

had been guilty of the murder, and some other persons who had been their abettors, were put to death. He did not, however, order the demolition in all places, but contended himself with forbidding the worship of them. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 90.

It would have been happy if he had contented himself with punishing persons for such violent breaches of the peace as this. But his librarian Œcumenicus and twelve of his assistants, who taught both religion and the sciences, not complying with the emperor's wishes in this business, he surrounded the place with faggots, and burned both them and the library. He then ordered all the images of the virgin Mary and other saints to be brought to a public place and burned, and the walls of the churches that had been painted to be white washed. They who refused to obey the order were punished, some with death, and others with mutilation.

When the news of this persecution reached Italy, the statues of the emperor were thrown down, and trampled upon by the populace of Rome. The emperor, however, wishing to gain the pope, sent him his decree against images, promising him his favour if he complied with it, and threatening him with deposition if he did not. The pope, far from complying, exerted himself all he could in resisting the will of the emperor, tho' he did not, as some have said, excommunicate him, (*Mosheim*, Vol. 2.

p. 92.) and the people of Italy in general took his part. The inhabitants of the Pentapolis also, and of the territory of Venice, rejected the orders of the emperor. The clergy even anathematized the exarch Paul, and him that employed him, meaning the emperor himself, and all who should obey him; and the people of Italy in general joining them, they resolved to chuse another emperor; but the pope, not willing to proceed so far, diverted them from their purpose. However, in consequence of this the emperor eventually lost all the exarchate, which fell to the Lombards.

On the other hand, Exhilaratus duke of Naples, being master of Campania, persuaded the people of that province to obey the emperor, and put the pope to death; but the people of Rome seizing him put *him* to death, and his son. They also expelled Peter the duke of Rome, because they supposed that he had written to the emperor against the pope. At Ravenna the people were divided, and the different parties coming to blows, Paul the exarch was killed.

Gregory III, who succeeded Gregory II, in A. D. 731, wrote a long letter of remonstrance to the emperor on the subject of the worship of images, defending it as an antient practice, and a worship that was only *relative*, and not that of the wood or stone of which they consisted. God forbid, says

he, that we should put our trust in these images. If it be that of our Saviour, we say "Lord Jesus Christ, son of God. succour us, save us; If it be that of the virgin Mary, we say, holy mother of God pray to thy son, that he may save our souls; If it be the martyr Stephen, we say holy Stephen, who shed your blood for Christ, and who have so much influence with him, pray for us." Speaking of the design of the emperor to have his predecessor carried in chains to Constantinople, he said the popes were the mediators and arbiters of peace between the East and the West. He added "We fear not your menaces. At the distance of a league from Rome we are in safety," meaning in the dominions of the Lombards.

The violence of the emperor induced Gregory to call a council on the subject at Rome in A. D. 732, when ninety-three bishops attended, without including the pope, Anthony archbishop of Grada, or John of Ravenna. All the clergy of Rome were also present with the nobles, the consuls, and the people in general; when it was unanimously agreed that all persons who should destroy, or even speak with contempt of, the holy images should be separated from the communion of the church.

The emperor, provoked at this opposition of the pope, and the revolt of Italy, on this occasion, fitted out a fleet, and sent it to Italy to support his  
 autho-

authority in that country; but it was shipwrecked in the Adriatic. He also confiscated all the patrimony of St. Peter in the countries subject to him, which amounted to a very great sum. In return, the people of Rome took an oath to defend the pope both against Leo, and Luitprand king of the Lombards, to whom they ceased to pay any tribute; and this was the origin of the temporal power of the popes, tho' they were not yet temporal princes. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 246. 248. The emperor also imprisoned or banished those in the East, who did not concur with him with respect to images.

John of Damascus, many of whose writings are now extant, being out of the power of the emperor, wrote on this occasion in defence of image worship, acknowledging the authority of the emperor in things of a civil nature, but strongly disclaiming it in all things ecclesiastical, and forewarning him of the judgments of God for his proceedings against his true servants, by the example of Saul, Jezebel, and Herod.

In A. D. 754 Constantine Copronymus, who succeeded Leo, both in the empire, and his zeal against image worship, held a council at Constantinople, of one hundred and thirty-eight bishops, on the subject. It lasted six months, and in the confession of faith which they made on this occasion, they charge the worshippers of images with many  
here,

heresies, especially that of Nestorius; saying that the true image of Christ was the Eucharist, comparing the union of Christ with the elements to the union of the logos with human flesh in the incarnation. The making, or the adoration of, images is by this council forbidden upon pain of deposition to all clergy, and of anathema to monks and laymen. They conclude with declaring their unanimity in this business, and with anathemas against Germanus of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, and John of Damascus. In consequence of this council images were burned in all the churches, and effaced from the walls on which they were painted. Copronymus moreover ordered his subjects to worship one God, that no person should be called a saint, that no relics should be adored, no departed spirits invoked, not even the virgin Mary herself; who he said was after the birth of Jesus no more than any other woman. *Rotinson* p. 169.

The person who suffered the most for defending the worship of images at this time was the monk Stephen of Auxence. He was cruelly used by the emperor, and after having been long banished, was reported to have wrought many miracles by presenting an image of Christ to be worshipped by sick persons. Being interrogated on the subject of his faith in the presence of the emperor, he disclaimed  
all

all worship of the materials of which images were made. The emperor at the same time disclaiming all disrespect to Christ, tho' he trampled upon his image; the monk produced a piece of money on which was the image of the emperor, and throwing it on the ground trampled on it. But for this argument he was sent to prison, to be tried for violating a law that had been made with respect to such actions. Stephen was afterwards taken out of prison by order of the emperor, and killed by a blow on the head by one of the persons who were dragging him about the streets. After he was dead, the body was still dragged about the streets, and much abused.

Constantine, the late patriarch of Constantinople, was brought from the place of his banishment, and after a formal degradation carried thro' the streets of Constantinople on an ass, with his face towards the tail, and then beheaded, A. D. 767. This Constantine having baptized two of the emperor's children, was justly considered as an aggravation of this shocking cruelty.

The monks in general being advocates for the worship of images, the emperor did every thing in his power to suppress them, after using both promises and threatnings to gain them, putting out the eyes of many, and banishing others.

The

The Western church was as zealous in the defence of image worship as the Eastern in the suppression of it. At a council held at Rome in A. D. 769, it was decreed that the relics and images of the saints should be honoured according to antient usage, and the council held at Constantinople was anathematized; but the shocking cruelties practiced in the East were not imitated in the West.

Leo the son of Constantine was as great an enemy of image worship as his father; but on his death, Irene his widow being a strenuous advocate for them, and her son Constantine being only ten years of age, and she governing in his name, things soon took a different turn, both with respect to the worship of images, and the monastic life, which any person was now at full liberty to embrace. And there cannot be a greater proof of the decisive influence of power in all proceedings of this nature, than the sudden transition from seeming unanimity on one side of the question to as great apparent unanimity on the opposite side. It was probably the same political motive that operated in this case as in that of the Monothelites. The concurrence of the popes, and of the powers of the West, was thought necessary in the then hazardous state of the Grecian empire.

In A. D. 784 Paul the patriarch of Constantinople, being sick, retired to a monastery, when, being

being visited by the emperor, and empress, and no doubt being apprized of their views, he acknowledged his weakness in joining in the condemnation of image worship, in obedience to the orders of the former emperors, and presently after this confession he died. His successor Tarasius, as well apprized of the new state of things, refused to accept of that dignity, unless a general council was called to heal the divisions of the church on the subject of image worship. Application was then made to the pope, who consented to the calling of the council, provided the first thing that should be done was the anathematizing of the former council. He even expressed his wish that, if it were possible, the images might be replaced in the churches before the council was held.

With some difficulty legates from the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, were procured to attend this council, the Saracens to whom those cities were now subject being naturally jealous of such assemblies. At length, the first of August A. D. 786, was fixed for the holding of this council, in the church of the twelve apostles at Constantinople. But the majority of the Eastern bishops being against the worship of images, or as they were then called *Iconoclasts*, and the design of the council being well known, they were very clamorous against it, as being in direct opposition to that

that which had been held in the same place before; and being joined by the old soldiers, attached to the principles of the emperor Constantine, it was found necessary to send for other troops to overawe them; and orders were given to hold the council at Nice the 24th of September A. D. 787, where the bishops accordingly met, to the number of three hundred and seventy-seven.

The council was opened by a speech of Tarasius patriarch of Constantinople, exhorting the bishops to reject all novelties, and adhere to the traditions of the church, which he said could not err, and said that they who had opposed the truth the year before might attend, and give their reasons. The bishops accused of this refractory disposition being then ordered to enter, the commissioners of the emperor read to them a letter which he had addressed to them, exhorting them to give peace to the church. Upon this Basil bishop of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodosius of Amorium, stood up, when the first named of them made an ample confession of his former heresy, and requested to be reunited to the Catholic church; saying he received with all honour the holy relics of the saints. "I adore them," he said, "with veneration, hoping to partake of their holyness. I also receive the venerable images of Jesus Christ, of his holy mother, of the angels, and all saints.

"I

“ I embrace them, and give them the adoration  
“ of honour. I reject and from my heart anathe-  
“ matize the false council called the seventh, as  
“ contrary to the traditions of the church.” He  
added much more to the same purpose, and was  
followed in the same strain by the other two.

After this seven other bishops, who had opposed the holding of this council the year before, stood up, and made their submission. Then, without any debate on the subject, followed a discussion of the manner in which penitents should be received; and one of the bishops asking in what rank they should place this new heresy of the iconoclasts, which they were assembled to oppose, John the legate from the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch (for he was sent by both) replied, it was worse than any that had preceded it, as it destroyed the incarnation.

In the second session Gregory of Neocæsarea, one of the most celebrated of the Iconoclasts, and who had distinguished himself the most in the preceding council, acknowledged his offence, and asked pardon. The letter of the pope being then read; except a part in which he had complained of the assumption of the title of universal bishop by the patriarch of Constantinople, and had asked the restitution of the patrimony of his church, Tarasus said he had expressed his own sentiments: Images,

he said, must be adored with a relative affection, reserving to God alone the worship of *latreia*. All the bishops present, to the number of two hundred and sixty one, declared they entertained the same sentiments, and the monks did the same.

At this council was read a discourse attributed to Athanasius, containing an account of a miracle wrought by an image of Christ, which had been pierced by some Jews, and from which had issued blood, which cured several sick persons. This piece is acknowledged by Fleury to be spurious, and the fact to be doubtful; but he maintains that this circumstance did not invalidate the decision. He only remarks on this occasion, that of so many bishops none seem to have been versed in criticism; for many spurious productions were cited; a proof, he says, of the ignorance of the age. But he must have been a bold man who, if he had entertained a doubt of the genuineness of those writings, should in that assembly have maintained his opinion.

In the fifth session images were ordered to be replaced in the churches, and one being brought into the assembly, they all saluted it in form. They also directed that all books condemning the worship of them should be burned.

In the sixth session, the council of A. D. 744 was condemned, as not having had the concurrence of the pope, or that of the patriarchs of Jerusalem,

AN.

Antioch, or Alexandria, and as having even been anathematized by the bishops of those churches.

In the seventh session the members of this council drew up and signed a confession of their faith, to the purport abovementioned, and it was signed by the legates, and all the bishops, to the number of three hundred and five. They anathematized the council of Constantinople which had decided against the worship of images, and some of the Iconoclastic writers by name; and addressed a letter to the pope, informing him of what they had done.

The last session of this council was held at Constantinople, when the empress Irene was present, with the emperor her son, and the confession of faith was recited, and signed by them both. They concluded, as usual, with loud acclamations, and the empress bestowed great liberalities upon all the bishops. And from her they were fully intitled to them.

In the canons of this council it was ordered, that no churches should be consecrated without relics.

Thus smoothly were all things conducted in favour of the worship of images in the East, and in Italy; but the case was different in the countries subject to Charlemagne, who is said to have been dissatisfied with the conduct of Irene, who had demanded his daughter for her son, and afterwards

married him to another. Whatever may be ascribed to the influence of this political situation, when the pope sent a copy of the decrees of the preceding council to Charlemagne, he assembled the bishops of his extensive dominions, none of whom had attended the council, and they drew up a long letter in the name of the king in several books, and thence called *Caroline books*, in which they express their disapprobation of both the councils which had been held on the subject of the worship of images, that of Constantinople, and that of Nice, recommending the use of images, but not for the purpose of adoration. They say they receive the six first councils, but that they reject all novelties, especially the council which ordered the adoration of images, the acts of which they say were destitute both of eloquence and common sense. The council of Nice, they say, cannot be allowed to be universal, because there were not in it bishops from all parts of the world, and because its decisions are not agreeable to the doctrine of the universal church. Alcuin, a learned Englishman employed by Charlemagne to teach the sciences in France, also wrote against the decrees of the council of Nice, in a letter addressed to this prince, in the name of the bishops and sovereigns of England.

Charlemagne, not content with this, having called another council of all the states subject to him

him at Frankfort A. D. 794, to settle various ecclesiastical matters, the adoration of images was then rejected unanimously, and great contempt of it expressed. Speaking of the council held by the Greeks on the subject, in the decrees of which it was said that "whoever does not render to the images of Christ service and adoration as to the divine trinity, let him be anathema," they say, We despise and reject this service and adoration unanimously.

Notwithstanding this harsh condemnation of the decrees of a council in which the pope concurred, Adrian, writing to Charlemagne, treated him with the greatest respect. In justification of his own conduct he alleged chiefly two councils held at Rome against the Iconoclasts in A. D. 732 and A. D. 769, in the last of which twelve bishops from France assisted, and when nevertheless it was agreed that images should be honoured. He also quoted a passage from a letter of St. Gregory, where he says that images are useful for instruction; tho' God only is to be adored. He said he received the canons of the council of Nice, because they were agreeable to the opinion of pope Gregory, and because he feared that if he did not receive them the Greeks would return to their errors, and he should have been responsible for the loss of many souls. Nevertheless he added that he had not then

given any answer to the emperor on the subject of the council, and that, if he thought proper, at the same time that he thanked the emperor for the restoration of images, he would press him on the subject of the restitution of the patrimony of his church; and that if he refused to make this restitution, he would declare him a heretic. Fleury says the pope had deferred sending his letters to Constantinople on account of the uncertain state of things there, and the great power of the Iconoclasts. That they were still very numerous there, appears from this circumstance, that when the patriarch Tarasus had threatened the emperor with excommunication for divorcing his wife, and marrying another, he did not venture to provoke him so much, lest he should join the Iconoclasts.

It is evident from these proceedings in the West, that no idea was at this time entertained of the infallibility of the popes.

## SECTION IV.

*Of the Controversy occasioned by the Opinion of Elipand of Toledo, and Felix of Urgela, concerning the Sense in which Christ is the Son of God.*

**H**ITHERTO we have seen that all the controversies concerning the person of Christ had their origin in the East. In this period one was started in the West, and tho' the consequences of it were not so great, or so lasting, as those of the preceding ones on similar subjects, they were by no means inconsiderable at the time.

In A. D. 790 Elipand bishop of Toledo, consulting Felix bishop of Urgela in Catalonia, about the sense in which Christ was the son of God, the latter answered, that he was his son by *adoption*, and not by *nature*; an opinion which was well received, and maintained, by Elipand, as it was by Ascaric of Braga. It also spread much in the Asturias, Galicia, and the southern provinces of France.

Pope Adrian hearing of this, wrote to the bishops of Spain, exhorting them to adhere to the doctrine of the Fathers on the subject. On receiving this letter, Elipand called a council at Toledo, but neither the pope's letter, nor any thing

that passed there, led him to change his opinion, tho' opposed by Beatus, a priest and monk in the Asturies, and Ethurius his disciple, afterwards bishop of Osma, who recovered many who had embraced the opinion of Elipand. This, however, did not discourage the archbishop, and writing against his opponents, he said that, they who hold that Christ was the adopted son of God according to his humanity only, and not according to his divinity also, were heretics. He said that the three persons in the trinity were God, the *principle* (*αρχη*) and the Holy spirit; and he compared their union to that of husband and wife, which Fleury says was making it nothing more than of a moral nature, and that in other things he wrote like a Nestorian. But the sentiment expressed above is more nearly that of the proper Unitarians.

Charlemagne having extended his conquests into Spain, Urgela was in his dominions; and being informed of this new opinion, and, like all statesmen, alarmed at any innovation, he called a council at Narbonne for several ecclesiastical matters, as he said, but "principally on account of the pernicious opinion of Felix of Urgela." What was at that time done in this business does not appear, but in another council held at Friuli the same year A. D. 791, the opinion of Felix and Elipand was condemned.

This

This sentence, however, does not appear to have had any more effect than the letter of the pope; and the uneasiness of Charlemagne on the subject continuing, Felix was brought before him at Ratisbon in A. D. 792. Being heard and answered in the presence of the king, it is said that he renounced his opinions; and being sent to Rome, he confessed and abjured his heresy, and then was permitted to return to Urgela. There, however, he maintained his former opinion; on which Alcuin addressed to him a letter of remonstrance, and Felix replied. In this piece he said that, since Christ, as a man, was the son of David, and the son of God, and it was impossible that the same person should have two fathers by nature, one of them must be by nature, and the other by adoption. Jesus Christ as man, he said, was God only nominally, since Peter said that "he wrought miracles because God was with him, and Paul said "that God was in Christ reconciling the world "unto himself. They do not say that Jesus Christ "was God." These, it is easy to perceive, are the sentiments of one who was not far from pure unitarianism.

Both Paulinus patriarch of Aquileia, and Alcuin, by order of Charlemagne, wrote a large answer to this piece [of Felix, and they charge him

with Nestorianism, in making two sons of God, one by nature, and the other by adoption.

Elipand appears to have been no less active than Felix in the defence of their common doctrine. He wrote a letter addressed to the bishops of Spain, and another to Charlemagne, in support of his opinion; and the letter was recited and seemingly with approbation, in a council which he assembled from the different provinces of Spain. This letter being read in the presence of Charlemagne, he arose, and spoke a long time on the subject; saying that this error had excited great horror to the very extremity of his dominions, and that it was absolutely necessary to put an end to it. The bishops who were present asked some days to give their opinion, and the king fixed a day on which they were to give it in writing. He also sent an embassy to consult the pope on the subject, and likewise sent for learned men from Great Britain, in order to have the concurrence of all the western churches.

The pope on the return of the embassy, sent to Charlemagne a copy of the letter which he had addressed to the bishops of Galicia in Spain, in which he replied to the letter of Elipand, and exhorted them to return to the faith of the church, threatening them with excommunication if they did not. Paulinus also gave his opinion in a letter

written

written not only in his own name, but also in that of the archbishop of Milan, and those of all the provinces of Italy subject to Charlemagne.

This letter of Paulinus was read in the general council of all the countries subject to Charlemagne, held at Frankfort A. D. 794, when two legates of the pope attended. The letter of Elipand being then read to them, they answered it at large, in a synodical epistle, in the name of all the bishops of Germany, Gaul, and Aquitain, addressed to all the bishops and the faithful in Spain. It concluded, however, with a simple exhortation, without any threatening of anathema.

Charlemagne also wrote in his own name to Elipand, and the other bishops of Spain, expressing his great concern for their subjection to the Infidels, but greater for their errors with respect to the faith; and after reciting all that had been done on the subject by himself, and the bishops in his connection, he urges them in the most earnest manner to embrace their faith, promising them in this case his assistance to deliver them from the infidels; but saying that, otherwise, he should consider them as absolute heretics, and hold no communication with them. The effect of this letter is not known; but as Spain was not subject to Charlemagne, it was probably very little. It certainly  
did

did not encourage him to do any thing for their relief.

Felix of Urgela was in a different situation, being intirely in the power of Charlemagne. He having relapsed into his heresy, as it was called, and replied to Alcuin, the king caused a council to be assembled at Rome in A. D. 799, when fifty-seven bishops attended. In this council Felix was declared to be excommunicated, if he did not renounce his errors.

In the same year Charlemagne sent a deputation of several bishops, and other persons of eminence, to persuade Felix to renounce his opinions; and in consequence of this he consented to accompany the deputies to Charlemagne at Aix la Chapelle. There, after giving his reasons for his opinions, in the presence of the king, and of many bishops and nobles assembled on the occasion, and heard their replies, he did finally renounce, or feigned to renounce, his opinion. But on account of his frequent relapses, he was deposed and sent to Lyons, where he passed the remainder of his days. This recantation was in the form of a letter addressed to the people of his diocese, exhorting them to join the universal church, and to cease from the scandal which he had occasioned.\* In

\* Claude of Turin was the disciple of Felix of Urgela. He was alive in A. D. 839, but his disciples formed no separate churches. *Robinson*, p. 448.

IN A. D. 800, Charlemagne sent a deputation of Archbishops, and other persons of eminence, to Elipand, and they carried with them a treatise of Alcuin addressed to him, in which he exhorted him very earnestly to follow the example of Felix. But Elipand, who was then in his ninety second year, was not to be gained. Old as he was, he replied to Alcuin, reproaching him with the number and value of his church preferments; saying that he had not less than twenty thousand serfs at his disposal, lands being then given with the serfs or villeins who cultivated them. Thus ended this controversy which does not appear to have had any effect after the age in which it arose.

---



---

SECTION V.

*Of the Progress of Christianity, and the State of Heathens, Jews, and Sectaries, in this Period.*

ABOUT the year A. D. 637, christianity was introduced into China by the Nestorians, who were indefatigable in their labours for this purpose, when Jesuabas of Gadala was at their head. *Mosheim*, vol. 2, p. 1. But it does not appear that any lasting effect was produced.

In

In the West great progress was made in the conversion of the Germans by St. Winitred, to whom the pope gave the name of Boniface, a man devoted to the see of Rome, the interests of which he seems to have had at heart full as much as those of christianity.

The conversion of the heathens in the more remote parts of Europe was always attended to by the christian powers, and especially by the popes, whose power and revenue were much increased by its success. Berin sent by pope Honorius to convert the Pagans in England, made a convert of Conisgisle king of Wesssex, in A. D. 638. St. Wilfrid converted many of the people of Friseland in his way to Rome in A. D. 679. But the most successful apostle in this age was Charlemagne, who propagated Christianity as Mahomet did his religion, by the sword. The great theatre of his exploits was in Saxony, then occupied by the pagans. These he conquered no less than four times, and every time he compelled them to be baptised; but every time that they revolted, they never failed to apostatize from their profession of christianity. It was judged, however, that tho' the first who were converted in this way would be very imperfect christians, their posterity, instructed by christian priests and monks, would be better, which certainly was the case.

How these new converts were instructed before they were admitted to baptism, will appear from the behaviour of Radbod king of Friseland, who was converted, that is persuaded to be baptized, by Wolfram from England in A. D. 719. When he had got one foot into the baptismal fount, he stopped to ask where his ancestors, who had died unbaptized, then were; and Wolfram replying that they were certainly in hell, he said he chose to go where they were, rather than with a small number of poor people into the kingdom of heaven, and refused to proceed any farther. He added, I do “not believe these novelties, and had rather follow “the antient customs of my nation,”

Notwithstanding the wonderfully rapid progress of christianity, especially within the bounds of the Roman empire, there were many remains of paganism, especially in villages, and the more distant provinces, of which we find traces within this period. Many heathen superstitious customs were noted and censured by St. Eloi, who laboured much in the conversion of the people of Flanders about the year A. D. 640. The remains of paganism were forbidden in the council of Toledo in A. D. 694, and in council of Trullo at Constantinople in A. D. 692, especially the invocation of Bacchus in the time of vintage.

We see as little of the true spirit of christianity  
in

in the conduct of christian princes and councils towards the *Jews* as towards the Heathens. At a council of Toledo in A. D. 633, it was ordered that the *Jews* should not be compelled to become christians, but that such of them as had been made christians by compulsion in the reign of Sisebat should continue in the christian faith, and that the children of all *Jews* should be educated in christian monasteries, in order to their being instructed in the christian religion. In another council at Toledo, in A. D. 694, the *Jews* of Spain, on pretence of their having conspired against the state, and against the christians, were condemned to have their goods confiscated, and be reduced to perpetual servitude; their masters being charged not to permit the exercise of their religion, to send their children at the age of seven years to be educated by christians, and that they should be married to christians.

The emperor Leo Isauricus, at the beginning of his reign, compelled the *Jews* in his dominions to be baptized, but they washed themselves immediately after, as if to efface their baptism, and, contrary to the custom of christians in those times, they ate before they received the eucharist. As many *Jews* pretended to be converted, and observed their own rites in private, it was ordered at the second council of Nice, that they should not be received to communion, and that their children should not  
be

be baptized. They were also prohibited from purchasing Christian slaves.

The emperor Heraclius obliged the Jews to embrace Christianity or leave his dominions, and he persuaded Dagobert the king of France to do the same. *Sueur* A. D. 629. But the Jews had been as hostile to the Christians, and whenever they had it in their power shewed an example of great cruelty. When Chosroes II of Persia delivered his Christian prisoners to the Jews, they put them to death, it is said, to the number of forty-eight thousand. *Basnage* Vol. 8. p. 285.

In A. D. 722 there appeared among the Jews in Syria a pretended Messiah, and for some time he had many followers. *Sueur*.

The ancient heresies, as they were deemed, were not wholly extinct in this period. In the reign of Leo Isauricus there were *Montanists*, who being ordered to join the Catholic church, rather chose to burn themselves in their churches. Grimoald king of the Lombards abolished Arianism in his dominions, after which all Italy professed the Catholic faith. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 226. On account of some remains of *Arianism* in Spain, Eugenius of Toledo wrote a treatise on the subject of the trinity, in A. D. 658. The heresies of *Novatus*, and also that of *Jovinian*, who had distinguished himself in the time of Jerom by opposing the

system of monkery, were revived about the year A. D. 700 in the diocese of Clermont in France, and the monks of Monlieu wrote to refute them. The *Pelagians* were by no means extinct. The clergy of Rome writing to the Scots in Ireland in A. D. 640 reproved them for retaining the doctrine of Pelagius, maintaining that it was in the power of man, by his own will, and the grace of God, to live without sin.

On the conquests of the Saracens the heretics of the East, who had been persecuted, and kept under, by the power of the Greek emperors, held up their heads. The *Nestorians* prevailed in Syria, and the *Eutychians* in Egypt. The Mahometans were more favourable to them than to those who held with the emperors, or the popes of Rome, who were their enemies; so that from this time we have no certain account of the succession of the Catholic bishops in the great sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, or Alexandria. When the Saracens conquered Egypt, they protected Benyon the patriarch of the Jacobites, who had concealed himself ten years under the emperor Heraclius, and he entered Alexandria in triumph; and from this time there were two patriarchs of Alexandria, one of the Jacobites, and the other of the Melchites, so called as has been observed, from their holding with the Greek emperors.

The

The controversy about the proper time for the celebration of Easter was kept up with great obstinacy on both sides in England; the antient Christians in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, maintaining the Jewish custom, of observing it on the fourteenth day of the month, without any regard to its being Sunday, and the new converts from Rome the custom that is now universally adopted in Europe, and thence called Catholic. Finan bishop of Landisferne in Ireland held with the former, and one Romanus with the latter, as also Wilfrid, son of Oswy king of Northumberland, who travelled to Rome, and on his return got the monastery of Rippon, from which the king ejected the monks, who preferred banishment to the observance of the new custom.

In A. D. 664 king Oswy appointed a solemn conference to be held on the subject at the monastery of Strenshall, where Colman bishop of Landisferne was the chief speaker on the part of the Irish, and Wilfrid on that of the Romanists. In the issue both parties, as usual on such occasions, retired with their former opinions, and the king was confirmed in his own.

In A. D. 669 Theodore was sent by the pope to be bishop of Canterbury, with the general superintence of all the churches in England, accompanied by the abbot Adrian. He established the

Roman custom with respect to the observance of Easter. He also founded a celebrated school of divinity, science, and psalmody, which from this time was introduced into all the churches in England. In A. D. 673 he held a council at Hertford, attended by four bishops besides himself, who all agreed to observe the Roman customs.

From this time the opposition to the Roman customs gradually ceased. About the year A. D. 710, the nation of the Picts renounced the schism, and conformed to the Roman custom of keeping Easter, their king Naitan having adopted that measure. The monks of Ai conformed to it, and to ecclesiastical tonsure in A. D. 716. Of so much importance was this question deemed, that no British or Irish priest could be reconciled to the Catholic church without a fresh imposition of hands, and no private person could receive the chrism (i. e. confirmation) or the eucharist, till he conformed to it.

Such was the state of heresies and opinions of an older date in this period. Within it arose some that were new, besides those of Elipand and Felix, an account of which has been given before. About the middle of the eighth century some disturbance was occasioned by Adalbert in Gaul, and Clement a native of Ireland (*Mosheim* Vol. 2. p. 99.) who formed separate societies in Germany and France,  
inde-

independent of those which were in communion with the church of Rome. Adalbert had adherents among some bishops who in those times were ordained without a view to any particular fees, which was contrary to the canons. He is not charged with any irregularity of morals, but only with hypocritical austerities. Clement rejected the authority of the canons, councils, and Fathers, allowed the marriage of a man with his brother's widow, and said that Jesus Christ when he went into hell saved all that were in a state of damnation, even infidels and idolaters. He is also said to have held some errors relating to predestination. On the whole, it is probable that, if the sentiments and conduct of these two men were fully known, they would be ranked with the most early reformers.

Winfrid, or Boniface, the Romish apostle of the North, wrote about these men to pope Zachary; and also procured them to be apprehended. And in a council held at Rome in A. D. 748 (*Mosheim* Vol. 2. p. 100.) some very absurd writings, said to be theirs, were produced, and ordered to be burned, and their authors to be deposed and anathematized, as also their followers if they persisted in their errors. After this the pope desired that the cause of Adalbert, Clement and Godalface (whose name does not occur before) might be heard at a council in France; but what the following

proceedings were, or what became of the men, or their partisans does not appear.

The false bishops, as they were called, who were complained of at this time, were said to be more numerous than the true ones. They are charged with being guilty of all kinds of crimes, and so were the primitive Christians, and the later reformers. They assembled people in the fields, and the houses of the peasants. They did not baptize with the sign of the cross, or the other forms of Catholic baptism. These circumstances sufficiently shew why they were obnoxious to the popes and the Catholics. By the orders of the popes they were every where deprived of their priesthood in provincial councils, and confined in monasteries, i. e. imprisoned.

Among the novelties in this period it may deserve to be mentioned, that a Scotch priest named Samson, taught that men might be saved without baptism, by the mere imposition of the hands of a bishop.

The subject which afterwards became the distinguishing difference between the Greek and the Latin churches some times occurs within this period, but as yet no great stress was laid upon it. I mean the procession of the Holy spirit, said in the council of Constantinople to be from the Father. But he being said in the Gospels to be  
sent

sent by the Son, when this *procession* came to be understood as relating to the *manner of his existence*, and the Son was supposed to be God equal to the Father, and the same was affirmed of the Holy Spirit, it was thought by some that he ought to be considered as proceeding alike from both. This, however, was not mentioned in any public act till the year A. D. 447, where it occurs in the acts of a synod held in Spain. The same phrase of the Holy Spirit "proceeding from the Father and "the Son" occurs in the acts of a council held at Toledo in A. D. 633.

It does appear that any complaint was made of this addition to the creed, (for in that it was inserted) till the year A. D. 767, when the emperor Constantine sent ambassadors to Pepin, who were heard at Gentilli near Paris. There the question was agitated about the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, or from the Father and the Son, and the Greeks complained of it as an innovation. But it does not appear that any thing was decided at this time on the subject. Indeed, neither the Greek nor the Latin church had any very settled opinion about it. For at the council in Trullo in A. D. 791, it was maintained that this procession was from the Son, as well as from the Father. And pope Adrian, writing to Charlemagne, approved of the sentiment of Tarasus pa-

triarch of Constantinople, who said that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father thro' the Son, which, as Fleury says, shews that at that time the church of Rome did not reproach the Greeks on that subject.

---

### SECTION VI.

*Of the Power of the Popes, and of the Bishops, in this Period.*

**I**T was in this period of our history that the popes obtained the rank of temporal princes (tho' not yet absolutely independent of a superior) which they have held ever since; and the great wealth and temporal power acquired by the see of Rome was in all times that which emboldened them in their claims of spiritual usurpation, and led the Christian world to give way to them. In the former periods of our history the patrimony of St. Peter (as the lands and revenues of the see of Rome were called) had been immense, not having been confined to the territory of Rome, or Italy, but consisted of donations made from time to time in Sicily, and all parts of the Christian world. But before this time they never received those revenues of any place or territory which had before  
been

been at the disposal of the prince, or emperor. But such an acquisition was now made by the popes in consequence of their favouring the conquests of the kings of France in Italy, and such was the influence of the popes at this time in all affairs temporal and spiritual, that it was of importance to the kings of France to purchase their alliance at almost any price. Besides, they might imagine that, whatever they gave, they might hereafter, if they thought proper, resume. The steps by which this great revolution in the state of the Christian world took place were as follows.

Gregory the third having taken the part of Trasimond duke of Spoleto against Luitprand king of the Lombards, and in consequence of it Rome being besieged by the latter, applied for help to Charles Martel, mayor of the palace in France, but in reality king of France in A. D. 741, promising that if he was relieved by him he would withdraw from the obedience of the Greek emperor, who had given him no assistance, and give him (Charles) the consulship of Rome.

After this it was by the advice of pope Zachary that Pepin, who had succeeded Charles Martel, assumed the title of king of France, the pope, who was consulted on the occasion, saying that the title should go with the power. In consequence of this

Childeric III, a weak and contemptible prince, was confined in a monastery.

Again Rome being threatened by Aftolphus king of the Lombards, pope Stephen II, having in vain invoked the aid of the emperor, and tried the effect of a solemn procession, in which he walked barefoot, carrying an image of christ which was said to have been made without hands, wrote to Pepin, and sent the letter privately by a pilgrim; and in order to procure an interview, he desired him to send embassadors to engage him to pay him a visit in France. He then went to Pavia, and there applied to the king of the Lombards, to procure the restitution of Ravenna, and other places of the exarchate, which had been taken from the Greek emperors, who were still sovereigns of Rome. Not succeeding in this, he was permitted to go to France, the king of the Lombards, having no suspicion of the business on which he went; and there he was received with the greatest honor by Pepin and his court, in A. D. 754.

The pope having obtained the promise of the assistance he wanted from Pepin, they returned together, and Aftolphus being besieged in Pavia, promised to restore his conquests from the Romans. But on the return of Pepin to France, he not only refused to do this, but besieged Rome itself. The pope, reduced to extremity, wrote to Pepin in the  
name

name of the apostle Peter, conjuring him in the most earnest manner to come to his assistance, promising him all the good things of this life and another in case of his compliance, and threatening him with the torments of hell in case of his refusal. On this Pepin came again, and besieging Astolphus in Pavia, forced him to fulfill the terms of the treaty of the preceding year; and having thus obtained Ravenna, and the exarchate, including Pentapolis, or the March of Ancona (*Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 261.) a territory containing twenty-two cities, he gave them in perpetuity to St. Peter, that is, to the church of Rome and the popes. And this was the first foundation of their temporal power. But notwithstanding this donation of Pepin, the popes continued to date their letters by the years of the emperors of Constantinople, and still the senate and people of Rome called the pope their father, not their lord.

On the death of Carloman, one of the sons of Pepin, and brother of Charles, who was afterwards, for his great exploits, surnamed Charles the Great, or Charlemagne (and who had a share of the dominions of their father) his widow went with her two sons to Desiderius king of the Lombards, who requested the pope to come to Pavia, and consecrate them kings of France, in opposition to Charlemagne, whom the peers of France had chosen for  
 their

their sole king, but he refused. On this Desiderius approached Rome with an army, but on the remonstrance of the pope he did not chuse to enter the place by force. Charlemagne, however, coming to his assistance, besieged the king of the Lombards in Pavia, and during the siege went to Rome, where he confirmed by his signature (for it is said that at this time he could not write) the grant of his father Pepin, with the addition of Corsica, and beginning on the coast of Genoa, by the port of Spezia, extended his grant to Bargi, Reggio, and Mantua, comprehending the whole of the exarchate, the provinces of Venetia and Istria, with the dutchies of Spoleto and Beneventum. *Fleury* Vol. 9. p. 421. On the return of Charlemagne to Pavia, Desiderius surrendered at discretion, and retired to the monastery of Corbie in France. On Charlemagne's third visit to Rome, in A. D. 787, he added to his donation the cities he had taken from the duke of Beneventum, viz. Sora, Arces, Aquino, Arpi, Theano, and Capua. But the extent of the grants of both Pepin and Charlemagne are much disputed by the adherents of the popes and of the emperors. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 69.

In order to induce Charlemagne to make this grant of territory it seems probable that the pope alleged the example of Constantine the great, who; it was pretended, had given the city and territory  
of

of Rome to pope Silvester, tho' some say that this forgery was of a later date. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 72. Charlemagne, however, retained the sovereignty of Rome, and probably of all the principalities that he had given him: for an oath of fealty was taken to him on the death of pope Adrian and the election of Leo III.

On Charlemagne's fourth visit to Rome, in A. D. 800, the pope put a crown of great value on his head, and anointed him, giving him the titles of *emperor*, and *Augustus*, and after this the pope prostrated himself before him, and acknowledged him his sovereign. The people of Rome easily consented to this transfer of their allegiance from the emperors at Constantinople, as they had given them no assistance, and the empire was then in the hands of a woman, which, being a novelty, made the Romans ashamed of their subjection. Thus the title of *emperor of the West*, which had become extinct in A. D. 476, was restored after a lapse of three hundred and four years; and from this time the popes dated their letters by the reign of Charlemagne.

One principal motive which induced Charlemagne to give so much power as he did to the clergy, and especially to the bishops of Rome, was that he expected more submission from them than from laymen; and that by their ecclesiastical  
power

power they would enable him to keep the others in subjection. Other princes acted upon the same principle, and were not altogether influenced by superstition. The excessive power of the clergy over the laity was confined to the West, where excommunication by the Druids had always excluded those who were subject to it from all the rights of society, and even humanity, as we learn from Cæsar. Of this circumstance the christian clergy had availed themselves to increase their own power.

In return for the temporal power which Charlemagne gave to the popes and the clergy, he assumed, and without opposition from them, much power of a spiritual nature. He not only retained the power of approving of the elections of the popes, which had been held by the emperors of the East, so that they could not be consecrated without his consent, but he regulated the churches by his *Capitularia*, calling synods by his own authority, in which both prelates and temporal princes were present, and in which rules were laid down for the discipline of the church, as well as for things of a temporal nature. Also, when any bishops were presented to him, and he thought proper to confirm the election, he invested them in their office by the delivery of the *Crosier and ring*, and after this the new bishop was consecrated by  
the

the neighbouring bishops. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 322.

In the history of this period, the popes advanced their pretensions to power of various kinds. Of this the following are instances.

When St. Winfred, or as he was generally called Boniface, was ordained a bishop by the pope, and sent into some parts of Germany, he took an oath by which he bound himself always to act in concurrence with the pope, to hold no communion with those who did not observe the canons, to hinder them all he could, or to acquaint the pope with their proceedings.

Gregory III sending St. Willibald who was a monk, on a mission, he said he must have the leave of his abbot, according to the rule of Benedict; but the pope replied "my orders are sufficient, the abbot has no right to resist me, if I were to send himself." On this Willibald submitted, offering to go wherever he should send him.

Tassilon duke of Bavaria not readily agreeing with Charlemagne, the pope declared him anathematized, if he did not abide by the oath he had taken, and said that in this case the king would not be answerable for the murders committed, and other damages done, in Bavaria. This, says Fleury, is the first time that the pope pronounced upon the justness of any war. Vol. 9 p. 491.

A circumstance which contributed very much to establish the power of the popes in these dark ages, was the production of the *decretal epistles* of the antient popes, of which the first mention is made in this period. In A. D. 785, Ingelram, bishop of Metz, drew up a collection of canons, and in them he inserted some from the decretals, which Fleury says no person now doubts were forged by Isidore Mercator of Spain, and which he says were calculated to advance the power of the popes, and of the clergy in general. Gross as this imposition was, it was admitted by all the Latin church eight hundred years, and was with difficulty abandoned by the Catholics even then.

Tho' those decretals are usually ascribed to Isidore of Seville in the sixth century, Mosheim doubts their being so antient, and is rather of opinion that they were forged in a later period, not without the knowledge of the popes. Several of the more learned bishops, especially in France, were sensible of the imposition, and refused to receive these decretals as the law of the church; but the authority of the popes, especially of Nicolas I, reduced them to silence. The surname of *Mercator* added to Isidore is, he says, a mistake for *Peccator*, which it was customary for bishops, by way of humility, to subjoin to their signatures. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 126. 127.

In

In one respect we find an instance of moderation in this holy see, that was not so common in later ages. Pope Zachary, writing to Boniface, disclaims his having received any thing from those bishops to whom he had given the *pallium*. "Let every one," says he, "who is so bold as to sell the gifts of the Holy Spirit, be anathema."

Some of the greater bishops of Italy, as those of Ravenna and Milan, when they were not under the same civil government with the city of Rome, were sometimes induced to hold themselves independent of the popes. Thus Maurus archbishop of Ravenna, being supported by the emperor Constantine, would not receive the *pallium* from the pope, on which account the Romans considered those who were subject to that see as heretics, and called them *Autocephali*. *Sueur* A. D. 649. In A. D. 979 Theodore the then bishop of Ravenna was reconciled to the pope.

The popes did not gain so great an accession of power in this period without the clergy in general, and the superior clergy in particular, gaining something in proportion.

At a council held at Ratisbon in A. D. 807 the *Choroepiscopi* were reduced to the condition of presbyters. They continued, however, notwithstanding this ordinance; and it was not till the

middle of the tenth century that they were intirely suppressed, both in the East and the West.

It was the great wealth that gave the bishops of the greater sees so much power as to bear down the village bishops, tho' none of them obtained the *principalities* which they did in a later period. Some instances, however, of the great wealth of clergymen occur in this. The case of Alcuin has been mentioned already. S. Wulfrid had so much secular power in consequence of his immense wealth, the number of his monasteries, the magnificence of his buildings, and the number of his vassals who attended him in complete armour, that the king took umbrage of it, and persuaded the bishop of Canterbury to depose him. This was in A. D. 678.

As the princes and the nobles assisted at the councils which were held at this time, we the less wonder at the regulations of a civil nature that were sometimes made in them. In a council at Toledo, in A. D. 633, several decrees were made with respect to the succession to the kingdom, and the part which the clergy were to take in it, which, says Fleury, is the first time that bishops took any part in civil government. At the sixth council of Toledo, in A. D. 638, it was agreed with the consent of the king Cinthila and the nobility, that no person should ascend the throne who would not promise

promise to preserve the Catholic faith, and that if he violated his oath, he should be condemned to eternal fire, with the bishops and others who should partake in his guilt. This, however, does not amount to the deposition of the prince.

Such a disposition, however, was shewn by the bishops in these councils to control the sovereigns, that those of them who suspected that they were not favoured by them took umbrage at such assemblies of the clergy. Sigebert king of Austria wrote to Disier bishop of Cahors, to forbid his attending any council within his dominions, without his previous knowledge of it; saying he would never refuse their assembling whenever he thought the good of the church, or of the state, required it.

Marriage being considered as a religious engagement, as well as a civil contract, the clergy soon began to take cognisance of it; and it evidently favoured their purpose to limit the degrees of affinity within which it might be lawfully contracted. Gregory III, writing to Boniface the bishop of Germany, in A. D. 732, says that he should forbid marriages to the seventh degree of relationship, and if possible, prevent men from marrying more than twice.

Not only were priests forbidden to marry, and the wives they had before receiving holy orders to have no commerce with them, but at a

council held in Rome in A. D. 720, an anathema was pronounced against any person who should marry the widow of one who had been ordained a priest. At the same time they who married the wife of a brother or cousin were anathematized.

Godfathers and godmothers being considered as spiritual relations, the new laws of marriage were extended even to them. But these restrictions did not satisfy all persons. Boniface, writing to the archbishop of Canterbury, inquires for the authority in the scriptures, or the canons of the church, for condemning the marriages of godfathers with the mother of the child, when she was become a widow, which he said the Romanists say deserves capital punishment. "I do not comprehend," he adds, "how spiritual relationship should render marriage criminal; since by baptism we are all brethren." However when the pope was in France in A. D. 754, it was agreed that marriage with godmothers, either at baptism or confirmation (for they were then used at both these rites) should be unlawful.

There was no prohibition of parents being sponsors for their children till the time of Charlemagne, at the council of Mentz. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 513.

In A. D. 702 Witiza, king of Spain, declared it to be lawful for the clergy in his dominions to marry.

marry. This was resented by the pope, who threatened that if the law was not abrogated, he would take his kingdom from him. But the king, in reply, said he would pay him a visit with his army, and chastise his insolence, by plundering Rome, as his ancestor Alaric had done. He also assembled a council at Toledo in A. D. 704, in which it was decreed that the bishop of Rome had no authority in the Spanish church or state. About twelve years after this Spain was conquered by the Moors. *Geddes's Tracts*. Vol. 2. p. 28. &c.

---



---

## SECTION VII.

*Of the Monks in this Period.*

THE general situation of the monks continued to be nearly the same in this period as in the preceding; but there are several particulars in their history not undeserving to be recorded. So much more strict were the lives of the monks than that of the clergy, that the term *religious* became appropriated to them, as distinguished from the regular clergy, who from living more in the world, obtained the epithet of *secular*. It appears, however, from the acts of the tenth council of Toledo, held A. D. 656, that at that time

the term *religious*, comprehended the clergy, as well as the monks.

In the time of Charlemagne it began to be the custom to give lands in fee to churches and monasteries. That of mount Cassin was the first that got possession of castles and baronies, whence its abbot boasts of being the first baron in the kingdom of Naples. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 324.

In several respects the superstition of the times grew more favourable to the monkish system than before. Whereas Basil did not permit any persons to take the vows under the age of seventeen, the council of Trullo in A. D. 692, permitted it at the age of ten, on the pretense that the church should advance dayly towards perfection. By the third council of Saragossa, in the same year, the widows of kings were obliged to become nuns.

In A. D. 633 it was decreed in the fourth council of Toledo, that no monk, tho' made so by the devotion of his parents, should ever return to secular life. *Bingham* p. 255.

In A. D. 694 abbeffes, as well as abbots, subscribed to the council of Becanfield in Kent, and before both presbyters and temporal lords. This is the first time that such a thing occurs in the history of the church. *Ib.* p. 259.

It is probable that there were many persons who lived on pillars in the East within this period,  
tho'

tho' their names have not come down to us. For when, after the death of Tarafus in A. D. 806, Theodore advised the emperor Nicephorus to chuse the most worthy to succeed him in the patriarchate of Constantinople, he wished him to look out not only among bishops and abbots, but also among the *stylites*, and the recluse.

There occur many examples within this period of sovereign princes renouncing their dignities, and confining themselves in cloisters. Coenred king of Mercia, after having reigned six years, went to Rome in A. D. 789, and there embraced the monastic life. Offa king of the East Saxons at the same time did the same, and tho' young he left his wife, his country, and kingdom together. Ceolulph king of Northumberland quitted his kingdom in A. D. 737 after he had reigned nine years, and he afterwards lived twenty-two years in a monastery. Carloman king of the Oriental Franks renounced the world in A. D. 747, leaving the government to his son Pepin. He received the monastic habit at the hands of the pope, and after passing some time in a monastery at Soracte, spent the remainder of his life at that of mount Cassin, conforming to the most rigorous discipline of that place, sometimes serving in the kitchen, keeping the sheep, and working in the garden. Rachis

king of the Lombards retired to the same monastery in A. D. 750.

Sebbi king of Essex would have embraced the monastic life if he could have persuaded his wife to do the same. When he was at the point of death, he received the monastic habit at the hands of the bishop of London, and was the first instance, as Fleury says, that he finds of any person chusing to die in this manner. In later times it was very common. Vol. 9. p. 6.

Vamba king of Spain, being to appearance at the point of death, in A. D. 680, put on the monastic habit, and recovering he was deemed incapable of the crown. The twelfth council of Toledo confirmed his resignation, and the election of his successor, declaring it to be unlawful for any person professing himself a monk to take any military function, which was implied in that of a king. Vamba lived in a monastery seven years. This, says Fleury, is the first instance of the clergy absolving any persons from their oath of obedience to a temporal prince. Vol. 9. p. 62.

Exemptions of monasteries from episcopal jurisdiction gained some ground in this period. In the formulary of Marculfus, published about the year A. D. 660, we see the beginning of it, the bishop promising to give orders to any whom the abbot or the monks should recommend, and not

to enter the monastery but at the request of the abbot. In A. D. 751 pope Zachary, at the request of Boniface, granted an exemption to the monastery of Fulda from all episcopal jurisdiction, except that of the holy see. This, says Fleury, is the first example of this kind of exemption. Monasteries founded by princes were independent of the bishops of the diocese, and subject to no other inspection than that of the king's chaplain.

In A. D. 785 pope Adrian granted to two monasteries, one of St. Martin de Tours, and that of St. Denis near Paris, the privilege of having bishops of their own. Other monasteries had the same. These bishops were in general such as, having quitted their preferments, had retired to these monasteries, and some time they were village bishops who had their residence in them. Sometimes the abbot himself was the bishop, and sometimes they were only priests who had the title of bishops, because they were sent to preach in certain districts.

In so high reputation were the austerities of the monkish life at this time, and so dissolute were the manners of many of the secular clergy, that a reformation for the promoting of piety and learning was much wanted. This was attempted, and in a great measure successfully executed, by Chrodogand bishop of Metz, in A. D. 763, who, in imi-

tation of Eusebius of Vercell, and Austin, formed a society of the clergy within his church, appointing revenues sufficient for their maintenance, and obliging them to live as much as possible for those who had clerical duty, according to the rules of Benedict.

He did not require absolute poverty of his *canons*, as those regular clergy were called, but that they should give all their property to the church of Metz, enjoying only the usufruct. They had the disposal of the alms that were given for masses, confession, and attendance upon the sick, if they were not given to the community. And this, says Fleury, is the first mention that is made of alms for masses, or any clerical duty. Those rules of Chrodogand were afterwards adopted in most cathedral churches, as those of Benedict were in the monasteries.

The rule of Chrodogand was condemned by Nicolas II in A. D. 1059 on account of its permitting the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and its allowing them too large a portion of bread and wine. But the true reason was that it was instituted by the emperor, without the consent or knowledge of the pope. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 130.

We find great complaints of irregular monasteries in this period. It appears by the rules of  
Fructuo-

Fructuofus archbifhop of Braga, for the monafteries in Spain, that there were what were called *falfe monafteries* in his time, erected by private perfons on their own authority, who confined themfelves to their country houfes, with their wives, children, flaves, and neighbours, engaging by oath to live in common, but without rule, or fuperior. They were, it is faid, interefted people, who far from giving, plundered others on pretence of poverty. They were quarrelfome, and often called on their relations and friends to affift them with an armed force. Bede complains of fuch pretended monafteries in England during thirty years before he wrote. It is faid there were alfo priefts who, to get the reputation of piety, or to preferve their tithes and other perquifites, erected themfelves into the fuperiors of monafteries without conforming to the monaftic rules; and they received with open arms thofe who quitted other monafteries, the difcipline of which they decried.

This account favours much of exaggeration. The perfons here complained of might be difgufted with many things in the conduct of the generality of the monafteries of this time, and think they confulted their own improvement better by adopting rules of their own.

The monkifh difcipline being greatly relaxed, found an eminent reftorer towards the clofe of this period.

period in Benedict of Aniene in France, a person of Gothic extraction, and born about A. D. 750. His father, the count of Maquelone, placed him in the service of king Pepin, and he was afterwards attached to Charlemagne; but becoming a monk at the abby of St. Seine, he distinguished himself so much by his voluntary austerities, as to be censured and ridiculed by the other monks.

His only food was bread without any wine. He slept little, sometimes on the bare ground, and often passed the night in the coldest weather with his feet uncovered, and was many days without speaking a word. He wore the meanest dress, the holes in which he mended with cloth of any colour, and also bore the vermin with which it swarmed, so that he was considered by his fellow monks as a madman. The abbot endeavoured to prevail upon him to abate of his austerities, but without effect. He said the rules of Benedict were for the weak, whereas he aimed at greater perfection; but finding that he should have few imitators on this rigid plan, he reverted to the observance of Benedict's rules.

On the death of the abbot he was chosen to succeed him, but there being too much difference between his manners and those of the monks of this monastery, he retired to an estate of his own near a brook called Aniane in Aquitaine, where he  
founded

founded another monastery about the year A. D. 780; but the monks finding they were to receive their victuals by measure, many of them left him. A few, however, continued with him, tho' they had neither farm nor vineyard, cattle or horses, but only an ass to carry them when it was absolutely necessary. Their numbers increasing, they built a new monastery with their own hands, and covered it with thatch. Their sacred vessels were at first of wood, then of glass, and lastly of tin. Afterwards Benedict admitted of some ornaments in his church, and many donations being made to this new monastery, he received the lands, but gave liberty to the serfs that were upon them, and never reclaimed any thing that was stolen from him.

The example of Benedict was followed by many other persons; and being assisted by dukes and counts, he began in A. D. 782 to build a church with more magnificence. He also rebuilt his cloister with pillars of marble, and taking down his thatched roof, he replaced it with one of tiles. All the decorations of his church were regulated by the number seven. He had seven chandeliers, with seven branches, seven lamps before the altar, &c. &c. But what he did of most value was collecting a great number of books, and he had among his monks grammarians, theologians, and persons well

well acquainted with the scriptures, of whom some were afterwards bishops.

Being in great favour with Charlemagne, Benedict received from him valuable presents, which he distributed among various monasteries, which he visited with great assiduity, as their common parent. The monks under his immediate care being increased to three hundred, he erected a larger building, which afterwards served for more than a thousand, and in various places he established smaller monasteries dependent upon this, which were in later times called *priories*. His monks were sent for to other monasteries where the discipline was become relaxed, to serve for an example to them.

The emperor Lewis gave Benedict the superintendance of all the monasteries in his dominions, and with his assistance made new regulations for them all at Aix in A. D. 817. The principal cause of the relaxation of discipline then so much complained of was the observance of different rules in different monasteries, pretending to be all of the order of Benedict; but now they were made exactly the same. Corporal punishment was allowed, but the monks were not to be whipped naked in the presence of their brethren. Benedict died in A. D. 821, aged 70.

## SECTION VIII.

*Of the disorderly State of this Period.*

SO great were the public violences and disorders of every kind, in the course of this period, tho' they were exceeded in the subsequent ones, that to give a clearer idea of them, as far as ecclesiastical matters were affected by them, I shall collect the principal articles into a section by themselves.

Excessive superstition, and great crimes, often go together, men having recourse to the one as an atonement and compensation for the other; and Christian princes too often set the example of occasionally plundering the wealth of churches, and monasteries, as well as of bestowing it. After the death of pope Honorius, and before the election of another, the emperor's officers plundered the treasury of the church of Rome, and carried large sums to Constantinople. The monastery of Mount Cassin was intirely ruined by the Lombards, but restored by the orders of pope Gregory II in A. D. 718, one hundred and forty years after the devastation. Charles Martel often gave the goods of the church to laymen, for the assistance they gave him in the wars that he carried on against the

the

the Saracens. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, was much affected with the frequent instances of this usurpation of the property of the church by laymen. Writing to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, he says, "Every layman, king, governor, or court, who takes a monastery by violence, withdrawing it from the ecclesiastical power, and subjecting the monks to himself, is called by the antient Fathers a ravisher, a sacrilegious prince, and a murderer of the poor, deserving of a terrible anathema before the tribunal of Jesus Christ."

Writing to pope Zachary in A. D. 742, he says, "the greatest part of the episcopal fees in France are abandoned to laymen, debauched clergy, or public farmers. This had been the case" he says; "eighty years." He probably, however, referred to that part of France which bordered on Germany, where he resided. He says, however, that there were bishops and priests of the French nation plunged in adultery, and debauchery, as appears by the children they have had since their ordination. In the same year, however, a council was held in Germany for the purpose of correcting these abuses, in consequence of which pope Zachary addressed a letter to the French nation, in which he thanks God that he had expelled from them the false schismatical priests and concubina-  
aries.

aries. But by the subsequent state of things it too evidently appears that to order a thing to be done, and actually to do it, are very different.

These disorders, as appears by this account, were owing to the clergy themselves, almost as much as to the laity. The greater clergy differed but little in their habits of living from the laity of equal wealth and power. During the troubles of France, the bishops, and even some of those who were the most esteemed for their piety, took a great part in public affairs, and in time of war marched with bodies of armed men like other great lords. But in A. D. 803, when Charlemagne held a council at Worms, it was requested by the laity of all his states, that the bishops and priests might not go to the wars, several of them having been slain in battle, and much inconvenience of various kinds having arisen from it. Accordingly it was ordered, that only two or three of the clergy, chosen by the rest, should attend the army, and that only to give the benediction, and for other spiritual functions.

The bishops of these times not only took part in civil dissensions, but sometimes appeared in arms against their sovereigns. When Wulfred was passing thro' France, he was met by one of the bishops who had conspired and killed king Dago- bert, at the head of a great army, with a design

to feize him, and all his companions, to kill those who should make resistance, to sell others for slaves, and put Wulfred himself in prison.

Some instances of open violences committed by clergymen of those times, as well as those in which they were the sufferers, are shocking in the extreme. Tetricus, bishop of Auxerre, was killed by his archdeacon while he slept. Lambert was bishop of Maistric when two brothers, Gallus and Riold, plundered the goods of his church, and became incorrigible in their violences. The friends and relations of this bishop, provoked at this, killed them both. These brothers were the relations of Dodon, a domestic of Pepin, mayor of the palace, who revenged their death upon the bishop himself. He attacked him in his own house, and murdered him, and all the persons he found in it. In A. D. 715 Savaric bishop of Auxerre, attacked with an army the country of Orleans, Nevers, and several other places, and annexed them to his bishopric.

It appears that some bishops, to gratify their resentment, caused the persons whom they disliked to be put to death privately, on pretence of subjecting them to penance. In the eleventh council of Toledo, it was therefore ordered, that all offenders should be punished in publick, or at least in the presence of two or three witnesses, and that  
the

the sentence be subscribed by the bishop. Bishops, says Fleury, in those times did condemn to such punishments. Vol. 8. p. 548.

But the most brutal violences and cruelties that we meet with in this period were committed at Rome, on occasion of the election of popes. After the death of pope Paul in A. D. 767, Constantine a layman was made pope, his brother duc Toton compelling three bishops to give him holy orders, and consecrate him bishop of Rome, a dignity which he held thirteen months. But then he was expelled by force, his brother, and other partisans, being overpowered by the help of the Lombards, and in the issue Stephen III was made pope.

As soon as he was elected, some of his partisans took Theodore, a bishop and vidame (Vice domini) of Constantine, put out his eyes, cut out his tongue, and shut him up in a monastery on mount Scaurus, where he was suffered to die of hunger and thirst, calling for water with the most lamentable cries. They also put out the eyes of Poffit, another of Constantine's friends, and confined him in the monastery of St. Silvester, seizing the goods of them both. Constantine himself, after being treated with the greatest indignity, being set on horseback, with a woman's saddle, and with heavy weights to his feet, was conducted to the

monastery of Celles neuves. There he was solemnly degraded, his eyes put out, and left exposed in the public street. The priest Valdepert had his eyes put out, and his tongue cut out, in so cruel a manner, that he died of the operation. After some time, a council was held at Rome, whither Constantine was brought; when, throwing himself on the ground, with his hands extended on the pavement, he confessed his fault with tears. The next day, when he was making his apology, he was driven out of the church with blows, and condemned to do penance all the rest of his life.

The treatment of pope Leo III, whether he was guilty or innocent of the things laid to his charge, is another proof of the violence of these times. Having affronted one Pascal, an officer of his court, the latter, accompanied by some of his friends, seized the pope in the midst of a solemn procession, and threw him on the ground. There they stripped him, tore his cloaths, and endeavoured to put out his eyes, and cut out his tongue. They left him, however, in the middle of the street, believing that they had made him both blind and dumb. Returning to him again, they dragged him into the church of a monastery, and before the altar again endeavoured to put out his eyes, and cut out his tongue. Then also they  
left

left him weltering in blood, and confined him under a strong guard in the same monastery. Fearing that his friends might rescue him there, they conveyed him to another monastery, and kept him a close prisoner. However, making his escape, he fled to Charlemagne, who was then in Saxony. Being well received by this prince, he returned to Rome with a great force, accompanied by commissioners from Charlemagne to inquire into the accusations against him; and they, finding no proof of the things that were laid to his charge, seized his enemies, and sent them to France. In A. D. 800 when Charlemagne came to Rome, the fourth time, the pope purged himself before him by taking a solemn oath that he was not guilty of the things of which he was accused, and this was deemed sufficient for his justification. The emperor then heard Pascal, and the other enemies of the pope, and condemned them to death; but the pope interceding for them, they were only banished into France.

Ages of superstition are also times of other immoralities besides open violence: for what vice is there for which some superstitious practice has not been thought an atonement. Boniface, writing to Ethelbald king of Mercia, reproves him for having no lawful wife, and debauching nuns. He adds, that the English nation were noted for their

debauchery in France and Italy. It was, he says, as a punishment for such vices as these, that Spain, Provence, and Burgundy, were abandoned to the Saracens. Writing to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, he complains that the honour of the British church suffered much in consequence of the frequent pilgrimages of nuns from England to Rome. Most of them, he says, lose their modesty. There are few cities in Lombardy or France, in which there are not some English prostitutes. It is a scandal, he adds, to the whole church.

---

## SECTION IX.

### *Miscellaneous Articles.*

**I** SHALL begin my account of miscellaneous articles that occur in this period with such as relate to churches, public worship, or discipline.

I. At the fourth council of Toledo, in A. D. 633, it was ordered that the same form of public worship should be observed thro' all Spain, lest, they say, there shou'd be the appearance of *schism* in the church. Isidore bishop of Seville is considered as the author of the Mosarabic liturgy, and he directed all the proceedings of this council; but he says that his brother Leander took much pains with it.

At this council the Apocalyps was ordered to be read in the churches, some even then not acknowledging it to be a canonical book.

At a preceding council of Toledo, viz. A. D. 622, it was ordered that baptism should be administered with one immerfion, lest by three immerfions they should imitate the Arians. It appears by the capitulary of Theodulph bishop of Orleans in A. D. 785, that all children, even in case of sickness, were baptized in churches, and not in private houses. It appears by the same work, that the dead were forbidden to be buried in churches, it beginning then to be practiced.

Persons employed in converting the people of Friseland about A. D. 696, carried with them, besides vessels for the celebration of the eucharist, a consecrated table, which served for an altar, which, says Fleury, is the first mention that is made of a portable altar. Vol. 9. p. 113.

2. Instances of the superstition of these times with respect to public worship, and every thing else, are without end, this being always in proportion to ignorance.

It being contrary to the canons to rebaptize any person who had been baptized, even by heretics, with the proper form of words, that is, *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*. Boniface, so often mentioned in the history of this

period, when he was about to baptize any person with respect to whose previous baptism he had any doubt, said, "I do not rebaptize thee, but, if thou be not baptized, I baptize thee in the name &c. &c." This, says Fleury, is the first instance of conditional baptism. Vol. 9. p. 346.

We see, however, some marks of good sense in the directions of pope Zachary with respect to baptism. Two priests who travelled in Germany under the conduct of Boniface wrote to inform him of another priest, who, being ignorant of Latin, said when he baptized any person, *baptizo te in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sancta*, instead of *Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, and Boniface was of opinion that such persons ought to be rebaptized; but the pope very sensibly observed, that it was a valid baptism, as there was no heresy in the case, but only ignorance of the Latin tongue, and said he was astonished at the opinion of Boniface on the subject.

In the latter end of the sixth century, women did not receive the communion bread with their naked hands, but with a fair linen cloth. Some think this custom was as antient as the time of Austin. *Bingham* Vol. 1, p. 799.

It is well known that superstition found its way into the courts of justice of those times; but one of the forms of it, mentioned in the capitulary

of Charlemagne, is curious. In a case in which either of the parties might be perjured without discovery, they both stood with their arms extended upright before a cross, and he, who could stand the longest in that posture was deemed innocent.

It will be allowed to be an argument of the progress of superstition, and of a very hurtful kind, that pope Boniface V made churches places of refuge for all criminals. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 28.

Tho' marriage could not be deemed absolutely unlawful, it was thought that there was a kind of pollution attending it; and according to the penitential of Theodore archbishop of Canterbury, a new married couple were not permitted to enter a church within a month of their marriage, and they underwent a penance of a fortnight before they were admitted to communion.

3. All Christians for a long time refrained from eating blood, as they still do except in these western parts. But pope Adrian, in his letter to the bishops of Spain, declares those to be anathematized who ate pork. Pope Zachary writing to Boniface, the apostle of Germany, forbade the eating of the jay, the crow, the stork, and even the hare. *Sueur* A. D. 748.

4. Masses for the dead, and other sources of gain to the priests, were greatly promoted by fabulous relations, to which persons of piety, and even

of good sense in other respects were too apt to give credit. Bede tells a story of a young man who was taken prisoner, when a brother of his who was a priest, supposing him to be dead, used to say masses for his soul, at a certain hour every day, and at that time he said his bonds were always loose. This being divulged excited many to get those masses said for them.

5. The ignorance of this age extended to the clergy as well as the laity, tho' not in the same degree. There was certainly more learning in the East than in the West, and yet at the second council of Nice in A. D. 787, it was thought necessary to order that every bishop should be required to know the psalter, tho' by this was probably meant that he was to be able to repeat it, or some part of it, by heart. And the metropolitan was to examine him whether he was determined to read with assiduity the canons, the councils, and the scriptures.

Few of the clergy of this age being qualified to preach, Charlemagne engaged Paulus Diaconus, and Alcuin, to compose *homilies*, or discourses on the gospels and epistles, which were read in the public services, and which the clergy were to commit to memory and repeat. This gave rise to the famous collection which went by the name of the *homiliarium* of Charlemagne, and which has been follow-

followed by many other similar works. *Mosheim* Vol. 2. p. 84. This prince directed the Roman ritual to be used in all his dominions. *Ib.*

Charlemagne, whatever his own education had been, endeavoured to provide a remedy for the ignorance of the age in which he lived. He brought persons from Rome into France to teach all the sciences, of which there was at that time any knowledge; and besides establishing schools within the precincts of his own palace, he appointed them in several cathedral churches and monasteries. The person he chiefly employed in this business was Alcuin an Englishman, and by him Charles himself was instructed in several sciences, especially astronomy. He expressed himself with ease in several foreign languages. He spoke Latin as well as German, which was his native tongue, and he understood Greek, tho' he could not speak it well.

It was but little however that was effected by these wellmeant establishments of Charlemagne. All the literature of those times lay in a very small compass, and few were qualified to teach even that. The whole circle of sciences was then divided into seven parts, viz. Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic, called the *trivium*, and Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy, called the *quadrivium*, and the manner of teaching had  
little

little to recommend it. They who wished to pursue their studies beyond the usual bounds of this circle were advised to study the writings of Cassiodorus, and Eusebius: *Mosheim* Vol. 2. p. 57.

In the East John of Damascus was the most distinguished for his learning and ability in this period. He is said to have been the first who mixed the philosophy of Aristotle with theology. He distinguished himself by compiling, regulating, and perhaps composing, chaunts for the Greek church, as pope Gregory had done for the Latin church. *Williams* p. 36.

6. The origin of country parishes in England was about the end of the seventh century. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 406.

## PERIOD XVI.

FROM THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE  
WESTERN EMPIRE IN A. D. 800 TO THE  
RAISING OF OTHO TO THE IMPERIAL  
THRONE A. D. 936.

## SECTION I.

*Of the Intercourse between the Greek and Latin Churches on the Subject of the Patriarch Photius, which led to their final Separation from each other.*

THERE had long subsisted a jealousy between the bishops of Rome and the patriarchs of Constantinople, one the head of the Western, and the other of the Eastern churches; and notwithstanding the edict of Valentinian in favour of the bishops of Rome, and their claim to supremacy, as successors of the apostles Peter and Paul, the patriarchs of Constantinople, which from the time of Constantine had been the seat of the empire, ill brooked their inferiority; and being favoured by the emperors, assumed the superintendency of those provinces which were sub-

subject to the Greeks, as Sicily, Illyricum, Dalmatia, &c. &c.

The bishops of Rome, whom I shall now distinguish by the exclusive title of *Popes*, which gradually took place, having gained a great increase of wealth, power, and influence after Rome was no longer subject to the emperors of Constantinople, and especially after they became temporal princes by the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, were less than ever disposed to yield to the pretensions of the Eastern patriarchs, and were particularly careful to take advantage of any difficulties in which the Greek church was involved, and when appeals were made to them by the contending parties in it. This was more especially the case on occasion of the schism which took place in that church from the rival patriarchs Ignatius and Photius; and as the disputes on this subject led to the total separation of the two churches, I shall be the more particular in my narrative concerning it.

When this disturbance commenced, Bardas, uncle of the emperor Michael, had the chief authority in Constantinople; and being reprov'd, and finally excommunicated, for his dissolute life by the patriarch Ignatius, he contriv'd to make him suspected of seditious intentions by the emperor, who in November A. D. 858 banished him from Constantinople. The person chosen to suc-

ceed

ceed him was Photius, who was of an illustrious family, and related to the emperor, and more distinguished for his abilities and learning than any person in that age, or several of the preceding. He was also grand nephew of the patriarch Tarasus; and tho' a layman, and having an office at court, he excelled in ecclesiastical as well as other branches of learning.

Bardas having determined to make him patriarch, found some difficulty in gaining the consent of the bishops, who were to ordain him; but on his promising to honour Ignatius as his father, and to do nothing without his approbation, they were all gained over except Metrophanes, the metropolitan of Smyrna; and from being a layman, he was in the space of six days raised to the rank of a bishop, and on Christmas day A. D. 858 ordained patriarch of Constantinople. Two months, however, had not passed before he began to persecute all who were attached to Ignatius; and assembling a council, he not only pronounced a sentence of deposition and anathema against Ignatius himself, but deposed all who had been ordained by him. Ignatius was first loaded with chains, and then banished to Mitylene in the isle of Lesbos; but, as was too customary in case of supposed injustice, he sought the protection of pope Nicolas, who, notwithstanding the remonstrance

of Photius, passed sentence of deposition against him, and all who had been ordained by him. He also ordered Ignatius to be restored, and that all who should prevent it, of whatever rank (meaning the emperor himself) should be excommunicated.

This conduct of the pope provoked the emperor to write to him in a haughty and menacing manner, and insist upon his revoking the sentence he had pronounced against Photius. Nicolas, who was one of the most violent men that had till then filled the papal chair, replied with no less warmth; and as the emperor had treated the see of Rome, as he thought, with disrespect, he magnified the prerogatives of it, as founded not upon councils, but on the words of Christ, and threatened him with excommunication if he did not attend to its admonitions. Photius, however, supported by the emperor, not only kept his see, but persecuted all those who separated from his communion on that account; and hearing that the legates, whom the pope had sent to Bulgaria, which had its first instruction in Christianity from Constantinople, had rejected the consecrated oil which he had sent thither, he was so provoked, that, calling a council A. D. 866, in which the emperors Michael and Basilus presided, he accused the pope of many crimes, and pronounced a sentence of deposition against him. Among the crimes of the  
pope

pope he enumerates the difference of their custom from those of the Greek church, but lays the greatest stress on the addition of the words *filiouque* (and from the Son) to the creed.

Basilus having murdered the emperor Michael, who was the friend of Photius, he was deposed, and Ignatius replaced in the patriarchate; when in resentment of the conduct of his rival, he not only pronounced a sentence of deposition against Photius, but against all who had been ordained by him, or who communicated with him. He, moreover, requested the emperor to call a general council, to remedy the scandal; in consequence of which embassadors were immediately sent to Rome for the purpose; and writing to the pope (who then was Adrian II) on the occasion, he acknowledged his supremacy, and his authority to rectify all the disorders of the church. This was sufficient to gain his judges, and consequently, in a council held at Rome A. D. 868, the council held by Photius was condemned, and the decrees of it ordered to be burned, and loaded with perpetual anathema. In this council, however, the temerity of Photius in condemning pope Nicolas being mentioned, the justice of his condemnation of pope Honorius for heresy was expressly allowed. That in the following council for which the emperor and Ignatius had applied, every thing was as much pre-

judged as in all the preceding general councils, was evident from the pope requiring, by the legates he sent to Constantinople on this occasion, the absolute condemnation of the council held by Photius, and the confirmation of that which he had held in opposition to it at Rome.

After this preparation, the *eighth general council*, as it is called, was held in the church of St. Sophia, on the fifth of October A. D. 869, the legates of the pope taking the chief seat. There were also persons who represented the sees of Jerusalem and Antioch, but not that of Alexandria. Eleven of the principal officers of the court attended on the part of the emperor. These being assembled, orders were first given to admit all those bishops who had suffered persecution under Photius, who were twelve in number, so that this first session consisted of no more than eighteen persons. In this session, however, a form of union between the Latin and Greek churches, presented by the pope, was read, and the anathema against Photius, as an usurper of the see of Constantinople, and also of the council held by him, was pronounced; and to these they all assented.

In the second session, held two days after, they who had acted in concert with Photius were admitted to the council, on acknowledging their offence. They were ten in all, and on their subscribing

scribing the instrument from Rome were permitted to take their seats.

In the third session there were in all twenty-four bishops present, and some of the friends of Photius demanding to be heard, the legates from Rome said that, if they came to hear the letter of pope Nicolas they should be admitted, but not to dispute. After much wrangling, however, and on the remonstrance of the emperor's deputies, they were admitted; but refusing to subscribe the instrument from Rome, they were expelled the council.

Photius himself being compelled to attend, he behaved with great dignity, refusing to make any answer to their interrogatories. On their calling him a prevaricator and adulterer, (meaning an usurper of the see) he said, "God hears me without my speaking;" intimating that his appeal was to him, and not to them. On their saying that his silence should not deliver him from their condemnation, he said, "Neither did the silence of Jesus deliver him." Being urged to say that he submitted to the sentence of the pope, and acknowledged Ignatius for the patriarch, he still kept silence; and being pressed to say what was his justification, he replied, "My justification is not of this world. If it was of this world, you would see it." Being admonished to take

time, and consider his situation, he said he did not require any time; but that, being in their power, they might do with him what they pleased. After this he was dismissed. In the same session the deputies from the sees of Jerusalem and Antioch said that Photius had never been acknowledged by them as patriarch.

At the sixth session the emperor attended in person, when many of the bishops of Photius's ordination, making their submission, were received. others alleging their promises, and the oaths they had taken never to do it, the legates from Rome said they would absolve them by the grace of Jesus Christ, who had given them power to bind and to loose, since they had done it by compulsion. Being urged by the emperor to speak on their own behalf, they said they would do it if they were at liberty, and easily shew that what had been advanced against them was nothing to the purpose. One of them said that the canons were above pope Nicolas, and all the patriarchs, and mentioned several instances of bishops being condemned, but not those ordained by them. After much altercation the legates asked whether they would subscribe the instrument from Rome, and on their refusing they were sent to another part of the room. Metrophanes of Smyrna having replied to what they had said, one of them was going to reply again,  
but

but the legates would not suffer it. After this an exhortation to the schismatics was pronounced in the name of the emperor, who said he would allow them seven days in which to make their submission, but that after this they would be judged by the council.

In the seventh session the emperor attended, and Photius being introduced, leaning on a staff, the pope's legates ordered it to be taken from him, as being an emblem of the pastoral office, from which he was deposed; saying that he was a wolf, and no shepherd. They then asked him if he would sign the instrument of his resignation, but he replied that he was willing to give an account of his conduct to the emperor, but not to the pope's legates. Being asked whether he had any thing more to say, he replied, "If you had heard what I said before, you would not have asked me that question. If they repent of the sentence they have passed upon me, let them shew it by their works." Being asked in what manner, he said, "let them do penance for the sin they have committed." Being farther insulted, he replied that he had nothing to answer to mere abuse.

The bishops of his party being then introduced, and required to submit to the decision of the Roman pontiff, they all answered with great firmness. John bishop of Heraclea said, pointing to Pho-

tius, "Whoever shall anathematize that bishop, let him be anathema." Zacharias of Chalcedon said, "We will not obey what is contrary to reason. We see how things have been conducted." Eusebion of Cæsarea in Cappadocia said, "With respect to what is contrary to reason, and the canons, let it come from Rome, from Jerusalem, or any angel from heaven, I will not obey it." Being asked what they could say against the decision of all the patriarchal sees, they said, "The authority of the apostles and the councils. We have demanded liberty to explain our conduct, but have not obtained it." Refusing to submit to the judgment of the council, an anathema was pronounced against Photius and all his adherents.

In the eighth session they publicly burned all the subscriptions in favour of Photius by bishops or other persons, together with all his writings against pope Nicolas, and the acts of his council against Ignatius. After this they who had been sent by Photius to Rome, as legates from the other patriarchal sees, being introduced, denied that they had any power to assume the character of legates, and pronounced an anathema against those who had any concern in that embassy, or who had opposed pope Nicolas. The metropolitans also denied

nied their subscription to the writing that was then sent to Rome.

In the ninth session a legate from the patriarch of Alexandria attended; but professing his ignorance of the merits of the question between the two patriarchs, he referred the decision to those who were better qualified to judge. Being asked whether he had been informed of what had been done in the eighth preceding sessions, he said that he had, and that he was satisfied with it. After this some persons were examined who confessed that they had been forced to acknowledge Photius, and condemn Ignatius.

In the last session, held February 12th A. D. 870, the emperor being present, ambassadors from the pope and the emperor of the West intreated the succour of Basilius against the Saracens in Italy. An hundred bishops were then present, and they recited and confirmed all that had been done in the preceding sessions. Among other things, they decreed that they who had been anathematized in this council should be forbidden to practice painting, or to teach the sciences. The former respected Gregory of Syracuse, who was a painter, and the second Photius himself, who had taught with great reputation, and whose disciples were much attached to him. They also decreed

that for the future no person should publish any writings against the pope, as Photius had done.

After the canons of the council, they recited a confession of faith, with anathemas against heretics, particularly the Monothelites, among whom pope Honorius was not forgotten, and also against the Iconoclasts. They declared their approbation of the seven general councils, and called this the *eighth*. A speech was then made in the name of the emperor, exhorting to peace and submission. In it he said, "As to the laity, whatever be their dignity, they must not dispute about ecclesiastical matters, since that belongs to the bishops. Whatever science or virtue a layman be possessed of, he is but one of the sheep, and how little forever be the merit of a bishop, he is always the shepherd, while he teaches the truth. Take care then how you judge your judges, and live in subjection to them."

The emperor then signed the decrees of the council after the legates from Rome, who did it with a reservation for the ratification of the pope. The bishops who attended never exceeded one hundred and two, the smallness of which number is accounted for by the many depositions made by Photius, and the fees not having been supplied. It is said that the decrees of this council were signed with ink mixed with wine from the eucharist.

Among

Among the letters written in the name of this council was one in which was implied the subjection of the church of Constantinople to that of Rome. This the Greeks wished to have withdrawn, and with the consent of the emperor it was taken from the copies that were in the custody of the legates. But the trick being discovered, and the emperor not chusing to have an open quarrel with them, all the papers were restored.

Photius was far from being depressed by the decrees of this council, tho' in his confinement he was denied the use of books, and the attendance of a physician when he was sick; on which he expostulated with the emperor, in a letter that he wrote to him. In his letters to his friends he represented himself as a person oppressed by power, as Jesus Christ was before him, and exhorted them to submit to the mysterious dispensations of providence. All his letters on this occasion are written with peculiar spirit and dignity. In that to the emperor, in which he complains of his harsh treatment, unprecedented on such occasions, he asked either relief from his misery, or a speedy death. In many of his letters he boasts of the number and firmness of his friends, and that, in so great a storm, not a single bishop, even of the most obscure village, neither the learned nor the ignorant, had deserted him. And in fact they were only a hundred

bishops, all of whom had been ordained by Methodius or Ignatius, who had subscribed to this council. All who had been ordained by Photius, and they were more than three hundred, still adhered to him.

Notwithstanding this seeming cordiality between the two churches, there remained a bone of contention between them in Bulgaria, the jurisdiction of which was claimed by them both. Pope John VIII even threatened Ignatius, tho' replaced on the see of Constantinople with the concurrence and assistance of his predecessors, that if he did not withdraw his bishops and clergy from Bulgaria, and renounce all jurisdiction over it within two months, he would excommunicate and depose him. He also wrote to the king of Bulgaria in A. D. 879, exhorting him to return to the obedience of the see of Rome, and to receive a legate that he would send to him. At the same time he wrote to the clergy of Salonæ, that church being then vacant, and to the bishops of Dalmatia, ordering them on pain of excommunication to send the person whom they should chuse for archbishop to receive consecration and the pallium from him, without regard to the opinion of the Greeks.

Photius after being deposed eight years contrived, as it is said by means of forged books, containing a flattering genealogy of the emperor, to

get into his favour, and attend his person. He was even permitted to resume his episcopal functions, and ordained some persons in the life time of Ignatius; and on his death, in A. D. 879, he was reinstated in the dignity of patriarch; when he immediately employed his power in advancing his friends and depressing his enemies, restoring the bishops who had been deposed by Ignatius, and deposing, or reordaining, those who had been ordained by him. He even prevailed upon the legates, who had been sent by the pope on the business of the Bulgarians, to communicate with him.

The situation of the pope himself was now such as disposed him to gratify the emperor, and consequently Photius. He wanted the aid of the powers of the East for the relief of Italy, Rome itself being threatened by the Saracens. He therefore received in the most favourable manner the letters of Photius, and as Fleury says, against all the rules of discipline, and the example of his predecessors, consented to acknowledge him as lawful patriarch of Constantinople, excusing himself on the plea of necessity, and of his being received by the patriarchs of the other oriental sees on condition that he should ask pardon in council, and resign his pretensions to the province of Bulgaria. On these terms he said that, by the authority of the apostolic see,

see, he would absolve him from all ecclesiastical censures. In his instructions to the legates that he sent to Constantinople, he bade them deliver his letters to "the most holy Photius," saying, "Pope John our master salutes you, and wishes to have you for a brother and a colleague." He also expressed his wish that the councils held against Photius under pope Adrian, as well that in Rome, or that in Constantinople, should be declared null, and not be reckoned among the councils: This letter was likewise subscribed by the bishops who assisted at the council in Rome.

After these preliminaries, Photius, being reinstated in his dignity, summoned a council at Constantinople to meet in November A. D. 879, and it was attended by three hundred and eighty bishops, the legate from the see of Jerusalem, the two legates from Rome who had been sent in the time of Ignatius, and cardinal Peter, who had brought the letters of the pope to Photius. After some others had spoken, this cardinal rose, and said, "Pope John is willing to consider Photius as a brother, and as his own soul;" and then delivered the presents which the pope had sent, consisting of pontifical habits, a pallium, and sandals, which the legates displayed before the council; and nothing was said of the terms on which the pope had said that he consented to the reconciliation, viz. his asking

asking pardon before the council; which, says Fleury, was apparently done with the consent of the legates, as they made no complaint on the subject. The pope's letters being read with this suppression, the cardinal said, "Do you receive these letters?" They answered, "We receive all that relates to the union with Photius, and the interest of the church, but not that which relates to the emperor, and his provinces;" meaning the claim of the pope to the superintendence of Bulgaria. The pope's letter to Photius being then read with the same suppression, he acknowledged that he was satisfied with it.

When the cardinal said that their instructions required them to demand the jurisdiction of Bulgaria, Photius replied, that he had always been a lover of peace, and that he had made no ordination in Bulgaria since his restoration. He added other things, but they were only general expressions, which did not bind him to any thing. In giving an account of his conduct with respect to the patriarchate, he declared that, from the beginning, it had been forced upon him; that when he was expelled he had yielded to the violence, without making any attempt to raise a sedition; that after his restoration to the favour of the emperor, he had lived on the best terms with Ignatius, had visited him in his sickness, and taken into his protection

tection the persons he had recommended to him; and that after this it was at the pressing request of the emperor, and all the clergy, that he had resumed his see. To all this the bishops assembled in council unanimously declared that it was true.

In this session, which was the second, letters from the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch, were read, all of them expressing their satisfaction in the restoration of Photius; and the persons who had appeared as legates from those sees, at the preceding council were said to have been persons sent by the Saracens, or with their consent, to treat of the redemption of captives, and only pretended that they were legates. After reading the pope's letters abrogating the council against Photius, they said, "We have already abrogated; rejected, and anathematized that pretended council; and we anathematize all who do not reject it." "And how," said Elias, the metropolitan of Martyropolis, and also Elias the legate from the see of Jerusalem, "can that be called a council, which has filled the church with so many schisms, where deputies from the Saracens sat as judges, the decrees of which are contrary to those of all other councils, which has condemned the innocent without examination, and overturned all laws ecclesiastical and civil."

In the fourth session a legate from the patriarch of Antioch attended, with letters from him, and also from the new patriarch of Jerusalem, the preceding having been dead, declaring that neither of them had had any thing to do with the proceedings against Photius. "We know," they said, "that the sees of the East have always acknowledged him." "This unanimity," said Elias of Jerusalem, "comes from heaven."

In this session the different articles of the pope's demands being considered, they referred the business of Bulgaria to the emperor, and would not consent to any obligation to raise none but of the clergy to the patriarchate; saying that this had never been a rule with the churches in the East. "We ought to be at liberty," they said, "to follow our own peculiar customs, as the people of Rome are to follow theirs." But they heartily concurred in condemning all that had been done or written against Photius, and in excommunicating all who would not acknowledge him. At the close of this session, at the proposal of cardinal Peter, and as a token of their perfect harmony, the time for divine service being near, they all received the eucharist at the hands of Photius.

At the fifth session, held in January A. D. 880, they voted the second council of Nice to be the seventh œcumenical one, and pronounced an anathema

thema upon those who did not acknowledge it to be such. They also voted that all who were excommunicated by the pope should be held excommunicated by Photius, and that all who were excommunicated by Photius should be so by the pope:

Among the canons of this council, there was one to anathematize those laymen who should strike or imprison a bishop.

In the sixth session the emperor himself presided, and proposed that they should all agree in a confession of faith; and they all consented, even the legates from Rome, tho' it was made with a view to censure the addition of the words *filioque* to the creed. It was accordingly declared that they received the seven general councils, without taking from them, adding to them, or making any alterations in them; saying, "If any person is so bold as to compose another confession of faith, or alter this by strange words, additions, or subtractions, we depose him if he be of the clergy, and we anathematize him if he be a layman." When they had done this, the emperor and his three sons signed the decrees of the council.

The last session of this council was held in the church of St. Sophia, on the 13th of March, when,  
after

after reciting every thing that had been agreed upon, the pope's legates said, " If any person do not receive Photius as patriarch, and communicate with him, let his lot be with Judas, and let him not be acknowledged as a christian." They broke up with the usual acclamations, the last of which were, " long life to the patriarch Photius, and to John."

After this the pope, writing to Photius on the subject of the addition to the creed, said that he considered it in the same light that he did, viz. as a corruption of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, but he wished not to compel any person to abandon that addition if they had been used to make it, but to use mildness and address, exhorting them by degrees to renounce that blasphemy. Indeed, this addition, as has been observed, had not its origin at Rome, but in the churches of Spain.

As to the facility with which the bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, took their part for or against Photius, Fleury says it may be easily accounted for from their poverty and abject condition; being ready to join with any who, having the most power, had the most to give. But certainly the history of these two councils proves the same with respect to the bishops in general, and all the councils which were composed of them.

The pope, on receiving the decrees of this council, approved of them; and writing to the emperor, thanked him for the succour which he had given him against the Saracens, and his surrender of the jurisdiction of Bulgaria; hoping, as may be supposed, that he would make no difficulty of it. He added, "We receive the council of Constantinople for the restoration of Photius to the patriarchate; but if our legates have done any thing contrary to our orders, we do not receive it."

The history of this affair is certainly no argument for the infallibility of the Roman pontifs, and much less is what presently followed what I have recited. For pope Martin and Adrian III, finding that the emperor and Photius did not intend to give up the jurisdiction of Bulgaria, not thinking themselves obliged to confirm what had been done by their predecessors, condemned Photius as an intruder; and in return he wrote a violent letter against the Latins on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit; saying that both pope Leo the Great, and Leo III held this procession to be from the Father only. The emperor, offended at the conduct of those popes, wrote a provoking letter addressed to Adrian, but received by Stephen who had succeeded him. He replied to it, and said that the city of Constantinople was  
without

without a patriarch ; considering Photius as an usurper, notwithstanding his solemn restoration with the hearty concurrence of his predecessors.

There was not, however, any more uniformity of conduct in the East than in the West. For Leo VI, surnamed *the Philosopher*, succeeding his father Basilus, in the first year of his reign banished Photius, and sent him to a monastery in Armenia, where he soon after died. The cause of this was that the emperor suspected him of a design to raise a relation of his own to the empire. Tho', however, he concurred with the pope in his condemnation of Photius, he wrote to him to request that he would restore those of the clergy who had been ordained by Photius. In answer to this, pope Formosus said he would pardon them on their repentance, but that they should only be considered as laymen. It does not appear that any thing was done in consequence of this ; and from this time the two churches had but little intercourse; tho' at a council held at Constantinople, in A. D. 920, in which fourth marriages were condemned, the emperor Constantine Porphyroganita sent to the pope to request the concurrence of the Latin church, and renew the intercourse that had formerly subsisted between them, and which he said had been unhappily interrupted.

It may not be improper, before I close this subject, to mention all the points of difference between the Greek and Latin churches, as they are enumerated by Photius, and shew the stress that he laid upon them. In the first place, he says, “ they  
 “ fast on saturdays, tho’ the least contempt of the  
 “ traditions tends to overturn all religion. More-  
 “ over, they take from Lent the first week, per-  
 “ mitting to eat milk, meat, and cheese in it.  
 “ Following the errors of Manes, they have an  
 “ aversion to priests engaged in lawful marriage.  
 “ They repeat the unction of chrism when it has  
 “ been administered by priests; saying that bishops  
 “ only are empowered to administer it. But the  
 “ height of their impiety is their daring to add new  
 “ words to the sacred symbol, authorized by all  
 “ the councils, saying that the Holy Spirit does  
 “ not proceed from the Father only, but also from  
 “ the Son. After this,” he says, “ it is in  
 “ vain to pretend to be Christians. This, is  
 “ admitting *two principles* in the trinity, and  
 “ confounding the properties of the divine persons.”  
*Fleury* Vol. II. p. 133.

Pope Nicolas having received a letter from Photius, containing these accusations of the Latin church, communicated it to Hincmar, the learned archbishop of Rheims; and he required the bishops who were under him to write their thoughts on the  
 sub-

subjects, and there are now extant two of those treatises, one written by Eneas bishop of Paris, and the other by Ratram a monk of Corbie. In this work Ratram says, “ If by the Holy Spirit being sent by the Son, a *procession* be not meant, it must be a *service*, and then the Holy Spirit will be inferior to the Son, which is Arianism. What,” says he, “ is it that the Holy Spirit can take from the Son, if it be not his substance ?”

This, however, was not the first time that this curious question was considered in the Latin church. In A. D. 809, in a council held at Aix la Chapelle in the presence of Charlemagne, this question about the procession of the Holy Spirit was formally discussed; and in order to have it decided this emperor sent an embassy to pope Leo, with a treatise written by Smaragdus abbot of St. Michael, to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit to be from the Son, as well as from the Father. To this doctrine the pope gave his assent. But when he was farther urged to say whether a man who did not believe it could be saved, he seemed unwilling to go so far; but acknowledged that if a man could understand it, and would not believe it, he could not be saved. He would not, however, allow any new clause to be added to the creed. Notwithstanding this, in France and Spain,

the creed was read with this addition, and in Rome without it.

---

## SECTION II.

### *The Sequel of the History of Image-worship.*

**T**HERE is hardly any thing in the whole compass of church history that demonstrates more clearly the decisive influence of the imperial authority in ecclesiastical matters, than the whole of this controversy relating to the worship of images; the decrees of the church constantly changing with the disposition of the court. In the time of Irene the worship of images was most solemnly established. But Nicephorus, who deposed and banished her, was no friend to that superstition, tho' he did not chuse to do any thing with respect to it. His successor Michael Curoplates favoured the worship of images, and persecuted those who opposed it.

On the contrary, Leo the Armenian was a violent Iconoclast, and considered the subjection of the Christians to the Saracens as owing to their superstition and the idolatry of image worship, and said that all the preceding emperors, who were of that sect, had died violent deaths; but the rest  
 peace.

peaceably in their beds. He had, however, much opposition from the patriarch Nicephorus, and the monks; and tho' he had a conference with them on the subject, it was to no purpose. Nicephorus, not yielding to the emperor, found himself obliged to abdicate the patriarchate, and he was conducted to a monastery. Theodorus who succeeded him was an iconoclast like the emperor, and consequently the images were every where demolished. In opposition to this, Theodore Studites, at the head of his monks, carried them in a solemn procession on a Whitfunday, singing hymns in honour of them. Being invited to attend a council which the emperor called, he refused to go, knowing the design of it, and remonstrated against it.

The first thing that was done in this council was to confirm that which had been held by Constantine Copronymus against the worship of images, and to anathematize the subsequent one of Nice. This was done with perfect unanimity by all who attended; but some bishops and abbots being introduced, and refusing to consent to what had been done, they were insulted, and sent to prison; and the council was closed with acclamations in the usual manner.

Agreeable to the orders of this council, images were again removed from the churches, and among

the many abbots and others who were banished for adhering to the late doctrine, Theodore Studites was not forgotten. He was sent to the castle of Metopus near Apollonia, where he continued to write and encourage his friends.

In this persecution of the worshippers of images, Nicetas and Theodore Studita, were not to be moved by the harshest treatment, nor could they be prevailed upon to communicate with the Iconoclasts. Theodore applied to the pope, imploring his assistance. He also wrote very moving letters to the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, begging their prayers, and their compassion. The patriarch of Jerusalem sent two monks to Constantinople; but on their remonstrating with too much freedom to the emperor, they were banished to the mouth of the Danube. Pope Pascal sent letters and a legate to Constantinople, but without any effect. However, he provided a monastery for the Greek refugees at Rome.

The stress which these rigid adherents to the worship of images laid on their doctrine and practice appears, at this distance of time, not a little extraordinary; but our surprize is lessened by the consideration that they wrote, in a time of persecution, and consequently of great irritation. Theodore Studita, writing about the reception of penitents, says, "they were to be received not as  
" those

“ those who had fallen into a heresy, but as those  
 “ who had denied Christ ; for, as Basil says, the  
 “ renouncing of the images, goes to the original.  
 “ It is not lawful,” he says, “ to eat with the he-  
 “ retics, not even in case of necessity, nor with the  
 “ Catholics themselves who communicate with  
 “ them, except once or twice, and that through  
 “ necessity. It is not lawful,” he says, “ to salute  
 “ heretics, or receive their gifts.”

This persecution ended with the life of the em-  
 peror Leo, and the accession of Michael the Stam-  
 merer, in A. D. 820. Michael recalled the exiles,  
 and tho' no worshipper of images himself, he al-  
 lowed other persons to do as they thought proper  
 in that respect. This emperor, pressed by his ene-  
 mies, and fearing lest the worshippers of images  
 should turn against him, proposed a conference  
 between the two parties. But Theodore and his  
 brethren absolutely refused it ; saying, it belonged  
 to the bishops of the apostolic sees, the chief of  
 which was that of Rome, to decide concerning the  
 faith.

After the civil war, in which Michael was en-  
 gaged, was over, this emperor sent embassadors to  
 Lewis the Western emperor, giving him an ac-  
 count of the worship of images in the East, parti-  
 cularly complaining of some gross and ridiculous  
 superstitions which he said had induced him, and

other emperors, to remove the images from a lower to a higher situation in the churches, where they might serve for the instruction of the people, without being the objects of such abuse. “They removed the crosses,” he says, “from the churches, and put images in their places; and before these images they lighted lamps, and burned incense, paying them honour as to the crosses. They also sing hymns before these images, adore them, and implore their assistance. Several persons put clothes upon them, and make them god-fathers and godmothers to their children; they put upon them the first hair they cut from their heads, or offer their hair to them when they take the monastic habit. Some priests scrape colours from the pictures, and mix them with the elements of the eucharist, or first put the elements into the hands of the images, and then give them into the hands of the communicants; and others take boards on which are the pictures of some faints, and make use of them for altars in private houses.” This letter shews the good sense of the emperor, as well as the ridiculous folly of the times, which, without historical evidence, would indeed be incredible.

On receiving this letter Lewis applied to the pope, requesting that an assembly of bishops might reexamine the business of images; and the pope, who

who was then Eugenius, consenting, several bishops were ordered to meet at Paris in November A. D. 825, none being absent but the bishop of Autun, who was detained by illness. In this assembly, after reading the letter of pope Adrian to Constantine and Irene, the Caroline books, and Adrian's answer to them, which they did not think satisfactory, they came to a resolution similar to that of the council of Frankfort, approving of the use of images, but not for the purpose of adoration.

From this council a deputation was sent to the pope with the approbation of Lewis, requesting his interference to compose the differences in the East, by bringing the two opposite parties to the medium which themselves observed. Agobard bishop of Lyons was the most distinguished of those bishops, and is supposed to have drawn up the letter to the pope, and others that were written on this occasion. What effect this deputation had does not appear. But it is certain, Fleury says, that the Gallican church continued to think and act as they then did a long time, and yet were in communion with the church of Rome. Political and interested considerations did not operate so powerfully in the West on this occasion as they did in the East, and the minds of men had never been so much irritated on the subject.

There

There was, however, some considerable difference of opinion on this subject even in the West, where the person who distinguished himself the most by his opposition to the worship of images, and other abuses of the times, was Claudius bishop of Turin, a disciple of Felix of Urgela. He had been a priest in the palace of the emperor Lewis, where he served with great reputation, and was particularly eminent for his knowledge of the scriptures, on many parts of which he wrote commentaries. The emperor, seeing that the people of Italy were very ignorant, sent Claudius to instruct them; and he, observing that the people paid a superstitious respect to images, removed them, and also all the crosses that had been erected in his diocese. He said, in defence of his conduct, that

“ when the Pagans transferred their worship from  
 “ the images of their gods to those of the saints,  
 “ they only changed the names of things, but did  
 “ not abandon the worship of idols, so that they  
 “ were still *idolaters*; and if men must be adored,  
 “ it were better to worship living men than dead  
 “ ones, as they bore a greater resemblance to God.”

He said that, “ if the cross was to be worshipped  
 “ because Christ hung upon it, every thing also  
 “ that bore as near a relation to him was to be  
 “ adored, as the manger in which he had lain, the  
 “ the ass on which he rode, the thorns and the  
 “ lance

“ lance which were the instruments of his passion, &c.” However, in what he published on this subject he was answered by Dungal of St. Denis in France, but what effect the controversy had does not appear.

Claudius was not content with reforming the the abuse of the adoration of images. In the litanies, and other offices of the church, he made no mention of any of the saints, and did not celebrate their festivals. He forbade the lighting of candles in the churches in the day time. He also declined attending the usual councils of bishops, saying they were the assemblies of asses. His answerer, however, said that they ought not to be so patient, or to spare such a person. The emperor was not altogether pleased with the writings of Claudius on those subjects, and by his direction Jonas bishop of Orleans, was employed in this work, when he heard that Claudius was dead.

This eminent reformer left disciples, and it appeared that, besides his zeal against the worship of images, and other superstitious practices, he is said to have revived the system of Arianism, or unitarianism, and to have left writings on this subject in the episcopal palace. But it does not appear that they were ever published. The answer of Jonas is confined to the article of images, the worship of which he disclaims, tho’ he said that they who prayed before  
them

them in their honour ought not to be treated as idolators.

Theophilus, who succeeded his father Michael in A. D. 829, soon discovered even more zeal against the worshippers of images than his father had done. He not only forbade the worship of images, but even the making, or keeping of them, and the prisons were full of painters, monks, and bishops. He had a particular dislike of the monks, and forbade them going into cities, or even being seen in the open fields. Notwithstanding this, his wife Theodora, and his mother in law, continued zealous for the worship of images.

This emperor was particularly desirous of gaining Theodore of Jerusalem, and his brother Theophanes, who had been ill used and banished by his father; and for this purpose he sent for them in A. D. 833. But not succeeding, they were grossly insulted, having, it is said, some verses inscribed on their faces, and were remanded to their place of banishment. They were offered their liberty if they would communicate, tho' but once, with the other party; but they resolutely refused, saying it was as if they should be desired to cut off their heads only once, and that then they might go where they pleased. Methodius had much better treatment, the emperor not only taking him out of prison, but keeping him about his person, and taking

taking him with him in his warlike expeditions; but it was said that he was apprehensive of his promoting a revolt of the common people if he was left behind. This, however, might have been prevented by his being left in prison.

On the death of Theophilus, his son Michael being an infant, the empress Theodora governed in his name, and being a zealous advocate for the worship of images, she signified to the patriarch John, that he must either assist her in restoring them, or be expelled from his see. Not complying with her wishes, he was deposed, and confined to his country house.

A council being then called, the Iconoclasts were again anathematized, the second council of Nice confirmed, and Methodius was made patriarch of Constantinople. After this, the images were immediately replaced in the church of St. Sophia, and every where else. And to complete the business, the empress made a feast for the clergy, and others who had suffered in the late persecution, and continued it annually as long as she lived, calling it *the feast of orthodoxy*; and it is still celebrated in the Greek church. Thus ended, say the Catholics, the heresy of the *Iconoclasts*, after about one hundred and twenty years from its introduction by the emperor Leo Isauricus.

The Iconoclasts were not, however, yet wholly silenced; and at the eighth general council, held by Basilius in A. D. 869, after the business of Photius and Ignatius was dispatched, Theodore Crithin, the chief of the Iconoclasts, was introduced; and being required to submit to the decrees of the church, expressed by the patriarchs of the five apostolic sees, he replied with great firmness, after acknowledging his respect for the image of the emperor which was shewn him, that he would not worship the image of Christ unless they could shew him that Christ required it. Others, however, of that party confessed their error, as it was called, and were received into the church.

---

### SECTION III.

*Of the Controversy occasioned by Goteschalchus concerning Predestination.*

THE doctrine of *predestination* was first advanced by Austin, in pursuance of what he had maintained in the Pelagian controversy on the subjects of *Grace*, and *original sin*. But tho' his authority was very great in the Western church, his doctrines had not been generally understood in their greatest rigour, and especially  
neither

neither himself nor any of his followers had said much on the subject of *reprobation*, so that, notwithstanding the *election* of some to eternal life, it was still taken for granted, that the destruction of the wicked was from themselves; that it was in their power to prevent it, and that Christ died for all men. In this period, however, we meet with a person, of a speculative and serious turn (and there were always many such among the monks) who seems to have pursued the leading principles of Austin pretty nearly to their full extent.

This was Godeschalchus, a Saxon, a person of noble birth, first a monk in the monastery of Fulda, and then in that of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons in France, and ordained a priest by a suffragan of the church of Rheims, of which Hincmar was archbishop. In A. D. 847 he visited Rome, and on his return he lived with count Eberhard, one of the chief lords in the court of the emperor Lothaire; and discoursing in the presence of Nothingus bishop of Verona, concerning the doctrine of predestination, is said to have maintained, that the predestination of God imposes upon man a necessity of being virtuous, or wicked. The bishop, offended at this, mentioned it to Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, who promised to confute that doctrine in writing; and accordingly wrote a treatise in two Letters, one addressed to Nothin-

gus, and the other to count Eberhard, in which he quotes the authority of Austin himself against the doctrine of Godeschalchus, and asserts that God predestinates only in consequence of foreseeing every thing that will come to pass. This treatise was answered by Godeschalchus, in a work in which, according to Hincmar, from whom only we have any account of it, he maintained that the reprobate are properly destined to damnation, tho' it was in consequence of God's foreseeing that they would live and die in sin; so that, in this respect, it seems to have been a difference in words only. But he asserted that Christ did not die but for those who were really saved.

Hitherto the universal opinion had been, that the proper effect of the obedience and death of Christ was reversing the consequence of the sin of Adam, or giving men again that immortality which they had lost in him; and that it was by the help of grace imparted at baptism that Christians were enabled to do good works.

This controversy excited so much attention that it having been the universal practice to decide upon all questions in councils, it was brought before one that was held by Rabanus at Mentz in October A. D. 848, in which, tho' Godeschalchus, in explaining his sentiments, said that the wicked were predestinated to misery on account of their  
wicked-

wickedness; he reprov'd Rabanus for saying, that the destruction of the wicked was not properly predestinated, but only foreseen. His opinion was reprobated by the bishops assembled on this occasion, and Hincmar, in whose diocese he had been ordained, was directed not to suffer him to seduce the people, which it was said he had done, making them indifferent to all good works.

Hincmar, having received and examined Godeschalchus, presented him to a council of bishops, which was to meet together with the parliament of Charles the Bald at Quercy in A. D. 859. Thirteen bishops were present on this occasion, and after the examination of Godeschalchus, he was judged to be heretical and incorrigible, and deposed from the order of priesthood. He was also, for what was called his obstinacy and insolence (the evidence of which, however, does not exist) sentenced to be whipped with rods, and imprisoned. This cruel sentence was executed, and with rigour, in the presence of the king. He was also obliged to burn his own writings, and was then confined at the abbey of Hautvilliers in the diocese of Rheims. He continued, however, to write in his prison, and published two confessions of his faith, expressing his earnest desire to defend what appeared to him to be the truth in the presence of king Charles, of the bishops, and the monks. It is likewise said that

he professed his willingness to put the truth of his opinions to the trial of fire or water.

Notwithstanding the authority of Hincmar, and the other enemies of Godeschalchus, he was not without friends, and some of them in high stations, or eminent for their literature. In particular Ratram, the learned monk of Corbie and Prudentius bishop of Troyes, took his part; thinking his doctrine supported by the authority of Austin; and many others shewed a disposition to join him. These circumstances contributed to draw the farther attention of king Charles; and in this age every prince considered himself as an authorized defender of the faith, and having consulted with Ratram, this learned man wrote two books on the subject of predestination, and in them maintained the doctrine of two predestinations. This treatise, and another of Lupus abbot of Ferrara on the same side of the question, the king gave to Hincmar for his examination.

Hincmar, and Pardulus bishop of Laon, who took the same side, seeing the doctrine of two predestinations supported by the writings of Ratram, Lupus, and Prudentius, employed the deacon Amulacius, and John surnamed Erigena, a learned and subtle Irishman, to answer them. The work of the latter is still extant, and in it he maintains that there is only one predestination, viz. that to  
eternal

eternal life, and that sin and punishment, being only privations, could not properly be predestinated, or foreseen. He also quotes St. Austin as favourable to his argument.

Prudentius replied to the work of John Erigena, treating him as a Pelagian, but did not undertake the defence of Godeschalchus, who indeed does not appear to have been any farther concerned in the controversy. Erigena was also answered by Florus a deacon of Lyons. Amolon the bishop of this diocese, to whom Godeschalchus had sent his writings, and seems on the whole to have been a well wisher to him, reproved him for many things that he had advanced, especially for asserting that they who, are redeemed by Christ cannot perish, that the reprobate cannot be saved, and that God and the saints rejoice in their destruction. Remigius, who succeeded Amolon took the part of Godeschalchus more openly, and in answer to some letters of Hincmar on the subject, complains of the hard fate of Godeschalchus for defending the truth.

After the council of Soissons, in A. D. 853, king Charles coming to Quercy signed four articles, which had been there composed by Hincmar, against the doctrine of Godeschalchus, in which he acknowledged only one predestination, viz. to eternal life, but allowed that God foresaw,

tho' he did not decree, the destruction of the wicked. "God," says he, wills all to be saved. Some "he actually saves by his mercy, but others perish thro' their own fault." Prudentius of Troyes was induced to sign these articles; and yet in the same year he declared himself of a different opinion in his writings; and on the whole the sentiments of Godeschalchus, tho' in some respects novel, appear to have been very prevalent, and were even sanctioned by the most respectable councils.

The four articles of Hincmar being sent to the church of Lyons, Remigius and his clergy were shocked at them, as, in their opinion, attacking the authority of the scriptures, the Fathers, and especially St. Austin. The bishop, therefore, answered them, maintaining the two-fold predestination. He maintained the same doctrine at the third council of Valence, assembled by the order of the emperor Lothaire in A. D. 855. There the bishops determined that "the prescience of God  
 " does not impose upon man a necessity of being  
 " wicked; that there are two predestinations of the  
 " good to eternal life, and of the wicked to death;  
 " and that Christ died only for those who believe  
 " in him. We reject" they say, "as hurtful and  
 " contrary to truth, the four articles which have  
 " been received with little precaution by our bre-  
 " thren

“ thren. As to the grace without which no rea-  
 “ sonable creature ever lived well, and the free  
 “ will which was weakened in Adam, and resto-  
 “ red by the grace of Christ, we believe what has  
 “ been taught by the Fathers, the councils of Afri-  
 “ ca and Orange, and what the popes have held ;  
 “ but we reject with disdain the impertinent fables  
 “ and questions of the Scots, which have been the  
 “ occasion of so lamentable a division in these un-  
 “ happy times.” By this they meant the writings  
 of John Erigena. The decrees of this council  
 were confirmed in another held at Savonieres in A.  
 D. 859, and seem to have had the sanction of the  
 papal see. Hincmar was not silenced by these  
 councils ; but wrote in defence of the four articles  
 of Quercy, tho’ Fleury says with more erudition  
 than judgment. Vol. 10, p. 536.

It seems not a little extraordinary that, not-  
 withstanding the prevalence of Godeschalchus’s  
 opinions, he himself continued in prison, the sen-  
 tence passed against him not having been reversed.  
 There was probably something offensive in his  
 manner, tho’ nothing will justify the treatment  
 he met with. Hincmar says he lived as other  
 monks did, with every convenience of life, but that  
 ever since he had been confined, he had never  
 washed his hands or face, so that if he should go  
 abroad he would strike persons with horror. He  
 died.

died in this state of confinement in A. D. 868, and before he died rejected with indignation a formula-ry of confession which Hincmar sent him,

---

#### SECTION IV.

##### *Of the Propagation of Christianity in this Period.*

CONSIDERABLE progress was made in the propagation of christianity in the course of this period of our history; and though in most cases the conversions were only nominal, and the christianity to which Heathens were converted a miserable superstition, it laid the foundation for something of a better kind in future time. That the conversions made by the arms of Charlemagne were of little value, appeared when, in A. D. 842; Charles the son of Lewis gave the Saxons the option of taking what religion they pleased. For they chose to return to paganism. In general the conversions in this period, as those in the preceding, began with the princes, and therefore may be suspected of having a political object; but some were brought about, in some measure at least, in a better manner.

The Bulgarians having taken Adrianople in A. D. 813, and carried away many captives, and among them the archbishop Manuel, they were the means of converting many of that people. In A. D. 865, the king of Bulgaria, who had married a christian, was himself converted, and sent to the emperor of Constantinople for a bishop, who baptized him; and his subjects in general followed his example. He was afterwards induced to send to Rome for farther instruction in the christian religion; and this was the occasion of legates and bishops being sent from thence; and at length the contest for the jurisdiction of this country contributed more than any other circumstance to the final separation of the two churches.

In A. D. 866, the Chazares sent to the emperor Michael for some persons to instruct them in the christian faith, and he sent Constantius, who after having learned their language, translated the scriptures into it, and taught them the use of letters. In the same year, Bartilas, prince of the Moravians, hearing what the Chazares had done, sent ambassadors to the emperor Michael with the same request; and accordingly he sent two brothers, Constantine and Methodius, who were well received. Pope Nicolas, however, hearing of this, wrote to them, and engaged them to go to Rome, and receive bishops of his ordination.

Methodius, who is called the archbishop of Slavonia, converted the duke of Bohemia, his wife, and thirty of his nobles in A. D. 880. Most of the Sclavi were converted in A. D. 950, Otho having conquered Boleslaus king of Bohemia.

It is disputed between the Greeks and the Latins which of them introduced christianity into Hungary, but it was probably the former. *Mosherm*, 2. 184.

About A. D. 870, the Russians received the christian faith, the prince, as usual, leading the way; but the circumstances of this conversion have much the air of fable.

In A. D. 825 Heriold king of Denmark being driven from his country, had recourse to the emperor Lewis; and in expectation of assistance from him, professed himself a christian, and was baptized, together with his children and many other Danes. When he returned to his dominions, he was accompanied by the monks Ansgar or Anscaire, and Aubert. In A. D. 830 Anscaire, accompanied by Vitmar, went to Sweden; and with the leave of the king preached with success there; and to facilitate the conversion of those northern nations, a bishoprick was established at Hamburg, and Anscaire was placed in the see; but he had to struggle with great difficulties, and was some-

times

times obliged to leave the place on account of the ravages of the Normans. He was most zealous and indefatigable in his labours in all the northern parts of Europe, and had for his fellow labourers or successors, besides Witmar above mentioned, Ebbo, Rembert, and others. *Mosheim*, vol. 2, p. 16.

As christianity gained ground in the North, it suffered in the East and the South, in consequence of the power of the Saracens. In the civil wars among them, after the death of Haroun Alraschid, the christians were exposed to great sufferings, and many of them fled to Constantinople, where they were received with great humanity by the emperor Michael.

About the year A. D. 850, several christians suffered death at Cordova, either for abandoning, or reviling the Mahometan religion; but the spirit with which they suffered is not to be commended. In general, they offered themselves to the judges, who seem to have been unwilling to hurt them. This conduct was much blamed by many of their fellow christians at the time; and an assembly of the clergy convoked by king Abderame on the occasion, forbade the offering themselves to martyrdom, tho' they did not chuse to pass any censure on those who had done it. As many persons would not consider them as martyrs, Eulogius, a priest of  
Cordova,

Cordova, wrote a history and defence of them. He himself was afterwards, put to death for secreting a young woman who had renounced the Mahometan religion. Fleury condemns the conduct of those who offered themselves to martyrdom; but says that the authority of the church, which has received them as martyrs and saints, and among them Eulogius their defender, ought to arrest our judgment, vol. 10, p. 510.

It is said that the monks opposed the assessment of the estates that had been given to their order, and that on this the king caused the council above mentioned to be held; but that it was reprobated, and Eulogius chosen archbishop of Toledo for the zeal he shewed on the occasion, tho' he was soon after apprehended, and executed. *Robinson*, p. 234.

## SECTION V.

*Of the State of the Jews and Christian Sectaries,  
and of the Rise of peculiar Opinions, within this  
Period.*

**I**N the time of Agobard bishop of Lyons, the Jews were very numerous in that city, and its neighbourhood, and many christians adopted their customs. Writing to Nebrodus bishop of Narbonne, he says that some christians observed the sabbath as they did, working on sundays, and paying no regard to the appointed fasts. Many women, he says, were corrupted by them, and said that they were of the race of the patriarchs and prophets. Nay, many of the common people went so far as to say that the Jews were the only true people of God, and who adhered to the true religion. They also said that the Jews preached better than the christian priests. It appears by the account of a famine in Germany in the ninth century, that the laws of Moses so far as they related to the eating of things strangled, were binding upon christians; it being said that necessity alone

made

made it excusable to eat of a hind that had been killed by wolves. But the prohibition to eat of things strangled, and blood, had the sanction of the apostles, and it is to this day observed in all the East.

The Jews were not, however, without some reason to complain of the treatment they met with in this period. Their slaves were sometimes baptized, and then, to their great prejudice, obtained their liberty. The emperor Lewis, who was disposed to favour them, made the consent of the master, tho' a Jew, necessary to the baptizing of a slave. Of this Agobard, who wrote against them, complained; saying, that the Jews ought to be indemnified for the loss of their slaves, but that salvation ought not to be denied to any. At a council held at Metz in A. D. 888, christians were forbidden to eat with Jews.

It has been observed, that in general, the Saracens were disposed to favour those christians who were deemed heretical, as less liable to take part with the Greek emperors against them. But Politien the Melchite patriarch of Alexandria, being a physician, and having cured a concubine of the caliph Haroun Alraschid, he gave him the possession of all the churches which had been usurped by the Jacobites in that city.

It was seen in the former part of this work how much the Gnostic doctrines, which arose from the oriental philosophy, spread among christians, appearing in the time of the apostles, and shewing themselves in different forms to the time of Manes. They were long considered as the only proper heretics in the christian church, being excluded from other churches, and forming separate societies of their own. From one Paul, who is said to have adopted and modified the doctrines of Manes, tho' it is not known at what time he lived, many of them were called *Paulicians*; and they were so numerous in Phrygia, Lycaonia, and especially Armenia, that at length, urged no doubt by persecution, they formed a separate state; and like the Donatists in Africa, were frequently at war with the Greek emperors.

The only account that we have of the principles of the Paulicians is given by Peter the Sicilian, who in A. D. 871, was sent by the emperor Basiliscus to Tibrica the capital of the Paulicians in Armenia, to treat of an exchange of prisoners. He was with them nine months; and having informed himself concerning their doctrines, he wrote an account of them, dedicating his work to the first archbishop of Bulgaria, where the Paulicians were making many converts. For they were indefati-

figable in propagating their doctrine, and had great success in that country.

According to this writer, the Paulicians acknowledged two principles, the one good, and the other bad, the latter the author of this world, and the former of the world to come. They received none of the books of the old Testament, but all those of the new, except the two epistles of Peter. They also made great account of some epistles of one Sergius, a person of note among them. Jesus, they said, brought his body from heaven. They rejected the eucharist, and according to other accounts, baptism also; and as Theophanes said; they denied the incarnation; and as the Albigenses, who were in part derived from them, were not trinitarians, it is pretty clear that they were not what was called orthodox in that respect.

The Paulicians were much divided among themselves, and a particular account of their different sects may be seen in Fleury, Vol. 10, p. 105; but it is not of much consequence to be acquainted with them. It is said that there are probably Paulicians still in France and Bulgaria. *Mosheim* Vol. 2, p. 175.

The emperor Nicephorus was much attached to the Paulicians, but they were cruelly persecuted by the emperor Michael in A. D. 811. The patriarch Nicephorus and others remonstrated against his

his severity, but the abbot Theophanes approved of it. At this time one Constantine is said to have made some alteration in their doctrine, and to have had many disciples. But by the order of Michael he was seized, and stoned to death. His own disciples were ordered to throw the stones, but none of them would hurt him, except one Justus, whom he had adopted some years before, and instructed with particular care. He gave him the mortal blow. It is remarkable that one Simeon, who executed the orders of the emperor, was afterwards a convert to the Paulicians, and succeeding Constantine as head of the sect, called himself Titus. By the order of Justin II. he was apprehended, and with some others burned to death.

In A. D. 845 the empress Theodora undertook to extirpate the Paulicians, and it is said that a hundred thousand of them were destroyed. Many of them fled to the Saracens, and joined them against the Romans. Crysocheris, a chief among the Paulicians, had great reputation for his prudence and valour. He was very troublesome to the Romans, making frequent incursions into the territories of the emperor, and taking many prisoners. At length, however, he was defeated and slain.

A schism of some continuance in the Greek church was occasioned by the emperor Constan-

tine Porphyrogeneta divorcing his wife and marrying another. The monk Theodore Studites, many of whose writings are come down to us, his brother Joseph bishop of Theffalonica, and Platon a person of noble family, famous for abandoning considerable employments and becoming a monk, distinguished themselves by their opposition to this marriage, and the last of them actually excommunicated the emperor on account of it. On their refusing to communicate with another Joseph, a priest who had performed the ceremony of marriage (considering him as one who had authorised adultery) a council was called, in consequence of which the persons above mentioned were banished to different places, and Theodore appealed to the pope. However, the emperor Michael recalled them, and put an end to the schism by the banishment of the priest Joseph.

The emperor Michael the Stammerer distinguished himself not a little by the freedom of his thinking in several respects. He did not believe that there was any devil, because, as he observed, Moses said nothing of one. He maintained that Judas Iscariot was saved, and he allowed of no oath but by the supreme God. Having been educated at Amorium in Phrygia, which abounded with Paulicians, he retained some of their principles, and is said to have denied the resurrection.

In this period was the origin of the afterwards famous doctrine of *transubstantiation*. In A. D. 831, Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corbie, at the request of one of his disciples, wrote a treatise on the eucharist, in which he maintained that the elements of bread and wine were the real body and blood of Christ, the very same that was born of the virgin Mary, and that after consecration the substance of bread and wine did not remain in them. From this he drew three consequences, viz, that Christ is truly sacrificed every day, but in a mystery; that the eucharist is at the same time the truth and a figure; and that the elements are not subject to the process of digestion. By this means he maintained what was called the doctrine of the *real presence*, and he laid so much stress upon it, as to say that they who did not believe it were worse than the openly profane. This doctrine, however, being new, had not at first many adherents, and at the request of Charles the Bald, Ratram answered the treatise of Paschasius. \*

S 2

In

\* La Croze says he considers the doctrine of transubstantiation as having originated in Egypt, and to have been a consequence of the doctrine of the Monophysites. It there appeared as an assumption of the bread and wine in the eucharist, into an hypostatical union with the body and blood of Christ; and by their union making but one nature with him. *Christianisme d' Arménie, v. 855.*

In A. D. 846, the same Paschasius wrote treatise to prove that the virgin Mary, having conceived without concupiscence, was free from the pains of childbirth, and was even delivered without any opening of the womb; Jesus having passed thro' her flesh, as it is supposed that he did thro' the door, without opening it, when he appeared to his disciples, *the door*, as we read, *being shut*. Ratram opposed this opinion also, but Paschasius defended it, and charged his adversary with denying the virginity of Mary. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2, p. 162.

The doctrine of the *trinity* was sufficiently established in this period; but the conclusion of an antient hymn *te trina deitas unaque poscimus*, giving offence to Hincmar, he wished to have it left out. The monks, however, joined by Gotheschalcus, who tho' in prison wrote in defence of it, opposing him, it continued to be sung as before: *Ib.* Vol. 2, p. 160.

## SECTION VI.

*Of the State of the Clergy in this Period.*

WE have seen in the preceding periods of this history, how very different a set of men were the christian clergy, and the original humble and suffering teachers of the religion of Jesus. In every subsequent period we shall find them advancing in their pretensions, and the laity aiding that advancement, both with respect to spiritual and temporal power. Their supposed power in spirituals contributed much to overawe an ignorant age, so that their power was hardly thought to have any bounds.

The bishops of France, in their letter to king Lewis (said to be written by Hincmar archbishop of Rheims) said he ought “ to compel the lords who  
 “ had seized the goods of the church to make satisfaction, and do penance. Would you augment your kingdom at the expence of your  
 “ soul? The churches which God has confided to  
 “ us are not fiefs, which the kings can give and  
 “ take away as they please, but goods consecrated  
 “ to God, which cannot be alienated without sac-

“ crilege. We are not secular persons, who can  
 “ make ourselves vassals, and take oaths contrary to  
 “ the scriptures and the canons. It would be an  
 “ abomination if those hands which have received  
 “ the unction of the holy chrism, and by  
 “ prayer and the sign of the cross make bread and  
 “ wine become the body and blood of Christ,  
 “ should become slaves to an oath, any more than  
 “ the tongue of the bishop, who has the key of  
 “ heaven. If any have exacted such an oath of  
 “ bishops, both they who have exacted it, and  
 “ they who have taken it, ought to do penance for it.”

The giving of fiefs to bishops and monks, which began with Charlemagne, and had never been done by the Lombard princes, was felt as a great evil in this period; and the insecure state of property contributed much to increase the evil, many persons giving their lands to the church for their greater security, reserving only a certain allowance out of them to themselves. When the heirs to such estates failed, they fell wholly to the church. Hence the distinction between *feudum datum* and *feudum oblatum*. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 366. When, afterwards, Arnold of Brescia maintained that fiefs could not be given to the church, he was deemed a heretic. *Ib.* p. 323.

The power of administering, and consequently of with-holding, the sacraments of the church,

was a great instrument of the power of the clergy, and was often used very improperly. The same Hincmar of Rheims, complaining of Hincmar bishop of Laon, his nephew and suffragan, says, he had laid an interdict on the whole diocese of Laon, forbidding to celebrate mass, to baptize children, appoint penance, give the viaticum to the dying, or bury the dead; and says he was shocked at it. This shews, says Fleury, that these general interdicts were not then common, tho' particular ones were in use.

Dispensations for marrying within the prohibited degrees was a great source of wealth and power to the clergy; and in this period the idea of *spiritual affinity*, between godfathers and godmothers, and their sons and daughters, as an impediment to marriage, was introduced. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 365.

Much as the princes had to complain of the usurpation of the bishops, it was derived from their own superstition, in sanctioning the decrees of councils. Charlemagne, a little before his death, appointed councils to be held at five different places in his dominions, the decrees of which were brought to him, and he added the civil authority to those of them that required it. He also ordered that, in any stage of a lawsuit, if either of the parties applied to a bishop, his sentence should be

accepted, and that the evidence of a single bishop should always be admitted by judges. This he thought was agreeable to a law of Constantine, which has since been proved to be spurious. Tho' as Fleury says, it has served much to extend the jurisdiction of the bishops.

The bishops had all the power of civil magistrates. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 813, it was ordered that the vagabond and independent clergy (probably the disciples of Adelbert or Clement, mentioned in the preceding period,) those who were not in the service of any prince, or under any bishop or abbot, should be arrested by the bishop of the diocese without delay, that if they would not submit, they should be excommunicated, and that if this did not correct them, they should be imprisoned, in order to be judged in a council.\*

In the Capitulary of Charles the Bald, in A. D. 853, lords were forbidden to hinder the bishops from ordering the ferts on their estates to be beaten when their crimes required it. Accordingly the count and his officers were ordered to accompany the bishops in their visitations, to compel those who could not be reduced by mere excommunication

\* It was Charlemagne who gave the popes and other bishops the privilege of having prisons, which before his time had not been allowed even in Rome. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 365.

cation to do penance. Pope Nicolas, writing to the king of Bulgaria concerning some of his subjects who had apostatized, says " If they cannot be reclaimed they must be excommunicated, and repressed by the secular power. For the king ought to chastise those who are faithless to God, no less than those who are faithless to himself. *Fleury*, Vol. 11, p. 108.

This interference of the spiritual and temporal powers did not pass without notice or complaint. The emperor Lewis having held an assembly at Aix in A. D. 828, to enquire into the causes of the disorders of the times, in order to apply a remedy to them, Vala the abbot of Corbie said, that the temporal and spiritual powers encroached upon each other, that the emperor quitted his duty to attend to matters of religion, which did not concern him, and that the bishops were occupied in temporal affairs. The same complaint of the interference of the two powers was made at the council of Paris in the year following, and in the second council of Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 836.

In the contest between the temporal and spiritual powers, we do not wonder to find the latter represented as superior to the former. Pope Gregory having taken the part of Lothaire against his father Lewis, and accompanied him into France, addressed a letter to the bishops who favoured the father, in which he maintained that the ecclesiasti-

cal authority was superior to the secular, and that on this occasion they ought to obey him rather than the emperor. Pope Nicolas, writing to the king of Bulgaria, says, " You laymen ought not to judge the priests, or any of the clergy, nor examine their lives. You must leave all to the judgment of the bishops."

The same pope, who approached very near to the character of Gregory VII, made bishops the judges even of kings. Writing to Adventius bishop of Metz, he says, " You say you submit to your king as your superior. But first see that those kings and princes be so in reality. See that they conduct themselves well. Otherwise they are to be considered as tyrants, and not kings, and ought to be resisted, and not submitted to." This, as Fleury says, was making them judges whether the princes were tyrants or not, and not only the bishops, but all subjects; for the reason applies to all. Vol. 11, p. 76. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims being threatened by king Lewis if he would not ordain Odacre bishop of Beauvais, persisted in his refusal, and said in answer, " It is not you who have chosen me bishop to govern the church, but it is I who, with my colleagues and other christians, have chosen you to govern the kingdom, on condition that you observe the laws."

Fulk, another archbishop of Rheims, proceeded further than this. For being informed that Charles the Simple intended to make peace with the Normans, he wrote to dissuade him from it, threatening that if he did, he would renounce his allegiance to him, and persuade as many as he could to do the same, and that joining with his brethren, he would condemn him to an eternal anathema. What is more extraordinary, princes seem to have acknowledged the power of the bishops to depose them. For at the council of Savoniers, held in A. D. 859, Charles the Bald complained that Vanelon archbishop of Sens had broken his promise not to depose him from his royal dignity, at least without the bishops who had joined him in his consecration.

One instrument of the power of the bishops over princes was their making them submit to do penance, which according to the canons of the council of Nice, and the decretals of pope Siricius, disqualified them for bearing arms. The emperor Lewis being overpowered by his sons, they and their partisans, made him undergo a public penance, that he might be afterwards deemed incapable of reigning. Among other offences, he confessed that he had marched his troops without necessity in lent, and that he had fixed on holy thursday for the meeting of a parliament. This, says  
Fleury,

Fleury, is the second attempt of the ecclesiastical power over the secular, the first being that in the case of Vamba in Spain, mentioned before. In both these cases, however, the power of the church would have availed nothing without power of a temporal kind. But the laity were not aware of the advantage which they gave the clergy in making this use of their spiritual weapons to serve their own purposes.

There was great cause of complaint in this period on account of the appointment of improper persons to bishopricks. Tho' the emperor Lewis. in the parliament at Attigni, in A. D. 822, restored the election of bishops to the clergy and people, forbidding the interference of any prince, yet it appears that, in many cases, the bishoprics were considered as the property of the king or the great lords, and disposed of without any regard to the choice of the people. On the death of Sculph archbishop of Rheims in A. D. 925, supposed to have been poisoned by Hebert count of Vermandois, his son Hughes, a child of five years old, was made bishop, and the election was confirmed by pope John X, Abbon bishop of Soissons discharging the episcopal functions for him. Hebert afterwards employed Odalric archbishop of Aix to perform the spiritual functions; and while he enjoyed the temporalities, he lived with his wife in the  
epis-

episcopal palace. Afterwards, Roul king of France quarrelling with him, Hughes was expelled from the see, and another was chosen in his place.

Atton of Verceil, in his letters of discipline, complains of patrons for giving bishopricks according to the riches, the relationship, or services, of the candidate, bringing up their children for them; and he humourously notes the ridicule attending the examination of such children, who were taught to repeat their answers by heart, or read in a paper, which, he says, was held with trembling hands, for fear of losing the preferment; those who put the questions to them well knowing that they did not understand what they were saying, and who only put the usual questions in order to observe the canonical forms, thus committing injustice in the guise of truth. Vol. 12. p. 112. Those bishops, he adds, who were ordained contrary to the rules were accused without respect, unjustly oppressed, perfidiously expelled, and sometimes cruelly put to death. We are not surprized that, in this state of things, at the ignorance of some bishops. Freculph bishop of Lisieux had not an intire bible.

We have an example of another kind of irregularity in the church of Constantinople, where Tryphon was chosen in A. D. 928, till Theophylact the son of the emperor Romanus should be of

a pro-

a proper age to be advanced to that dignity. This, says Fleury, was the first example of this species of abuse.

We do not, that I remember, read of any *pluralities* till this period, but there is a remarkable example of this abuse in Manasseh archbishop of Arles, a relation of king Hugo, getting himself made bishop of Verona, Mantua, and Trent.

Translations were as yet very rare, tho' in other respects the antient customs in the appointments of bishops were violated. On the death of Venilon archbishop of Sens, the pope made some difficulty of admitting Egilon, a monk in another diocese, to succeed him; it having been an established rule, that the place of every bishop should be filled by some of the clergy of the same church, or from another if no person in it should be found capable. But the contrary practice, Fleury says, was now become common in France.

When bishoprics and abbacies were chiefly desired, and bestowed, as offices of power and profit, we do not wonder that the possessors of them lived in all respects like other great lords, and that many of them still bore arms. At a battle in the south of France in A. D. 844, Ebroin bishop  
of

of Poitiers, and chaplain \* to king Charles, and also Lupus abbot of Ferriers, were taken prisoners; so that even abbots, tho' priests and bishops, bore arms like other lords, pretending that they were obliged to do so on account of their fiefs. In fact, little regard was paid to the regulations of Charlemagne on this subject.

Much complaint was made by the priests of the oppression of their bishops in their visitations at Thoulouse in A. D. 360, when, by the order of king Charles, several regulations were made to remedy the evil. At a council at Constantinople in A. D. 870, archbishops were forbidden, on the pretence of visitations, to live without necessity upon their suffragans, thus consuming the revenues of the churches under them. Metropolitans were also forbidden to get their duty done by their suffragans while they attended to temporal affairs. Here we see, says Fleury, why those bishops were called suffragans. Vol. 11. p. 261.

Greater complaint still was made in this period of the debauched lives that many of the clergy, who were not allowed to marry. In the Capitulum

\* The word *chaplain* was derived from the custom of the kings of France carrying the cap of St. Martin with them to battle, hoping by its means to gain the victory, and a priest had the charge of it. *Fleury Vol. 10. p. 49.*

pitulary of Hincmar, composed in A. D. 852, there are so many injunctions against the clergy having any communication with women, that Fleury says, there is reason to fear there was much irregularity in that respect. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 888 priests were forbidden to lodge with any woman whatever, because some had been found to have children by their own sisters. Atton of Verceil, in his letters of discipline, complains that many of the clergy maintained two concubines, with whom they lived publicly, that these women governed the house, and after their death inherited what they had amassed of the goods of the church, and the donations of the faithful. This, says he, gave occasion to the officers of justice to enter the houses of the clergy, on pretence of removing those women and their children, the canons having condemned such concubines to servitude. To enrich those women and their families, he says, "the clergy  
" become avaritious, plunderers, usurpers, and  
" cheats, which cools the devotion of the people,  
" and prevents their paying their tithes; so that  
" the lower clergy are so poor, that they are hardly  
" able to subsist. When the bishops," he says;  
" reprove them for these disorders, they often re-  
" volt against them, seek the protection of power-  
" ful lords, and often take part with the enemies  
" of

“ of the church, and some would excuse themselves by saying they could not live without women.”

Alvarus Pelágius in a treatise intitled *The complaints of the church*, says, It were to be wished that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially those in Spain, where the sons of the laity are not more numerous than the sons of the clergy. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 165.

That these irregularities were not confined to the West, we see in the account of Theophylact patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A. D. 956, which, in order to give a faithful picture of the age, I think ought not to be omitted. It is, however, a singular case, and in any other than a son of the emperor would not have been borne. At the age of sixteen he was put in possession of this dignity, and held it twenty-three years. While he was under the care of another he appeared discreet and moderate, but when his tutors were dismissed he abandoned himself to the most shameful and criminal actions. He set to sale all ecclesiastical promotions, he had the most violent passion for hunting and horses, of which he had more than two thousand; and he fed them not with hay and barley, but with almonds, dates, raisins, and other delicacies, with figs dipped in the finest wines, &c. As he was celebrating mass

on a holy thursday, his hostler came to tell him that a mare of which he was particularly fond had foaled, when he was so overjoyed, that after getting thro' the litany as fast as he possibly could, he ran to the stable to see the foal, and returned to the great church to finish the service. He introduced the custom of dancing in churches on the great festivals, with indecent gestures, and common songs. His death was occasioned by being crushed against a wall as he was riding full speed after languishing two years. When he recovered after seeming to be at the point of death, he behaved better, but afterwards he appeared not to be at all reformed. He still sold his bishopricks, was fond of horses, and lived an effeminate life, unworthy of his station. At length his disorder turned to a dropsy of which he died.

Notwithstanding the ignorance, superstition, and extreme depravity, of this age, it was not destitute of good sense and real piety. In one of the memoirs written by Charlemagne a little before his death, we find some excellent observations on the manners of the clergy and the monks of his time, and a just preference of good morals to what were usually deemed the greatest virtues of the age. Speaking of the clergy, he says, "I would ask  
" them what it is to quit the world, and how we  
" are to distinguish those who abandon it from  
" those

“ those who remain in it, if it be that they only do  
 “ not carry arms, and are not married publickly;  
 “ if he who has abandoned the world cease not  
 “ to increase his possessions every day, and by all  
 “ means, promising paradise, or threatening hell;  
 “ employing the names of the saints to persuade  
 “ simple people to part with their wealth, and de-  
 “ prive their lawful heirs; who being thus reduced  
 “ to poverty, think public robbery, and all crimes,  
 “ permitted to them? Of what use,” says he, “ is  
 “ it to the church, that the superior of a commu-  
 “ nity is more desirous to have a great number of  
 “ subjects, than to have them good, and to have  
 “ them sing and read well, than to have them live  
 “ well? For tho’ care ought to be taken about  
 “ reading and singing, the perfection of morals is  
 “ of greater importance; and tho’ it is a good  
 “ thing that churches be built, and ornamented,  
 “ the ornament of virtue is preferable.” *Fleury*,  
 Vol. 10. p. 96.

We are not to conclude from the dissolute  
 lives of some of the clergy, that the whole body  
 was so corrupt. On the contrary, I have no doubt  
 but that the majority of them had such virtues as  
 were held in esteem in that age, and decent good  
 morals were never wholly overlooked in the most  
 superstitious times. They could not otherwise  
 have had any degree of credit with the people, and

the religion they taught would have been exploded.

As a specimen of the better sort of the clergy of this period; I shall mention some particulars of the life of Udalric, bishop of Augsburg. After the death of Henry the Fowler, he declined going to court, or to lead his troops in person, having devolved that duty on Adalberon his nephew, and gave himself wholly to his spiritual functions. He recited the office every day with the clergy of his cathedral, and moreover the office of the virgin, and of the cross, and also that of all the saints, besides several psalms, and the whole psalter every day, or as much as he could. Every day, he said one mass, and sometimes two or three masses. He observed all the rules of the monastery, lying on a matt, wearing no linen, and eating no flesh, tho' it was served in abundance to his guests. The greatest part of the first course at his table was distributed to the poor, or invalides of all sorts, who were fed every day in his presence. He cheerfully exercised hospitality to all persons, especially the clergy, the monks, and the nuns, and he took great care of the education and instruction of his clergy. He heard with great kindness the complaints of the serfs of his estates, both against their lords his vassals, or other serfs, and resolutely did them justice. He was never idle, but

but always employed in regulating his canons or his school, providing for the maintenance of his family, repairing or ornamenting his church, or fortifying his city against the frequent incursions of the Hungarians. He regularly visited his diocese in a carriage drawn by oxen; not that he objected to riding, but that he might have the company of his chaplain, and that they might sing psalms. For he always went with a great company of priests and other clergy, also of laymen from among his vassals, chosen serfs of his own family, and poor persons, and defrayed all their expences. On his visitations he preached, heard complaints, examined the priests, confirmed, and sometimes continued all night in the churches, without even dismissing the people.

It is to be observed that an attention to the serfs was expected of the clergy. Every bishop or abbot was to give liberty to three of them; and at a council held in England in A. D. 817, it was ordered that when a bishop died, besides giving a tenth of his effects to the poor, all his slaves, or villeins, of the English nation should be set free.

## SECTION VII.

*Of the Popes in this Period.*

SOME accession was gained to the temporalities of the papal see in this period. On the election of Paschal A. D. 817, the emperor Lewis, besides confirming the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, added to them the city and duchy of Rome, with the isles of Sardinia and Corsica. Still, however, the emperor retained the sovereignty of all those states, and confirmed the election of the popes before their consecration. But Charles the Bald in A. D. 876 granted the sovereignty of Rome to the Apostolic see. *Giannone, Vol. 1. p. 265.*

If the emperor claimed the right of confirming the election of the popes, the popes, in return, soon availed themselves of the part they performed in the ceremony of the consecration of princes, to assume a right to dispose of their crowns. Pope Nicolas, writing to the bishops of Charles the Bald, says, “ Let not the emperor turn against the faithful the sword which he received from the vicar of St. Peter. Let him govern the kingdom which has fallen to him by succession, confirmed

“firmed by the authority of the holy see, and by  
 “the crown which the soveraign pontiff has put  
 “upon his head.”

As far as circumstances favoured them, the popes were always ready to carry their pretensions into act. This appeared in the history of Lothaire king of Lorrain. His wife Thetberge, having confessed that she had been debauched by her own brother before her marriage, was repudiated by order of the bishops in council, and he married Valdrade. Thetberge, however, having interested pope Nicolas in her favour, he compelled Lothaire to take her again, and excommunicated Valdrade. The king even wrote a very submissive letter to the pope, begging that he would not raise above him any of his equals to establish themselves in his states; dreading, as the historian says, lest his uncles should take advantage of his situation. This pope, writing to Thetberge, who had desired to be divorced from her husband, and come to live at Rome, dissuaded her from it; saying, that if Lothaire should make any attempt upon her life, of which she was apprehensive, it would be to put himself and his kingdom into peril, as she had not only innocence, but the protection of the church and the people of the holy see.

On the death of this Lothaire, pope Adrian declared that “if any person opposed the just pre-

“ tensions of the emperor to the succession, let  
 f him know that the holy see is for this prince,  
 “ and that the arms which God has put into our  
 “ hands are prepared for his defence.” Thus,  
 says Fleury, did the pope make himself the arbiter  
 of crowns. When, notwithstanding this threat  
 of the pope, Charles seized the states of his brother  
 Lothaire, Adrian wrote to him, insisting on his  
 giving them up to his brother, the lawful heir,  
 who was then fighting against the Saracens; say-  
 ing, that after the third admonition, “ we will  
 “ ourselves come upon the place, and do what  
 “ belongs to our ministry.” He likewise admo-  
 nished the bishops to refuse him the communion  
 if he did not obey. However Hincmar archbishop  
 of Rheims replied with great spirit to the pope,  
 telling him, that he could not be at the same time  
 king, and bishop, that his predecessors regulated  
 the church, but not the state, which belonged to  
 the kings. “ If,” says he, “ the pope will pro-  
 “ cure peace, let him not excite quarrels; for he  
 “ will not persuade us that we cannot arrive at the  
 “ kingdom of heaven without receiving the king  
 “ that he gives us on earth.”

In this period we meet with the first mention  
 of the donation of Constantine to the see of Rome,  
 now universally allowed to be a forgery. Æneas  
 bishop of Paris, writing on the subject of the dif-  
 ferences

ferences between the Latin and Greek churches; says that when the emperor Constantine became a Christian, he left Rome; saying, "it was not convenient for two emperors, one the prince of the earth, and the other of the church, to govern in the same city." He therefore fixed his residence at Constantinople, and gave Rome and a great part of several provinces to the apostolic see; thus investing the Roman pontiff with royal authority, and caused an authentic act of it to be drawn up, and universally dispersed.

The only rival of the pope in this period was the patriarch of Constantinople; but of his pretensions pope Nicolas made very light. Writing to the king of Bulgaria, who was lately become a Christian, and wished to know to which of the two churches he was to be subject, he says, "The true patriarchs are those who govern the churches that were founded by the apostles, viz. those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The bishops of Constantinople, and of Jerusalem, have the name, but not the same authority; for the church of Constantinople was not founded by any of the apostles, and the bishop of Jerusalem was only stiled a bishop, and not a metropolitan, by the council of Nice. But next to Rome, was the patriarch of Alexandria." Notwith-

that the popes had recourse to for the purpose, they did not succeed in gaining the superintendance of the churches in Bulgaria. For the Bulgarians received their bishops from the Greek church. \*

The power of the pope in ecclesiastical matters, tho' allowed to be extensive, was never exactly defined, and therefore was sometimes disputed by the bishops, especially when supported by the temporal powers. But sometimes by argument in this ignorant age, and sometimes by policy, the popes generally carried every point in the end.

Pope Nicolas, in answer to the synodical letter of the council of Senlis, in A. D. 863, says, "When the laws are contrary to the canons, these ought to prevail, but appeals to the holy see  
"were

\* The bishops of Rome had no authority over the Spanish church till the eighth century. The proof of this is taken from forty synods held between A. D. 324 and 694, none of which were assembled by the bishops of Rome, in which he had no representative, and which were notified to him for his approbation. In some of them he was not so much as mentioned, and tho' in them many canons were made for the regulation of ecclesiastical hierarchies, there is not the least mention of the papal supremacy in them. *Robinson*, p. 178 from *Geddes's Tracts*. Vol. 2.

“ were established by the council of Sardica. \*  
 “ We will defend till death the privileges of our  
 “ see, and you yourselves have an interest in it.  
 “ How do you know but what has happened to  
 “ Rothade (who had been deposed in a council  
 “ in France, and whose part was taken by the pope)  
 “ to day, may happen to you to-morrow ; and in  
 “ that case to whom would you have recourse ?”  
 Writing to all the bishops of Gaul, the same pope  
 says, “ Some of you say that the decretals are not  
 “ among the canons. But if we reject the decrees  
 “ of the antient popes, because they are not among  
 “ the canons, we must reject the writings of Gre-  
 “ gory, and the other popes, and even the holy  
 “ scriptures.” He then proceeds to prove by the  
 “ authority of Leo and Gelasius, that all the de-  
 cretals of the popes ought to be received without  
 exception. At this time it was universally allowed  
 that the canons of the general councils were of the  
 highest authority, equal to that of the scriptures ;  
 and the authenticity of the decretals was un-  
 questioned.

Not.

\* The fourth canon of this council, supposing it to  
 be genuine, related only to the particular case of a  
 bishop deposed by the neighbouring prelates ; when it  
 was ordered that another should not be appointed till the  
 bishop of Rome had examined the cause, and pro-  
 nounced sentence. *Mosheim*, Vol. 1, p. 288.

Notwithstanding the almost impossibility of convicting a priest of any crime, on account of the evidence required for it, he still had a remedy in an appeal to Rome. The clergy of Bretagne having consulted Leo IV in A. D. 848 about what was to be done with simoniacal priests, he said they ought to be deposed, but only in a council, and by twelve bishops, and on the evidence of seventy persons; and if the person accused demand to be heard at Rome, he must be sent thither.

This period furnishes several instances of the popes dispensing with the obligation of *oaths*; and it seems to have been generally taken for granted, that they had this power, as being included in that of *binding and loosing* given to Peter. The emperor Lewis having been compelled by the duke of Benevento, who had him in his power, never to come in arms upon his lands, he applied to pope Adrian to absolve him from his oath. The request being complied with, he marched against the duke, who being supported by the Greeks, was not easily conquered.

Pope John VIII being much distressed by the incursions of the Saracens, in consequence of a treaty they had made with Sergius duke of Naples, urged the Neapolitans to break that treaty; saying that such a peace was a breach of the alliance made with Christ at their baptism. But the duke,

notwithstanding the excommunication of the pope; kept his faith with the Saracens. When, after this, his brother Athanasius archbishop of Naples seized him, put out his eyes, and took possession of the dukedom, the pope expressed his approbation of his conduct, praising him for loving God more than his brother, and for putting out the eye which scandalized the church. At last this pope, having no assistance from any prince, was himself obliged to make a treaty with the Saracens, engaging to pay them twenty-five thousand marks of silver a year. Even in these circumstances this pope kept urging the princes of Italy to break their treaties with the Saracens, and in A. D. 879 he excommunicated the people of Amalphi because they would not do it. However, in consequence of the pope's exhortations, Docibilis the governor of Gaieta did break his truce with them; on which many of the inhabitants were killed, and many taken prisoners. This obliged him to make a new treaty with them, by which they got an establishment on the river Garillan, where they remained forty years, and did incredible mischief.

Athanasius abovementioned, whom the pope had praised for seizing the possessions of his brother, and even putting out his eyes, finding it necessary to adhere to a treaty with the Saracens, the pope excommunicated him; and after he had continued

a year

a year in that state, he submitted, and was absolved; on condition that, after sending some of the prisoners (whose names were given him) to Rome; he should put all the rest to death; a condition of absolution, as Fleury observes, not agreeable to the antient mildness of the church.

As the popes took advantage of circumstances to advance their power, princes and bishops did the same; and sometimes they not only remonstrated against their usurpations with great freedom, but openly opposed them with success.

At the request of king Charles, the pope had got Vulfade archbishop of Bourges restored at the council of Soissons in A. D. 866, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Hincmar, after he had been degraded at a preceding council. On this occasion Hincmar expostulated with the pope by means of the person who carried the decrees of the council to Rome; saying; that “if what they had done before would not stand, neither would what they had done then; that there would be nothing to depend upon in the decrees of bishops, or of the popes; that excommunications would not be regarded, and that the priests who were deposed would not quit their functions, because our judgments, and those of the holy see, follow the wills of our kings, and the movements of our passions.”

In A. D. 864 pope Nicolas, in his council at Rome, condemned a council held at Metz in the year preceding, and deposed Theugand archbishop of Treves, and Gonthier archbishop of Cologne, for having decided against his wishes in the cause of Lothaire and his wives. All the bishops who joined with them in this business the pope also deposed. They all, however, continued their functions, without any regard to the sentence of the pope. The emperor who favoured them was so provoked at his conduct, that he went to Rome with a determination to compel him to restore the bishops. And Gonthier wrote to all the bishops in the dominion of Lothaire, desiring them “not  
“ to be disturbed at the conduct of Nicolas, who  
“ was called pope, and who considered himself as  
“ an apostle among the apostles, making himself  
“ emperor of all the world. Thanks to God;” says he, “we have resisted his folly, and he repents of what he has done.” He then complains of the conduct of the pope for having condemned them unheard, and in an irregular manner, according to his fancy and tyrannical fury. Addressing himself to the pope, he says, “We will  
“ not receive your accursed sentence; we despise  
“ it as a calumny. We reject you from our communion as communicating with those who are  
“ excommunicated, and content ourselves with  
“ com-

making himself master of the pope's person, he kept him a prisoner, without suffering any person to come to him, or even carry him victuals, but after much intreaty. After he left the city the pope excommunicated him, with all his accomplices. This excommunication was repealed at the council of Troyes, where the pope was present in A. D. 878. What effect this measure had does not appear; but so much was said about excommunications at the council of Ravenna in A. D. 877, that it is evident, says Fleury, they were now much despised. On this journey to France this pope was treated with little ceremony by the thieves of the country; for when he was at Châlons his horses were stolen from him, and also a silver cup. He revenged himself as before by excommunicating the thieves, and all their accomplices.

Anspert archbishop of Milan, without any regard to the excommunication published against him, at a council held by this pope at Rome, continued his functions, and the church of Vercell being vacant, he ordained one Joseph a bishop of it. The pope, however, declared the ordination null, and appointed another bishop. Anspert having agreed with the pope about the coronation of Charles le Gros, he was received into favour, and the pope even confirmed his ordination of Joseph bishop of Vercell to the bishopric of Asti.

Several

Several persons held doctrines unfavourable to the pretensions of the popes in spiritual as well as temporal matters. In the capitulary of Heyten bishop of Basse, the pilgrims who went to Rome were directed to confess before they set out, because, he says, they ought to be bound or loosed by their own bishops, and not by a stranger; meaning, says Fleury, the pope, as well as other foreign bishops. Claudius of Turin maintained that the words of our Saviour to Peter had been misunderstood, that the power was only given to him while he was alive, and that the proper successor of the apostle is not he who fills his see, but he who follows his example.

We shall not wonder at the opposition some of the popes met with, but rather that all reverence for the holy see was not wholly thrown off, if we attend to the character and conduct of some of them in this period. As an historian, I shall mention a few particulars of their violent and indecent behaviour.

Formosus, a man of distinguished abilities, and on that account translated from the bishopric of Porto to the see of Rome in A. D. 891, (which is the first instance of such translation to that see) after having been excommunicated by pope John VIII, and absolved by Martin II, had an opponent in Sergius, who took part with Adelbert duke

of Tuscany against Arnulph acknowledged to be emperor by Formosus. After his death the Tuscan party prevailed, and raised to the papacy Stephen VII bishop of Anagni: This pope held a council, in which he produced the body of Formosus; dressed in pontifical robes, with an advocate to plead his cause. Then, after addressing him as if he had been alive, they stripped him of his habit, cut off three of his fingers, and then his head, and lastly threw the body into the Tiber. He then deposed all who had been ordained by Formosus, and ordained them again. This pope was, however, himself driven from the papal see, thrown into prison, and strangled. Romanus, who succeeded him in A. D. 897, having by means of some fishermen got the body of Formosus, buried it in the sepulchre of the popes, and the bishops who had joined in the scandalous transaction respecting him were pardoned on their acknowledging that they did it by compulsion.

Leo V was expelled by Christopher I; but both of them died in prison. The last was succeeded by Sergius, who had opposed Formosus; having been chosen pope by his party in A. D. 898 and expelled; but being elected again in A. D. 907, he considered John IX and the three succeeding popes as usurpers. He, as might be expected, declared against Formosus, and approved

of the conduct of Stephen with respect to him. In his time one Theodora, an impudent woman, absolutely governed the city of Rome. She had two daughters, Marozia and Theodora, more disorderly than herself. By the former of them pope Sergius had a son, John, who was afterwards pope, and by her husband Albert she had Alberic, who became master of Rome.

By the influence of Theodora, John, a cleric of Ravenna, with whom she had a criminal connection, and who was afterwards archbishop of Ravenna, was made pope in A. D. 914. This John X was thrown into prison by Gui the governor of Rome, and he died soon after, being supposed to be strangled. On the death of Stephen in A. D. 931, Marozia, then married to Gui the marquis of Tuscany, got her son by pope Sergius, then only twenty-five years old, to be made pope. He was John XI, but he was without authority, and only performed the ceremonies of religion. Shocked as we cannot but be by those enormities, we shall see greater in the succeeding periods of this history.

Between the pontificate of Leo IV who died A. D. 855, and that of Benedict III, it was long believed that a woman of the name of *Joan*, who had concealed her sex, was chosen pope. After the reformation this was the subject of much dispute, and at this day persons who have taken

much pains in the enquiry entertain doubts with respect to it, notwithstanding Blondel, a learned Protestant; wrote to refute it. This history, if it were admitted, would not be so disgraceful to the church as the conduct of several of the popes in this period.

I shall conclude this account of the popes of this period by observing, that Octavian, the son of Alberic, being made pope after the death of Agapit II in A. D. 954, changed his name to that of John XII, and was the first that did so.

---

### SECTION VIII.

#### *Of the Monks in this Period.*

**T**HE history of the monks is remarkable for periods of great relaxation of discipline, succeeded by periods of great rigour. Notwithstanding the reformations of the two Benedicts, we find, in this age of general disorder, much neglect and abuse with respect to monasteries, sometimes occasioned by the violence of foreign nations, as the Saracens, Normans and Huns, and sometimes by the depredations of Christian lords.

In consequence of sixty years civil wars, and the ravages of the Normans, the greater part of the monasteries in France were ruined, many of  
the

the monks were killed, and the rest being put to flight, led a vagabond disorderly life: Some of the houses, thus abandoned by the monks, were seized by the clergy, and others by the lay lords. In some cases even the popes authorized the appropriation of the revenues of monasteries for the use of lay persons. Adrian II required Lothaire king of Lorraine to allow his wife Thetberge the abbey which he had promised her for her royal maintenance; which, as Fleury says, was tacitly approving the abuse of giving abbeys to secular persons.

Before the reign of Alfred in England the monastic discipline was intirely neglected, owing to the frequent irruptions of the Danes, and the negligence of the English, so that no person of noble birth voluntarily became a monk; and tho' there were many monasteries in the country, they were only filled with children, who lived without any regard to the rules of the place. On this account Alfred filled his new monastery of Altenay with foreign monks, especially from France.

The reformation of monastic discipline in France was undertaken by William duke of Aquitain and Berry. He founded the monastery of Clugni in A. D. 910, and subjected it to the rules of Benedict, making the first abbot, Bernon, a person of a noble family in Burgundy, who was assisted by Hugo from the monastery of Autun. At first Bernon

had no more than twelve monks, after the example of Benedict.

Bernon dying in A. D. 926, left the abbey of Clugni to his disciple Odo, the son of Abbon, a nobleman of great piety, who had distinguished himself by his austerities, and his application to learning in the monastery of St. Martin at Tours. Odo was forty years old when he was made abbot of Clugni, and from that time it began to be distinguished from all other monasteries by the exact observance of the rules, the emulation of virtue among the monks, the study of religion, and charity to the poor. Odo was employed to reform many other monasteries in France and Italy, being himself appointed abbot of them all, and making other persons his vicars. In his time the monastery of Clugni received so many donations, that it had an hundred and eighty-eight charters.

In the time of Odo the monastic discipline was restored in Belgic Gaul by Gerard of Brogne, descended of a noble family near Namur. He reformed more than eighteen monasteries; but before he died he appointed abbots in all the other monasteries, and confined himself to that of Brogne.

Another distinguished monk in this period was John, born at Vendieres between Metz and Toul, and afterwards abbot of Gorze, which had been ruined by the Normans; but at first he was only  
assistant

assistant to the abbot Einold in A. D. 923. Besides giving great attention to the secular concerns of the abbey, he was assiduous in his application to literature.

The great restorer of the monkish discipline in England was Dunstan. He was of a noble family, and was educated at Glastonbury, where at that time some Irishmen taught, but there were no monks, the kings having seized the domains. On the death of his parents, Dunstan gave his estate to the monastery, and he reformed five monasteries in other places. He was himself abbot of Glastonbury, which he built in a magnificent manner, and it became so much distinguished for learning and piety, that a great number of bishops and abbots were taken from it. Dunstan was afterwards bishop of Worcester, then of Canterbury, and legate of the holy see. He was the restorer of letters as well as of monastic discipline. With his conduct as a politician, I have no occasion to meddle.

In this period, as well as in the preceding, we find some, tho' not so many, examples of persons in high stations retiring to monasteries. Two sisters of William duke of Aquitain, being determined, according to the language of these times, to devote their virginity to God, begged of him to present them in form in the new church which he was

building as an oblation; which, says Fleury, is the first example of adult persons being presented by others. They formed a little convent themselves.

The same duke William, when in the highest favour with Charlemagne, and with every thing prosperous about him, devoted himself with peculiar solemnity to a monkish life at Gellene, and submitted to all the austerities of it. It is said that he made an hundred genuflexions every day before the altar, often plunged in the coldest water by way of purification before prayer; and to prepare himself for communion he sometimes used flagellation, administered in a private chamber by a confidential friend, in memory of our Saviour's passion. He lived this life seven years, dying in A. D. 812. The monastery of Gellene was from him called *St. William of the desert*.

The emperor Lothaire took the monastic habit before he died in A. D. 853, and so did Alphon- sus IV king of Spain in A. D. 933.

It was not uncommon in this period to unite the two characters of bishop and monk. Rembert who succeeded Anscaire in the bishopricks of Ham- burgh and Bremen, went after his consecration to the monastery of new Corbie, where he took the habit, and promised to observe the rules of Bene- dict, as much as his pastoral functions would per- mit;

mit; and for twenty-three years which he lived afterwards, he conformed to that strict discipline, as much as if he had lived in a cloister. This, however, would not have been permitted in the East; for at a council held at Constantinople in A. D. 880, it was ordered that a bishop becoming a monk ceased to be a bishop.

Mention was made in the preceding period of the institution of *canons* in cathedral churches by Chrodogand bishop of Metz. In A. D. 816 a council was held at Aix la Chapelle, to make regulations for them, and the rules then agreed upon served for many ages to distinguish canons from the rest of the clergy. Among other things it was then ordered that the bishop should establish an hospital to receive the poor, with a sufficient revenue out of the funds of the church. To it the canons were to give the tythe of their income, even of the oblations; and one of them was to be the governor of it for the temporalities. At Christmas at least the canons were to wash the feet of the poor, for which reason the hospital was to be so situated, that they might have easy access to it. This, Fleury thinks, is the first certain origin of hospitals founded in cathedral churches, and superintended by the canons. At the same time rules were laid down for *canonesses*, which much resembled those of the nuns. They were allowed

to have property, and even servants; but they were to eat in the same refectory, and sleep in the same dormitory.

In this period we meet with a new variety in the monkish institutions, viz. that of *recluses* in monasteries and nunneries. These were persons who shut themselves up in particular cells annexed to monasteries, after making a vow never to go out of them. No person, however, was permitted to take this vow, but after sufficient trial, and with the permission of the bishop, or abbot, to which the monastery belonged. After obtaining this leave, the candidates passed a year of trial in the monastery; and in this time did not, on any pretense, go out of it. This term being expired, they took the vow of permanence in the church, in the presence of the bishop, and after the recluse had entered his cell, the bishop put his seal upon the door.

These recluses had within their cells every thing that was necessary for them. If they were priests, they had oratories consecrated by the bishop. The cells had windows looking into the church, thro' which the recluse could give his offering for the masses, hear the singing, join in it, and answer to those who spoke to him; but this window had curtains within and without, so that the recluse could neither see, nor be seen. He had, however,

ever, a garden in which he could take the air and work. He had also a bath in his cell, which he could make use of whenever he thought proper; and this was thought to be necessary before communion. The recluses were allowed to take what was voluntarily offered them, either for their own occasions, or to give to the poor. If they were sick, the door of the cell might be opened for any person to administer to their relief; but they were not allowed to go out themselves on any pretence whatever. Adjoining to these cells were others appropriated to the disciples of the recluses, with windows, by means of which they could either minister to them, or receive their instructions. Sometimes there were two or three cells of recluses together, with such windows of communication.

A priest of the name of Grimlaic, probably the person of that name who was favoured by pope Formosus, drew up rules for these recluses. Complaining of the disorders of the times, he laments the languor of these recluses. Their first concern, he says, was to inquire whether they would have every thing necessary for their subsistence. He particularly recommends to them bodily labour.

Nothing of any consequence occurs in this period relating to the monks in the East. But we cannot doubt but that, from similar causes, there were similar complaints. Theodore Studita;

in an address to the nuns, advises them not to lead the insipid and relaxed lives of the generality of their profession, who were nuns only in appearance.

We still read of *Stilites*, or persons who passed all their time on pillars in the open air, in this part of the world, tho' not in the West. A person who was examined on the subject of the patriarch Ignatius, at the council in Constantinople in A. D. 870, mentioned his having made his confession to one of these stilites. We also read of another, on whom St. Luke junr. attended in the middle of the tenth century.

---

## SECTION IX.

### *Of the Superstitions of this Period.*

AS this was an age of great ignorance, we are not surprized that it abounded with *superstition*, to the injury of morality. on which it always encroaches. It appears by the decrees of the council of Chalons in A. D. 813, that some persons committed sins with a view to efface them by alms.

At the council of Arles in A. D. 813, it was ordered that the priests should keep the chrism under a seal, and not give it to any person as a medicine,

dicine, or on any other pretext whatever. For many persons imagined that criminals who were either anointed with it, or who swallowed it, could not be discovered.

By pilgrimages it was thought that persons obtained pardon for sins past, and also to come. The most celebrated pilgrimages at this time were those to Rome, and to St. Martin at Tours.

A notion still more dangerous to morality, and yet very popular, prevailed at this time, viz. that the precepts of the gospel were only designed for the monks, and the clergy. This was noticed, and condemned at a council held at Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 816.

Many of the first converts to Christianity among the Danes did not chuse to be baptized till near the time of their death, that they might go out of the world intirely pure. This has been observed to have obtained very much about the time of Constantine, who was himself influenced by it; but we do not read of it from that time to the present. In order to die with greater safety, many persons in this age put on the monastic habit before they expired. When the emperor Lewis died in A. D. 840, a piece of the true cross was laid on his breast. Indeed, it was natural to suppose that a relick would have as much virtue as the dress of a monk.

We

We cannot wonder that, in this age, many persons should be desirous of being buried in churches; but as dead bodies in general were thought to defile consecrated places, it was ordered in a council at Meaux in A. D. 849, that no person should be buried in churches, but those whom the bishop should think worthy of it, on account of their sanctity.

In A. D. 827 there were several famous translations of relicks; and many applications were made to Rome for them. Among others, particular application was made to the pope in A. D. 827 for the relicks of St. Sebastian for a monastery in France. The request was with some difficulty granted; but it was said that at the same time the persons who had the charge of those relicks, got possession in a clandestine manner of those of St. Gregory. Notwithstanding this, the people of Rome pretend to have them both; so that, as Fleury says, the Romans either deceived the Franks, or gave them only part of the relicks. Nothing, says this writer, shews in a stronger light the devotion that was at this time paid to relicks, and how eagerly they were desired, than the history of the translation of some relicks by Eginhart the secretary of Charlemagne, which he gives at full length, with all the miracles that were said to accompany the translation of them. No  
pains

pains or expence were spared in order to procure them, and some of the most enlightened persons of the age laid the greatest stress upon them. He acknowledges that much artifice was used in getting possession of relicks, persons stealing them from one another. With his usual good sense, he adds, "It was perhaps the same spirit which led to the composition of so many histories of martyrs, and other saints, either to adorn and amplify old ones, or to invent new ones, in order to have legends for the festivals of saints newly translated."

It appears by the writings of Valafred Strabo, in the middle of the ninth century, that it was the custom to bless a lamb brought near to the altar, in order to eat it on Easter day before any other victuals. The form of this benediction is at the end of the Roman missal. It is condemned by this Strabo as a remains of Jewish superstition.

At the coronation of Charles king of Lorrain, on the death of Lothaire in A. D. 869, Hincmar, who consecrated him, mentioned for the first time that appears, the *holy oil* that was said to have come down from heaven, with which he said that Clôvis had been anointed.

The same ideas which among other mortifications led to an entire abstinence from marriage, led to restrictions in the number of marriages. By

many second marriages were condemned, but third and fourth marriages were held in great abhorrence. These ideas, however, were more prevalent in the East than in the West. Leo, surnamed *the philosopher*, having married a fourth wife, Zoe, the child he had by her, could not be baptized by the patriarch till he had promised to send her away. Zoe being after this received into the palace, all the people were scandalized at it, and the emperor engaged to have the validity of the marriage examined in a general council. Accordingly legates were sent to Constantinople in A. D. 905 from all the patriarchal sees, and the marriage was confirmed, but only by dispensation, that this case might not be drawn into a precedent. The patriarch, opposing the whole proceeding, was sent out of the way.

The West, however, was by no means free from superstition with respect to the commerce of the sexes. Hermentrude, wife of Charles king of Bretagne, having lost some children, and others having become monks, the king requested the bishops assembled in council in A. D. 866 to give her their benediction, that she might have other children useful to the church and the state. Accordingly, she was crowned by them, and that oration was pronounced over her which is at the end of the mass of marriage.

Ideas of some impurity attending the most lawful commerce of the sexes were universal. Pope Nicolas giving instructions to the king of Bulgaria, who was lately become a Christian, directs that men abstain from any commerce with their wives in lent, on sundays, and as long as they gave suck.

In one respect we perceive the decrease of superstition in this period. Charlemagne had ordered that if there should be any difference among his sons about the limits of their kingdoms, it should be decided by the judgment of the cross, without having recourse to arms. But the emperor Lewis forbad the trial by the cross. And Agobard bishop of Lyons wrote against all appeals to God by ordeals or duel.

---



---

### SECTION X.

*Of the disorderly State of this Period.*

**T**HE civil state of the world is no proper part of ecclesiastical history, and therefore I shall not dwell upon it, but the disorders of this period are so prominent a feature of it, that they cannot be passed without notice. Besides, they had a great connection with the affairs of the

church. In no period whatever does it appear that the inhabitants of the antient Western Roman empire suffered more, partly from the invasions of foreign nations, and partly from violences committed among themselves. The invasions of the Saracens, the Normans, the Danes, and the Huns, were almost constant, and most dreadful.

The Saracens, besides keeping possession of the greater part of Spain, and being generally at war with the Christian princes of it, frequently invaded other countries, especially the coasts of Italy, on which they had for some time considerable establishments. In A. D. 884 they destroyed the monastery of Mount Cassin, and often threatened Rome itself. In A. D. 846 they plundered the Vatican, which was then contiguous to the city, and is now a part of it, and carried away much wealth. *Sueur.* Wherever they came, the churches and monasteries were a constant object of plunder. They were a rich and an easy prey.

The Normans committed still greater ravages, not only in the North of France, where they at length obtained a permanent settlement, but even in the South. They even infested the coasts of Italy, and in A. D. 859 took Pifa and other cities. These ravages, in which the total destruction of churches and monasteries, was most dreadful, continued seventy years, when they settled in the province

vince since called *Normandy*, and their duke Rollo making peace with Charles surnamed *the Simple*, embraced Christianity in A. D. 912. Being baptized himself, he ordered all his counts, knights, and his whole army, to be baptized. Rollo's becoming a Christian was one article in the treaty. In this manner was Christianity propagated in those times.

In A. D. 900 the Huns made an irruption into Italy, and among other ravages destroyed the monasteries of Nonantula, in the territory of Modena. In A. D. 924, being invited by Berenger, they again entered Italy, when they ravaged Lombardy, took Pavia, and burned forty-three churches.

But, upon the whole, it seems probable that France in particular suffered as much from the want of an efficient government, and a due subordination among the different members of the state. For all the great lords or landholders, were independent of one another, and almost so upon the king; so that they were frequently at war with one another. Consequently travelling was very hazardous, and all that the kings or the bishops could do to restrain these disorders had little effect. In those times, there being no regular administration of justice, the lords were obliged to do themselves justice by force of arms. Gerault count of Aurillac, who for his piety and application to li-

terature obtained the title of faint, was obliged to do the same, acting the part of those who were afterwards stiled *knights errant*, who fought to redress public wrongs. His historian said, that he used as much moderation as he possibly could, avoiding the shedding of blood, and treating his prisoners with generosity.

In a council, or parliament, held by Charles the Bald in A. D. 862, many directions were given to restrain the disorders of the times; but Fleury says they were so little observed, that they rather served to shew the greatness of the evil, than to remedy it. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 888, great complaints were made of the distress of the times, of the destruction of churches and monasteries, of the murder of priests and monks, of whole troops of persons who lived by plunder, and of schismatics, who made no account of murder and rapine, and would not submit to any penance.

Hincmar, in an address to king Charles, complains of all kinds of crimes being committed with impunity by the lords, and as they generally went out of the church before the communion, he prepared an address to be read to them in all the churches of his diocese before that time. Among other complaints, he says that, after getting from the churches all the provisions they could consume, they demanded money, and if it was not granted,  
they

they committed greater waste. Even the clergy who attended the court suffered their domestics to commit these disorders, to maintain their horses and servants, and to abuse the women they met with. Hubert, brother of queen Thetberge, who had been in holy orders, giving himself up to debauchery, committed many violences. He seized on the monastery of St. Maurice in Valois, and employed the revenues of it in the maintenance of his women, dogs, and hawks. He also entered with an armed force into the monastery of Luxieu, and there lived some days with his women. John VIII having complained of the injuries he had received from Lambert duke of Spoleto at the council of Troyes in A. D. 878, all the bishops said, "We wish to know how to act ourselves, for all our churches are plundered."

Even the persons of the clergy were not spared in the violence of these times. Fulk archbishop of Rheims having a quarrel with Baldwin count of Flanders, the vassals of the count met the archbishop as he was going to the king in A. D. 900, and murdered him. Three of the vassals of Baldwin were solemnly excommunicated on this occasion, and the bishops, in pronouncing the curses, threw lamps from their hands, and extinguished them; which Fleury says is the first example that

he had met with of such a mode of excommunication.

The election of a new pope was at this time, and has in some degree continued ever since, to be a season of disorder in Rome. When Stephen was elected pope in A. D. 885, the sacristy was plundered, so that there were hardly vessels enough left for the solemn festivals. Every thing else was completely gone, and little left in the treasury of the church. In a council held by John IX, complaint was made that, on the death of a pope, it was grown into a custom to plunder the patriarchal palace, that the plunder extended thro' the city of Rome, and the suburbs, and that all pontifical houses were treated in the same manner on the death of a bishop.

The great wealth of churches and monasteries, which were of little apparent use in a civil respect, furnished an excuse to the laity for seizing upon them. When an inquiry was made by the emperor Lewis, in an assembly held at Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 828, into the causes of the disorders of the times, and the bishops complained of the seizing of their temporalities, the lords replied, that the state was so much weakened by donations to the church, that without its assistance it could not be supported. However, from a letter of the bishops of France to king Lewis in A. D. 858, said

to be written by Hincmar, it appears that the rich bishopricks were given to freemen to strengthen the militia of the kingdom, and thereby to procure a defence for the church. This, says Fleury, was the origin of fiefs dependant upon churches.

In the second council of Aix, in A. D. 836, the clergy strongly remonstrated against the conduct of king Pepin, in usurping the goods of the church, on the pretence that there was no harm in making use of them in case of necessity; that neither God nor the saints wanted them, that every thing is God's, and he has made them for the use of man. They shewed him, however, that God accepts the offerings of men, and that he has given them to his servants the priests. In consequence of this remonstrance, orders were given at this time for the restitution of all usurpations.

The popes themselves were sometimes guilty of these violences. When the emperor Lothaire was at Rome in A. D. 824, the abbot of Farfa complained to him that, to the prejudice of his monastery, the pope had imposed a tribute upon it, and had taken away some lands by violence. The complaint appearing to be just, restitution was ordered to be made.

Such disorders as those mentioned in this section were as common in Bretagne as in France

properly so called, and as common in England, as in any other country.

---

## SECTION XI.

### *Miscellaneous Articles.*

I SHALL begin this section with the notice of such articles as relate the ordinances of the church, and public worship.

1. It appears from the treatises on baptism, written at the requisition of Charlemagne, that the administration of the Lord's supper immediately followed the baptism of infants. At a council in England in A. D. 817, it was ordered that baptism should not be administered by affusion, but by dipping the whole body of the child three times.

2. At a council of Mayence in A. D. 813, it was ordered that no priest should say mass alone; for that otherwise he could not say *the Lord be with us*. Solitary masses were also forbidden at the council of Paris in A. D. 829.

3. The recital of the Nicene creed in the public worship became more common after the condemnation of Felix of Urgel.

4. Pope John VIII, writing to the Moravians, ordered them to recite the mass in Latin or  
Greek,

Greek, and not, as he had heard they did, in the Sclavonian tongue, tho' they might preach in that language. "All the world," he says, "recites the mass in Latin, or Greek," not knowing, as Fleury observes, that the Syrians, Egyptians, and Armenians, all recited the office in their own tongues. Afterwards, being probably convinced by the remonstrances of Methodius, who went from thence to Rome, he made no objection to the whole service being performed in Sclavonic. Still, however, he recommended the reading of the gospels in Latin first.

5. At the council of Paris in A. D. 829, great complaint was made of the priests, who thro' ignorance prescribed penance from books called *Penitentials*, which were of no authority, and which were ordered to be collected; and burned. By this means very light penances had been appointed for great crimes. Halitgarius, bishop of Arras and Cambray, who assisted at this council, was requested to compose a treatise from the Fathers, and the canons of the church, to serve instead of those Penitentials. He undertook it, and called his book *A remedy for sins*. Before this period there was no penance but what was in public, for offences known to the world; but now another kind of penance was introduced for secret sins. *Sueur*, A. D. 813.

6. It

6. It was not till the council of Lateran under Innocent III that *auricular confession* was made necessary; but in the ninth century private penance enjoined by the priest was pretty common. *Bingham*, Vol. 2. p. 22.

7. About A. D. 890 the council of Nante ordered the presbyters to keep some part of the oblations of the people till after the service, that such as were not prepared to communicate might on every festival, and on the Lord's day, receive some of this bread (called *eulogia*) when blessed in a proper manner. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 770.

8. In A. D. 835 Gregory IV dedicated the Pantheon (which had before been dedicated to the virgin Mary and the martyrs) to all the saints. He also instituted the festival of *All Saints*. He wrote to the emperor Lewis on the occasion, and he, with the consent of the bishops of France, ordered it to be celebrated the first of November thro' all his dominions, according to the direction of the pope. *Sueur*.

9. Hereditary sepulchres in churches were not allowed in the ninth century, but were introduced by the papal decretals. For a decree of Leo III was inserted in his decretals by Gregory IX, giving a sort of hereditary right to all persons to be buried in the sepulchres of their ancestors. *Bingham*, Vol. 2. p. 426.

10. In the acts of the council of Meaux in A. D. 845 we find a distinction made between simple excommunication, and an anathema.

11. Early in the ninth century there was a dispute between the French and Roman singers; and an appeal being made to Charlemagne, he decided in favour of the Roman, and got the pope to send him singers to teach the Roman method in France. *Williams* p. 36.

In the tenth century Dunstan was the patron of science and the arts in England, and among the rest of music, in which he was a proficient. It is said that he presented the abbey of Malmesbury with an organ, perhaps the first that was seen in England, and that he cast two of the bells of Abingdon abby with his own hands. *Williams*, p. 36.

12. The general state of literature is intimately connected with ecclesiastical history, and therefore I shall not fail to note whatever I find of importance relating to it.

It is said that Charlemagne requested his bishops to write treatises on the subject of baptism, not for his own information so much as theirs; for he was continually exciting the prelates to the study of the scriptures, the clergy in general to the observance of their discipline, the monks to regularity, the grandees to give good council, the judges to do justice, the superiors to humility, the  
inferiors

inferiors to obedience, and all to virtue and concord. This is, in the style of panegyric; but it was probably in a great measure true of that extraordinary man. But the effects of all that he did for the advancement of learning were but temporary. For at a council held in Rome in A. D. 826, thirty-eight canons were made, the object of most of which was the reformation of the clergy, whose ignorance is said to have been very great, and therefore schools were directed to be established in cathedral churches and parishes. In the reign of Charles the Bald, at the council of Langres in A. D. 859, there was great complaint made of the want of public schools, and that, in consequence of this, there hardly remained a trace of the knowledge of the scriptures. This prince, however, is praised for having in some measure restored letters, having procured learned men from all countries, and among others from Ireland. He had a school in his palace.

In England Alfred distinguished himself not only by his excellent civil institutions, but also by his zeal to promote literature. He is considered as the founder of the university of Oxford. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 113.

Literature had also been much neglected at Constantinople in several reigns preceding that of Michael in A. D. 858, when his uncle Bardas promoted

promoted the revival of it, in which he was assisted by Leo surnamed the *Philosopher*, who had been archbishop of Thessalonica, and had been deposed as an Iconoclast, and by Photius the learned patriarch of Constantinople.

13. In this period we find the first mention of *coloured glass* in the windows of churches. Pope Leo III ornamented a church in Rome with glass of this kind.

14. As a specimen of the fabulous legends which abounded in this age of ignorance and superstition, I shall relate what Hildwin abbot of St. Denis, at the request of the emperor Lewis, collected concerning St. Dionysius, from whom the monastery had its name. In this history he says the first bishop of Paris was Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted by St. Paul, and was the author of the writings then usually ascribed to him: After having for some years governed the church of Athens, he put another person in his place, and travelled to Rome, in order to see Peter and Paul; but did not arrive there till after their martyrdom under the pontificate of St. Clement, who sent him as an apostle into Gaul; with several persons to accompany him. After arriving at Arles, Dionysius went to Paris, then a royal city, and famous for the assemblies of Gauls and Germans. There he built a church, and ordained clergy,

clergy, converted a number of infidels, and wrought many miracles. The emperor Domitian, hearing of this, sent into Gaul a governor called Fescennius Sifinius, who arriving at Paris caused bishop Dionysius to be apprehended, together with the archpriest Rusticus, and the archdeacon Eleutherus, and made them suffer many torments. Dionysius was scourged, laid on a gridiron, thrown to the wild beasts, after that into a furnace, fastened to a cross, and then sent back to prison, together with many other Christians; where, as he was celebrating mass, Jesus Christ himself appeared with several angels, and gave them the eucharist with his own hands. At length these three saints were conducted to Montmartre, where their heads were cut off before the idol Mercury. Many others suffered martyrdom along with them, but the body of Dionysius got up, and took his head in his hands, being conducted by angels. Lastly, a lady named Catula had the three bodies taken out of the Seine, into which the pagans had thrown them, and buried them in a field where the church and monastery now stand. After this my readers will excuse me, if I pass over a thousand other legends similar to this in silence.

## PERIOD XVII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF OTHO IN A. D.  
936 TO THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM  
BY THE CRUSADERS IN A. D. 1099.

---

## SECTION I.

*Of the State of the Papacy in this Period.*

IN order to give a just idea of the wretched state to which the papacy was sunk in the greatest part of this period, it will be necessary to give a sketch of the history of several of the popes, and of the principal transactions of the times; but this shall be as succinct as I can well make it.

Otho king of Germany, being invited to Italy by pope John XII, to relieve him from the tyranny of Berenger king of Italy, was by him crowned emperor in A. D. 960; and in return he restored to the pope all that had been taken from the see of Rome in every part of Italy. He also promised him Sicily, if he should be able to conquer it from the Saracens; reserving, however, the

sovereignty of all the states to himself and his heirs. Afterwards the pope joined Adelbert the son of Berenger; but flying from Rome on the approach of Otho, and being accused of many crimes in a council held in A. D. 963, he was deposed, and Leo VIII chosen in his place.

John's party prevailing again, he deposed Leo, who fled to the emperor; and to satiate his revenge John ordered the right hand of another John, a cardinal deacon and a partisan of Leo, to be cut off, and also the tongue, nose, and two fingers of Azon his chief secretary. Then, in a council held in Rome, Leo was declared to be an usurper, and John, after deposing all who had been ordained by him, reordained them. John survived this council only three months. For being in company with a common prostitute without the gates of Rome, he received so violent a blow on the temples, that he died in eight days, and, as the historian says, without receiving the viaticum. He was succeeded by Benedict V. but the people of Rome, who opposed the entrance of Otho, being pressed by famine, gave up the pope; and Leo VIII, who had been deposed by John, was reinstated; and in another council Benedict was degraded and banished.

On the death of John XIII, in A. D. 972, Benedict VI was made pope, but becoming odious

bus to the Romans, he was seized by Crescēntius the son of John X, by Theodora, and confined in the castle of St. Angelo. Francon, called Boniface VII was made pope in his place, and some time after Benedict was strangled in prison. After his death Boniface was expelled, and fled to Constantinople; but returning after the death of Benedict, in A. D. 984, and his party gaining the ascendancy, they seized his successor John XIV, and confined him in the castle of St. Angelo, where he died of hunger and vermin. When he was dead, his own friends disliked him so much, that they pierced his body with lances, dragged it by the feet, and left it exposed in the open street.

Such is the complexion of the papal history in this period, mentioned with horror and disgust by all the Catholic historians; and in the same light it was viewed by pious and intelligent persons at the time. Arnold bishop of Orleans, at a council, in which the archbishop of Rheims was tried for high treason, and it was proposed to appeal to the pope, after reciting the history of the late popes, said, “ Is it then determined that so many bishops, “ distinguished by their learning and their virtue “ in all parts of the world, should be subject to “ such monsters, full of infamy, and void of know- “ ledge of things divine or human? Whom are “ we to blame that the principal church, formerly

“crowned with honour and glory, is now so debased, and loaded with infamy? The fault is ours. It is because we seek our own interests, and not those of Jesus Christ.” He then said they were to blame in not making a proper choice of popes. What,” said he, “can we think of a man fitting on a high throne, clothed in gold and purple if he be destitute of charity, and only puffed up with knowledge? It is antichrist sitting in the temple of God and shewing himself as God: but if he have neither charity nor science, he is in the temple of God as an idol, and to consult him is to consult the marble.” He therefore recommends an appeal to the bishops of the neighbouring provinces rather than to Rome, where, he says, every thing is venal, and all judgments sold by the weight of gold. He clearly proved, says Fleury, that according to antient custom, appeals should not have been made to Rome; but that he was embarrassed by the spurious decretals, which he could not distinguish. But to proceed with my sketch of the history.

John XIX was a mere layman, who got himself made pope by the force of money. At the solicitation of the emperor Basilius he would for a bribe have consented that the patriarch of Constantinople should have the title of universal bishop of the East, as he had that of the whole church, but the alarm it gave prevented his doing it. On

On the death of this John, a son of Alberic count of Tusculum, who was only twelve years of age, was made pope by the name of Benedict IX, and he continued eleven years, dishonouring the see by his infamous life. Simony then reigned at Rome, Fleury says for twenty five years. This pope making himself infamous by his rapines and murders, the Roman people were unable to bear him any longer, and expelled him from Rome A. D. 1044, making John bishop of Sabine pope, by the name of Silvester III. Benedict, however, by the help of his relations, forced his way into the city; but continuing his scandalous life, and seeing himself despised by the clergy and people, he agreed to withdraw for a sum of money. He, however, assumed the papacy the third time in A. D. 1047, and held it more than eight months, when Fleury says, being touched with repentance, he finally abdicated.

Alexander II, being chosen pope without waiting for the consent of the court of Henry IV, then a child, they made Henry bishop of Parma pope, by the name of Honorius II. He marched towards Rome with an army, but was repulsed, and was afterwards deposed by all the bishops of Germany and Italy, A. D. 1062. He was, however, supported by Godfrey duke of Lorrain and Tuscany, who had at first opposed him; but notwith-

standing this, at the council of Mantua Alexander satisfied the people of Lombardy with respect to the validity of his election, and Honorius was condemned as a simoniac. Not discouraged with this, Honorius entered Rome by surprise, and seized the church of St. Peter; but being overpowered, he took refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, where he continued two years. Escaping thence, he retired to mount Bardon near Baretto, where he continued to act as pope as long as he lived, and when excommunicated himself, he excommunicated his opponents.

But by far the most interesting part of the papal history in this period is that of Gregory VII, and his contest with the emperor Henry IV, which I shall therefore relate at some length.

This famous pope, under the name of Hildebrand, had, with great ability, activity and integrity, directed the most important affairs of the papacy under several of the preceding popes, and as far as appears, was a man of an irreproachable moral character. He was a great enemy of Simony, the prevailing complaint of the times, but he had unfortunately entertained the most extravagant ideas of the papal power, as superior to any other in the world; and acting upon them, he involved himself in inextricable difficulties, and was the occasion of  
much

much mischief, by being the occasion of a civil war in Germany and Italy.

Henry IV too much resembled other princes of this time, being equally deffolute and rapacious; and tho' he was induced to make some mean submissions, he was a prince of great courage and resolution, and in more favourable circumstances might have appeared to considerable advantage.

The first occasion of this prince's unfortunate contest with the church was his desire to get rid of his queen Bertha. Alleging for an excuse, that he had not been able to consummate his marriage with her, he applied to the bishops for a divorce, and they applying to the pope, he sent St. Damien with his orders, expressing his strong disapprobation of the proposal, and declaring that he would not give him the imperial crown if he betrayed the cause of religion in so shameful a manner. The lords approving of the pope's sentence, the king was obliged to comply, and keep his wife, tho' he never lived with her as such.

Another offence of this king was his sale of church livings. He encouraged the archbishop of Mayence in exacting the tithes of Thuringia, promising him his assistance, on condition that he should share them with him. The archbishop consented, and at the council of Erford, all the bishops had been gained to give their consent;

and by the king's management no appeal was made to the pope on the subject. Being, however, accused of selling his church livings, the pope excommunicated him, and moreover sent legates into Germany to preside at a council which was to be held on the subject. This the bishops opposed; saying, that their own metropolitan should preside, unless the pope was present in person. And Fleury says the presiding of the popes' legates in councils was then a novelty. They, therefore, returned without holding the council, but they carried letters from the king, in which he expressed his entire submission to the pope, acknowledging his offences, and especially that of selling his church livings. This, however, did not satisfy the haughty prelate. For when Henry was celebrating the festival of christmas at Goslar in A. D. 1075, he sent a legate to order him to attend at Rome, the second week in lent, to defend himself against several things that were laid to his charge; threatening that, otherwise, he would again excommunicate him. This was more than a young and high spirited prince could bear. Being exceedingly provoked at this conduct, he appointed a meeting of the bishops and abbots of his kingdom at Worms, the 23d of January, with a view to consult about deposing the pope.

To this Henry might be encouraged by the appearance of other enemies to the pope. Cencius, the prefect of Rome; a man abandoned to all wickedness, having been often reproved by Gregory without any effect, was at length excommunicated. On this he went to consult with Robert Guiscard, and others, in the same state of excommunication, to concert measures for seizing the pope; and at christmas in A. D. 1075 Cencius did seize the pope as he was performing mass. He was even dragged by the hair, and received a dangerous wound in the forehead, from a man who intended to have killed him. The people, however, rising in favour of the pope, Cencius retired to a castle which he had built in the city; and asking the pope's pardon, was admitted to penance, but lest he should be taken, he fled.

About the same time Guibert archbishop of Ravenna concerted with the archbishop of Milan, and other bishops of Lombardy, which was subject to the king, and in a state of revolt, and they employed cardinal Hugh, surnamed *the White*, who had been deposed by the pope for his disorderly conduct, to excite Robert Guiscard and king Henry against the pope, both sufficiently disposed to it.

Surrounded by so many enemies, the pope seems to have been desirous of accommodating mat-

ters with the king. He wrote to him to expostulate with him on his conduct, and without any acrimony. It was, however, without effect. For Henry persisting in his purpose, did not fail to go to Worms at the time appointed, and there he was met by a great number of bishops and abbots, together with cardinal Hugh. There the king recited an account which he had drawn up of the life, education, and behaviour of the pope, calculated to excite the indignation of his audience. To encourage them in their opposition to him, he informed them, that he had made himself many enemies, the Normans, the neighbouring counts, and many of the people of Rome. After some opposition from Adalberon bishop of Virsburgh, and Herman bishop of Metz, on account of the person accused being absent, it was unanimously determined that Hildebrand was no proper pope, and that he had not the power of binding or loosing.

The bishops of Lombardy also, and those in the march of Ancona, assembled at Pavia, and all signed the condemnation of the pope, swearing on the evangelists that they would no more acknowledge him as such, and they sent deputies who took the same oath of others. It does not appear, however, that either at Worms or Pavia, any specific charge was brought against the pope. Henry's speech was only general invective, except that he  
said

said that there was some irregularity in his election; but whatever it was, it had been confirmed and sanctioned by himself.

Henry also wrote to the clergy and people of Rome, advising them of what had been done, charging Gregory with enmity to himself, and as having declared that he would either die or deprive him of his kingdom, and even of his life, and desiring them to chuse another pope. He likewise wrote to the pope himself, reproaching him with the contempt with which he had treated the bishops, and saying that he held his kingdom not of the pope, but of God only, and that he could not be deposed unless he abandoned the faith; so, at least, says Fleury, the bishops who composed the letter, said for him.

Roland, a clergyman of Parma, was the bearer of this letter, and of another from the council, and they were delivered at the opening of Gregory's council in Rome the first week in Lent. Such, however, was the indignation of those who attended that council, that it was not without difficulty, and by means of the interposition of Gregory himself, that Roland escaped with his life. Had this pope always spoken and acted as he did on this occasion, he would have been great indeed. When Roland was safe, he addressed the council with moderation and dignity, becoming a christian bishop.

“ These

“ These,” said he, “ are the *perilous times*, which  
 “ the scriptures say should come. Offences will  
 “ come, and we must be as sheep among wolves.  
 “ Let us then, without hating any person, bear  
 “ with these madmen who violate the laws of God.  
 “ I have in my hand a sign of the victory which  
 “ God will give to his church ;” and with this he  
 exhibited an egg, or something in the form of an  
 egg, which had been found in the church of St.  
 Peter, round which he said a serpent, armed with  
 a sword and helmet, was seen endeavouring to get  
 to the top, but was not able to do it. “ We must  
 “ now” he said, “ employ the sword of the word,  
 “ to bruise the head of the serpent, and avenge the  
 church.” All present applauded the speech of  
 the pope, declared that they were ready to die  
 in so good a cause, and concluded with saying,  
 that Henry should be deprived of his royal digni-  
 ty, and anathematized, together with his abettors.

The day following the pope pronounced a-  
 gainst the king a solemn sentence of deposition, in  
 the form of an address to the apostle Peter, as  
 head of the church. “ I forbid,” he said “ Henry  
 “ son of the emperor Henry, who by unheard of  
 “ pride has raised himself against your church, to  
 “ govern the kingdoms of Germany and Italy. I  
 “ absolve the christians from the oath they have  
 “ taken or shall take to him, and I forbid any per-  
 “ son

“son to serve him as king. For he who will attack the authority of your church, deserves to lose the dignity with which he is invested.” He also pronounced excommunications against the bishops of Germany in general, and those who had distinguished themselves the most in this opposition to him by name. He treated in the same manner the bishops of Lombardy. After this, Gregory addressed a letter to all the faithful, imploring their assistance in the defence of the church. “If,” says he, “you believe that St. Peter has received from Christ the keys of the kingdom of heaven, you are not worthy to partake of his glory in heaven, if you do not take part of his sufferings below.”

In the mean time Guibert archbishop of Ravenna, some time after Easter assembled the bishops of Lombardy; when they again excommunicated the pope. But the lords were divided on the subject, thinking that the pope could not be judged by any person. Many persons in Germany and Italy said the same with respect to the king. But, in answer to this, Gregory, in a letter to Herman bishop of Metz, who had returned to his obedience after having taken part with Henry, said, “Perhaps it will be said that when Christ bad Peter feed his sheep, he excepted kings; but in giving him the power of binding and loosing, it is plain that he excepted no person; and if the holy  
“see

“ see has received from God the power of judging  
 “ in spiritual things, why shall she not also judge  
 “ in things temporal. Perhaps it will be said that  
 “ the royal dignity is above the episcopal, but the  
 “ difference may be seen in the origin of both.  
 “ The former was the invention of human pride,  
 “ whereas the latter is an institution of divine good-  
 “ nefs; and therefore St. Ambrose says, that the  
 “ episcopacy is superior to royalty, as much as  
 “ gold is superior to lead, and the emperor Con-  
 “ stantine took the last place among the bishops.”

This letter is dated August 24, A. D 1076. In  
 it, says Fleury, we see the foundation of a doctrine  
 unheard of before, viz. that the pope has a right to  
 depose sovereigns. At the same time he addressed  
 a long letter to the bishops and the people of Ger-  
 many, vindicating his conduct towards the king,  
 from his total disregard of his repeated admoniti-  
 ons; taking it for granted that what he had done  
 in consequence of it was right. In another letter  
 he urges them to chuse another king, if Henry  
 did not submit to the authority of the church; but  
 in this case he said that he must be consulted, as  
 well as Agnes the king's mother.

In this state of things many deserted the part of  
 the king, even some of those who joined in the ex-  
 communication of the pope; and confessing their  
 fault they were received into favour; while others  
 urged

urged the king to take his revenge for the insult. But at this juncture, the formidable state of the king's enemies made this very hazardous. At the head of them were Rudolph duke of Suabia, Guelf duke of Bavaria, Adalberon bishop of Virsburgh, Adalbert bishop of Worms, and many others; who having met at Ulm, appointed another meeting at Tribur near Mayence, when all who wished well to the state should consider of the remedies to be applied for the disorders of it. Accordingly, the lords of Suabia and Saxony met there in great numbers, when they determined to depose Henry and elect another king. There were also two legates from the pope at this meeting; one of whom, Altman of Passau, having been expelled by the king, went to the pope, and having formally renounced his bishoprick, on a pretended scruple for having received the investiture at the hands of a layman, had been reinstated by the pope.

Henry, who was not far from the place of this meeting, being greatly alarmed at their proceedings, sent so them to make many concessions, even to abandon the government, and to retain only the outward badge of royalty; but even this was not deemed sufficient. They proposed to refer his sentence to the pope, who was to be at Augsburgh at the festival of the purification of the virgin Mary; and declared that, if he was not absolved from his

excom-

"eyes"  
"gold"  
"flam"

The

it, says  
unheard  
depose  
a long  
many,  
from his  
ons; tak  
in conse  
he urges  
did not  
in this  
well as

In this

the king,  
communication  
fault they

that if the pope would absolve him from his excom-  
 munication, he would afterward justify his con-  
 duct before him at Augsburgh. After some diffi-  
 culties the pope consented, but not without exact-  
 ing the most humiliating terms, and treating him  
 with the greatest indignity. For the king on  
 the 20th of Canossa left all his state behind him,  
 and without any marks of his dignity waited three  
 days exposed, and the first without eating any  
 thing being admitted on the fourth day to  
 the presence of this haughty prelate, he was ab-  
 solved on condition that he should justify his  
 proceedings in the general diet of Germany, when  
 he should be called to account till that time  
 he was to remain in prison, and if he  
 should not appear, he should be declared  
 excommunicate, and his lands  
 forfeited.

excommunication within a year and a day they should consider themselves as no longer bound by the allegiance they had sworn to him. To these hard conditions, the king, seeing no remedy, consented.

Alarmed at this opposition, and determined if possible, to get the excommunication taken off before the time fixed for it was expired, Henry undertook a journey to Italy, tho' it was in the midst of winter, accompanied by his wife and his son yet an infant. Being arrived in Lombardy, where the people were irritated against the pope, he was soon surrounded by a considerable army, hoping that he would depose the pope. He himself, however, saw the necessity he was under, on account of the state of things in Germany, to persist in his purpose, and therefore proceeded to meet the pope, who was then on his way to Augsburgh, accompanied by Matilda countess of Tuscany, a widow of great power and wealth, and much attached to his interests. Gregory, surprized to find that the king was in Italy, went to the castle of Canossa in Lombardy, which belonged to Matilda. There he was met by many bishops and other persons from Germany, who made their submission to him, and doing penance, were received into favour.

By the intervention of the countess, and other persons to whom the king applied, he promised.  
that

that if the pope would absolve him from his excommunication, he would afterwards justify his conduct before him at Augsburgh. After some difficulty the pope consented, but not without exacting the most humiliating terms, and treating him with the greatest indignity. For the king on coming to Canossa left all his suite behind him, and without any marks of his dignity waited three days barefooted, and the first without eating any thing. Being admitted on the fourth day to the presence of this haughty prelate, he was absolved, on condition that he should justify his conduct at the general diet of Germany, when the pope was to be his judge; till that time he should wear no badge of royalty, and if he should be acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge, he should ever after live in obedience to the pope.

This passed the 28th of January A. D. 1077. After this, the pope administered the communion, and declaring his own innocence of the things of which he had been accused, he took a part of the consecrated wafer, and presenting the other part to the king, he desired him to take it, if he also was conscious of his innocence. The king, not prepared for this, hesitated; but recollecting himself, he said that no justification would be of any avail to him, except in the presence of his friends,

and his accusers; and the pope gave him the communion in the common form.

The king's friends in Lombardy, hearing of this transaction, were exceedingly provoked both at him and the pope, and were determined to reject them both. In order to pacify them, after in vain pleading the necessity of his affairs, he within a fortnight openly broke the agreement he had made with the pope, and was soon able to raise a considerable army.

In the mean time the king's enemies met at Forshheim, and on the 15th of March A. D. 1077 elected Rodolf duke of Suabia king; but on his declaring himself an enemy to simony, such a tumult was raised against him on the very day of his coronation, that an hundred persons were killed in the fray. Tho' the pope's legates were present at this election, and concurred in it, he, no doubt considering the power of Henry, did not think proper to declare his approbation of it; but said that, if the archbishops and bishops who had consecrated him did not give a good account of their conduct, they should be deposed from their dignities, and Rodolf from the kingdom. In another letter he said that obedience should be rendered to him of the two who should obey the orders of his legates.

The friends of Rodolf, quite dispirited at this unexpected timid conduct of the pope, wrote him an expostulatory letter on the subject. In it, they say, they believed his intentions to have been good, but that they could not penetrate into his views. They saw, however, the fatal effects of what he had done, in the civil war that must be the consequence of it, in innumerable homicides, plundering, and burnings; for that, in these circumstances, they could only live by rapine, and no property, civil or ecclesiastical, would be spared; in short there would be an abolition of all laws, human and divine. These evils, they add, would not have existed, if he had acted steadily; neither turning to the right hand nor to the left; that his zeal had drawn them into a difficulty, in which it was hazardous to advance, and shameful to recede.

Henry, taking advantage of the consternation of his enemies, endeavoured to seize both the pope and Matilda. But they escaped to one of her fortresses in a mountain, and in this recess she made to the see of Rome a donation in writing of all her estates, comprehending Tuscany, and a great part of Lombardy. \* In May the pope returned

Z 2

to

\* This donation of Matilda was disputed by the emperors; but the popes still enjoy a part of it. *Mosheim*; Vol. 2. p. 281.

to Rome, where he was received with great joy, and at a council held there in A. D. 1078, it was determined to send legates to Germany, to decide between the two competitors to the throne, threatening excommunication to any person, king, bishop, or others, who should oppose this commission. The pope added these remarkable words, "We bind him by the apostolical authority, not only as to the spirit, but as to the body. We take from him all prosperity in this life, and victory from his arms." At another council held at Rome in November, deputies from both the kings attended, each swearing for his master, that they would not hinder the conferences which the legates of the holy see should hold in Germany. At the same council the receiving investiture of church livings from the king, or any layman, was prohibited.

In A. D. 1080 Henry was defeated by Rodolf; and Gregory hearing of it, held a council at Rome, in which he excommunicated Henry and all his abettors; taking from him, he said, the kingdom of Germany and Italy, so that he shall have no force in battle, and never gain any victory. He then gave the kingdom of Germany to Rodolf and absolution to all his adherents, with the benediction of the apostles, both in this life and the other. All this was done, as before, in the form of an address

address to the apostles Peter and Paul, to whom he says, " Let all the world know, that if you  
" have power to bind and loose in heaven, you  
" can now on earth give or take away empires,  
" kingdoms, principalities, dukedoms, marquifates,  
" and counties, and the goods of all men, accord-  
" ing to their merits. For you have often taken  
" from unworthy persons, and given to the good,  
" patriarchates, primacies, archbishopsricks, and  
" bishopsricks. For if you judge things spiritual,  
" who can believe that you do not judge things  
" temporal. Let the kings and princes of the age  
" then learn what is your greatness and power,  
" that they may dread to despise the orders of  
" your church; and let your justice be so speedily  
" exercised upon Henry, that all may know it  
" does not come by chance, but by [your pow-  
" er." This act is dated March 7. A. D. 1080.

When Henry heard of this excommunication, nineteen bishops of his party assembled at Mayence on the last of May, and in consequence of their letters thirty bishops and many lords of Italy and Germany met at Brixen in Tyrol, where they pronounced the deposition of Gregory and elected Guibert archbishop of Ravenna, who took the name of Clement III, tho' there was no person present to represent the proper church of Rome but cardinal Hugh.

To strengthen himself against Henry, Gregory applied to the Norman princes, William king of England, and Robert duke of Calabria; to the former of whom he wrote in a style very different from that which he used in the days of his prosperity; expressing the confidence he had in his friendship, and promising him not only an eternal recompence, but victory and power in this world. Notwithstanding his having formerly excommunicated the Norman princes of Italy, he now had a conference with them, and received them into favour, on their promising him their assistance. Thus aided, Gregory sent forth the most violent invectives against the new pope, and proposed to march against him with an army.

In October A. D. 1080, Henry was again defeated by Rodolf, but the latter was slain in the battle; and on the same day the troops of Matilda were defeated in Lombardy; so that the affairs of Henry were rather advanced than otherwise. In these circumstances Gregory, writing to his partisans in Germany, exhorted them to be very cautious in their choice of another king; and in the form of the oath which he sent them to administer to him, he was to declare himself a vassal of St. Peter, and to promise obedience and fidelity to the pope.

In March A. D. 1081 Henry, having no more

fear

fear of the Saxons, came into Italy, and was at Verona in Easter, and about the same time Gregory held a council at Rome, in which he again excommunicated Henry, and all his adherents. This however, did not prevent Henry's marching to Rome, which he did the following May; but the people opposing him, and Matilda sending assistance to Gregory, he retired to Lombardy. In the mean time the Saxons, and other enemies of Henry in Germany, made choice of Herman, lord of Luxenbourgh, to succeed Rodolf.

This, however, did not induce Henry to go to Germany, and in A. D. 1082 he went to Rome, which he besieged the whole year, but was again obliged to retreat to Lombardy. The next year Herman would have come to the relief of Gregory; but the state of his affairs would not admit of it, and Henry once more advanced to Rome. But finding that Hugh, the abbot of Clugny, who was then in Italy, and many other respectable persons, did not approve of his conduct, but considered him as an excommunicated person, he was desirous of justifying his conduct to them, and expressed his willingness to receive the imperial crown at the hands of the pope. But Gregory, tho' much urged to it by those who were weary of the war, refused to do this, till he had given satisfaction to God, and the church; and this the king would not do.

In these circumstances the pope held another council, the king giving safe conduct to those who attended it; and on this occasion the pope was persuaded to use some moderation: for he did not repeat his excommunication of Henry himself, but was content with excommunicating those who had obstructed the communication with Rome, which Henry had frequently done. Notwithstanding all the endeavours of the people of Rome to make peace, the war continued seven years, and in all the states belonging to the king there remained but few bishops faithful to the pope; being either expelled from their sees, or having retired to monasteries.

At length in March A. D. 1084, Henry forced his way into Rome, and there received the imperial crown from his pope Clement, Gregory retiring to the castle of St. Angelo, which Henry besieged. Both parties, however, kept their ground in the city, till Robert Guiscard compelled Henry to abandon it, and retire to Lombardy, which he did in May, but a great part of the city was plundered in this contest.

Gregory, being now at liberty, held another council in which he excommunicated the new pope and Henry, who now went to Germany, leaving his pope in Lombardy, where his party were defeated by the forces of Matilda, by which

it was considerably weakened. While Henry was in Germany councils were held both by his partisans, and those of Herman, in which they excommunicated one another.

In the mean time Gregory retired to Salerno, where he fell sick, and died the 25th of May, A. D. 1085. Being urged on his death bed to shew some indulgence to those whom he had excommunicated, he said that, excepting Henry himself, and the antipope, he absolved and blessed all those who believed that he had the power of doing it. His last words were, "I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." Thus died this extraordinary man, respectable for his personal qualities, but who, misled by his passions, and carrying the false maxims concerning the papal power, which had begun to prevail before his time, to their proper extent, not only involved himself in inextricable difficulties, and a great part of the Christian world in a destructive civil war, but laid the foundation for various mischiefs, which continued many centuries. For, violent as his conduct was, and inconsistent as the maxims of it were with the temporal power of princes, they were never reprobated by any of his successors, but were resumed by them whenever the circumstances of the times were favourable to them.

In all this time Clement kept possession of the church of St. Peter in Rome; but on the accession of Victor II, who was Desiderius, abbot of Mount Cassin (and who did not consent to his election till he was in a manner compelled to it) he was driven out of it. Still, however, he kept possession of a great part of the city.

On the death of Herman in A. D. 1089, the Saxons, weary of their opposition, received Henry as king; and thus ended this long civil war. In the same year the people of Rome expelled Clement, after making him take an oath that he would no longer usurp the holy see. But by this he did not appear to have thought himself bound, and he had a considerable party even in Rome two years after his expulsion, the friends of Henry being very powerful in Italy. In A. D. 1081 pope Urban II held a council at Benevento, in which he excommunicated Clement, and all his adherents.

In A. D. 1093 Conrad the son of Henry revolted against his father, and in A. D. 1094, Urban had so far got the better of Clement, that he held a council at Placentia, in the very midst of the schismatics, and was met by two hundred bishops more than four thousand ecclesiastics, and thirty thousand laymen; so that no church being able to contain so great a number, they met in the open air. In this council Proxide, the wife of Henry

Henry, made her complaints against him, in consequence of which many of his adherents abandoned him. After this council Conrad met the pope at Cremona, and waited upon him; and on his swearing allegiance to him, and renouncing the right of investiture, the pope received him as a true son of the church, and promised him his assistance to maintain him in the kingdom, and acquire the imperial dignity.

After this the pope made a progress into France, where he held the famous council of Clermont, of which an account will be given in the article of the Crusades, and on his return, being assisted by the Crusaders, the friends of Clement were driven out of the city of Rome, and held only the castle of St. Angelo. Henry was also driven out of Lombardy, and was obliged to retire into Germany.

The party of Clement was not, however, extinct. For in A. D. 1098 they held a council in Rome, he himself being then in Lombardy; and at the head of it were eight cardinals, the principal of whom was Hugh above-mentioned bishop of Preneſte. They invited the opposite party to a conference, promising to aim at nothing but the unity of the church. But the friends of Urban paid no attention to the proposal, despising the efforts of a dying party; and indeed after this we hear nothing more of it.

## SECTION II.

*Various Instances of the claims of the Popes in this Period to Ecclesiastical and Civil Power, and of the Opposition that was sometimes made to them.*

HAVING been unwilling to interrupt the account given in the preceding section of the general state of the papacy, and especially the history of Gregory VII, I have reserved for this separate section other less connected instances of the claims of the popes to power civil and ecclesiastical, and of the opposition that the more intelligent and more spirited, of the clergy or laity had the courage to make to them. I would observe, however, in this place, that the papal claims were favoured by the established opinions and maxims of the times, without which they would never have been allowed, and acquiesced in so tamely as they generally were.

On the occasion of the coronation of the emperor Henry in A. D. 1014, Glaber, in a history addressed to Odilon abbot of Clugny, says, “ It  
 “ seems reasonable, and well established, that no  
 “ prince should take the title of emperor, but he  
 “ whom the pope shall chuse for his merit, and  
 “ to

“to whom he shall give the badges of that dignity.”

The giving of kingdoms, as well as titles, did not begin with Gregory VII. Leo IV, who was a person of an exemplary life, seeing the rising power of the Normans in Italy, persuaded the emperors to endeavour to put a stop to their progress, and put himself at the head of an army for that purpose, which was the first time that any pope headed an army against christians, the emperor having before this granted to him his right to the city of Benevento, in exchange for an annual payment of an hundred marks of silver ; a white horse, which had been part of the annual allowance, being still reserved. The pope, being now at the head of an army, marched against the Normans ; but, tho' he was defeated by them, he was treated with much respect. Afterwards, both parties finding it to their interest, the Normans consented to swear fealty to the popes for their possessions in Italy, and also those in Sicily when they should conquer it. This was done to Nicolas II, in A. D. 1059. (*Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 433.) This investiture was renewed by Gregory VII. *Ib.* p. 463.

Afterwards Roger count of Sicily complaining of the appointment of the bishop of Trani as the pope's legate in Sicily, pope Urban II, finding it to be his interest to oblige him, appointed him  
and

his heirs the power of legates of the see of Rome; promising that whatever he should have to do by legates should be done by himself and his successors, (*Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 475) and that whenever he called a council, they might send what clergy they pleased to it. In virtue of this bull; the Sicilians say that their princes are born legates of the holy see; and this they call *the monarchy of Sicily*, no other country having that privilege. But the court of Rome says that, if the bull be genuine it has been revoked since. Clement XI when the kingdom of Naples came to the duke of Savoy in A. D. 1715, abolished this monarchy of Sicily, and established a new ecclesiastical hierarchy in that kingdom; but the bull had no effect. No change was made in consequence of it, and much less when the kingdom returned to the family of Austria. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 474.

Tho' the principle on which Gregory VII acted was avowed, and in some degree acted upon before his time, no other pope had recourse to it so often, or carried it so far. Of his conduct in this respect I shall give several instances, which have no relation to his contest with the emperor Henry.

Philip king of France not being willing that Landri, chosen bishop of Autun by the clergy and people, should have the investiture *gratis*, Gregory wrote to Rocon bishop of Chalons, charging

charging him to endeavour to dissuade the king from his purpose; saying "The king shall either renounce simony, or being anathematized, the French will refuse to obey him, unless they will renounce christianity;" a threatening, which Henry says was never before given out against any sovereign.

Great disorders prevailing in the kingdom of France in the reign of this Philip, no merchants or pilgrims being able to travel in safety, Gregory wrote to the bishops, urging them to press the king to exert his power to put a stop to the evil; saying that, if he proved refractory, they should not only excommunicate him, and lay the kingdom under an interdict, but oppose him by force, as, he says, they were very well able to do; and in this case he promised them the assistance of the holy see. He also wrote to William count of Poitiers, to desire him to join the bishops on this occasion. But the letters had no effect.

Gregory also threatened Alphonfus king of Leon and Castile, that if he did not yield to his will with respect to the adoption of the Roman ritual, and some other things, he would himself go into Spain, and give him much trouble, as an enemy of the christian religion.

Ebles count of Rouci in Champagne treated with Alexander II for all the conquests that he should be able to make from the Saracens in Spain.

For

For at Rome it was, says Fleury, taken for granted, that the kingdom of Spain belonged to St. Peter, or the church of Rome, tho' there is no trace of such an idea before that time.

In A. D. 1075 Gregory wrote to Sueno king of Denmark, to know whether he might depend upon him in case the holy see should want his assistance; saying, "There is near us a rich province occupied  
" by cowardly heretics, in which we desire one of  
" your sons to be established as its prince, and the defender of religion."

The emperor Henry was not the only prince of that age that shewed a disposition to resist the unreasonable claims of Gregory. When he wrote to William the conqueror, requiring him to take an oath of fealty to him and his successors, he absolutely refused, as he said it was what neither himself, nor any of his predecessors had ever done; but he granted him his claim of Peter pence. At this the pope was much offended, saying that he preferred honour to money. He also complained of this king for preventing his bishops from going to Rome; saying that if he did not behave with more moderation, he would draw upon himself the indignation of St. Peter.

Writing to Herman bishop of Metz in A. D. 1081, he says, "More power is given to every ex-  
" ercist, than to a lay lord. For kings and princes  
who

“ who do not live like christians are the slaves of  
 “ demons. If, then, the exorcist has received em-  
 “ pire over demons, how much more over the  
 “ slaves and members of demons ; and if the exor-  
 “ cist has this power, how much more the bishop.”

This pontiff, besides being persuaded that temporal power ought always to be subject to the spiritual, advanced particular claims to all the kingdoms of Europe, and even to Russia. He wrote to the judges of Sardinia, that several princes had asked their country of him, promising half the revenues of it ; but that he had refused till he could learn what they would do. “ But” says he, “ since  
 “ you are devoted to St. Peter, if you persevere as  
 “ you ought, we shall allow no person to have  
 “ your country ; and if any person attempt the  
 “ conquest of it, we will obstruct his designs by  
 “ methods spiritual and temporal.” He also assumed a right to decide all differences among christian princes, and threatened, in the case of a dispute between two sons of count Raimond Berenger, that if they disobeyed him, and continued their differences, he would take the grace of St. Peter from him who should be in fault ; so that he should no more gain any victory in war, or prosperity in this world.

But perhaps, the most extraordinary of all the wild pretensions of this pope was his maintaining

that all popes canonically elected became saints of course. Fleury, however, expresses his wonder that the scandalous lives of the popes in the tenth century had not convinced him of his error.

More instances occur in this period of opposition to the usurpation of the popes in spirituals by the bishops, than in temporals by the princes; the bishops having the advantage of a knowledge of the antient canons, and these were universally considered as of equal authority with the scriptures. Had it not been for the forged decretals, it would not have been in the power of the popes to exceed the bounds of other patriarchs.

John XVII having sent a legate to dedicate a church at Loches in the diocese of Tours in France, a tempest which came on at the time was said to be a judgment of God for the violation of the canons, the pope himself having no power to do any thing in the diocese of another bishop. This was said by Glaber, an historian of the time, tho' he was a monk of Clugny, which owned no superior besides its own abbot and the pope. The proper diocese of Rome, Fleury says, did not extend beyond the bounds of the city, as appeared by Leo IX in A. D. 1049, confirming to the bishop of Porto the right of performing clerical functions beyond the Tiber.

At the council of Selingstadt in A. D. 1022, it was declared that the absolution of the pope without that of the bishop of the diocese where the pilgrim lived, would signify nothing. Many persons charged with great crimes, having refused to confess at home, had gone to Rome, to get absolved there.

At the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, a similar complaint was made, viz. of excommunicated persons getting absolution of the pope unknown to their own bishops, which it was said would be the ruin of churches, and set aside the decrees of councils; when one who attended the council said that, when Ponticus count of Auvergne had been excommunicated some time before by Stephen bishop of Clermont, and had got absolved at Rome, the pope being informed of it declared that he did not know that he was in a state of excommunication. "I declare" said he, "to all my brethren, the bishops, that far from contradicting, I only pretend to aid and comfort them. God forbid that I should make a schism with them," and he annulled the absolution.

At the council of Anse in A. D. 1025, Gauslin bishop of Macon complained of Bouchard archbishop of Vienna, that, without his permission, he had ordained monks within his diocese, viz. at the monastery of Clugny. And tho' the express per-

permission of the pope was pleaded for the privilege of the abbot of Clugny employing what bishop he pleased, it was said that the canons, which ordered it to be done by the bishop of the diocese, was superior to any other authority; and the archbishop being convinced asked pardon. This example, says Fleury, and that of the dedication of the monastery at Loches, shews that the bishops of this age did not think the popes above the canons.

The pope's legate, the archbishop of Laon, insisting on the archbishop of Sens swearing allegiance to him as his primate, the clergy refused to obey, and Ivo of Chartres wrote to expostulate with him on the subject; saying that they could not act contrary to the authority of the Fathers, and the established customs; and he cited the authority of several popes, who declared that they would make no innovation against tradition, and the authority of the canons. He also wrote to the pope himself on the subject.

The canonization of saints began to be appropriated to the popes in this period; and the first instance of it was that of Udalric twenty years after his death, by John XV, in A. D. 993. The act expressed, that the memory of saints should be honoured, that the honour done to the saints, and to their relics, returns to the Lord, who said, *he*  
*that*

*that receiveth you receiveth me* ; and that the object of this honour was that men might be aided by their prayers and merits. When saints were canonized at this time, altars were erected over their bodies. This was done to Romuald five years after his death in A. D. 1027.

The dispensing with vows was universally allowed to the popes of this time. When Casimer, a monk of Clugny, became heir to the kingdom of Poland, pope Benedict IX gave him leave to secularize. He had been referred to the pope by Odilon the abbot, who said that he had not the power to dispense with his vows.

Before I conclude this article relating to the popes, I shall observe, that at a council in Rome in A. D. 1059, it was decreed that for the future the cardinal bishops should first consider of a proper person to be pope, then the cardinal clergy, and that then the rest of the clergy, and the people should give their consent. This rule was made in consequence of there having been much confusion in the election of Nicolas II. This law was not, however, immediately acquiesced in ; and to quiet the clamours of the principal of the clergy, some of them were afterwards admitted to the rank of cardinal presbyters, and to pacify the inferior clergy some of them were made cardinal deacons.

The cardinal bishops were those of the territory of Rome. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2, p. 262.

Here I would observe that the dignity of *Cardinal* was much advanced in this period; and especially as they were not only the electors of the popes, but the popes were generally chosen out of their body. It was not, however, till A. D. 1458 that Paul II gave them the distinction of a red hat, and it was Urban VIII who gave them the title of *eminence*. Still, however, there remain traces of their former condition. For tho' the pope calls all bishops his *brethren*, he calls the cardinals his *beloved children*. *Sueur*, A. D. 964. *Pictet*, A. D. 1059.

By much address the popes got rid of their confirmation by the emperors. When Leo IX, at the request of the people, was made pope by the emperor Henry III, he was persuaded by Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, to strip himself of his pontifical robes, and entering Rome as a pilgrim, get himself elected by the people and clergy, in order to set aside the election by a layman. By the management of the same Hildebrand, Alexander II was elected pope without the consent of the emperor Henry IV, who in vain opposed the election by setting up another pope. *Giannone*, Vol. p. 452. In former times, not only was the election of the pope confirmed by the emperors, but

but they received for it twenty pounds of gold for their confirmation. *Sueur*, A. D. 964.

Mention was made in a preceding period of a pope who was a foreigner changing his name. The first pope who was a native of Rome that did this, was Bocco di Porco, in english *hog's snout*, who called himself Sergius IV in A. D. 1009.

### SECTION III.

*Of the Character of the Clergy in this Period.*

**C**OMPLAINTS of the disorderly lives of the clergy were as frequent in this period as in any of the former; the superior clergy being as dissolute as the laity of the same fortunes, and lived in the same manner.

Ratherius bishop of Verona in A. D. 974 makes loud complaint of the licentiousness of the clergy in his time. "When" says he "I was translated to Liege, one bishop objected to me the canon against translations, when he himself was addicted to wine and gaming, had hounds and hawks, and did not keep his residence. I have heard two of them reproach one another, that the one

“ carried arms, and the other kept a concubine,  
 “ that one had committed adultery before his or-  
 “ dination, and the other had married after ordi-  
 “ nation. Can we wonder,” he adds, “ after this  
 “ that laymen are not struck with the menaces  
 “ which we draw from the scriptures and the ca-  
 “ nons, when they see that we laugh as we are read-  
 “ ing them, and ourselves persist in despising them.  
 “ This is the reason why they make so little ac-  
 “ count of our excommunications and absolutions,  
 “ because they see that we ourselves stand excom-  
 “ municated by the canons.” There was not one  
 of his clergy at Verona but, he says, kept a con-  
 cubine, either publicly or privately.

Indeed the clergy of Lombardy seem to have  
 been the most disorderly of any in this respect. At  
 a council held at Pavia in A. D. 1020, Benedict  
 VIII complained of the licentious lives of the cler-  
 gy, that they dissipated the wealth of their churches  
 in the open maintenance of their concubines and  
 the children they had by them. To put a stop to  
 this practice in some measure, it was decreed that  
 the children of clergymen, even by free women,  
 should rank with serfs. The emperor Henry con-  
 firmed this regulation. At a council in Rome in  
 A. D. 1050, it was ordered that those women who  
 prostituted themselves to priests should be slaves  
 to the palace of the Lateran. At another council

in the same city, in A. D. 1059, it was decreed that a clergyman who had kept a concubine should not perform mass, or receive his share of the revenues of the church, and that those who kept their continence should eat and sleep together, near to the church in which they were ordained, and have in common what they received from the church. This, Fleury, says, was the origin of the *regular canons*.

In A. D. 1067 Alexander II sent legates to Milan, which was a scene of the greatest disorder, the clergy keeping women in the most public manner, and the children they had by them; and where all benefices were openly sold, with constitutions expressly provided for that diocese. They conclude with observing that because many persons paid more regard to temporal punishments than to those that are eternal, they who did not observe the constitutions should pay fines according to their ranks (which are particularly specified) and that till the fines were paid, they were to be in a state of interdict.

So common was concubinage with the clergy of Germany, that when two councils were held in A. D. 1074 by the legates of Gregory VII for the purpose of repressing it, they absolutely refused to comply. This vice, and simony, being almost universal in this country, this pope wrote in the

most earnest manner to several of the bishops on the subject, urging them to use every means in their power, even that of force, to compel their clergy to conform to the antient canons. At a council at Mayence in A. D. 1075, he sent a legate with orders to oblige all the clergy of that province to dismiss their wives, or relinquish the service of the altar; but when the archbishop of the place would have executed the order, all the clergy who were present expressed so much indignation, that he was in danger of his life, and the scheme was obliged to be given up.

In England some of the priests had two wives, or even more, and this abuse it is said was common. A council called by king Ethelred at Eng-ham made thirty two canons for the reformation of the morals of the clergy. They were ordered to dismiss their wives, and they who kept their concubines were promised to be treated as the nobles. Unfortunately the marriage of priests was considered in the same light as concubinage.

Simony was another great complaint of this period, and so common that few persons thought it to be any sin. As ordination by a simoniac was deemed to be invalid, much difficulty was necessarily occasioned by the commonness of this vice, and the councils were obliged to remit of the strict-

ness

ness of discipline in this respect. At a council in Rome in A. D. 1047, it was agreed that a person who knew that he had been ordained by a simoniac should continue his functions after forty days penance; and at another council in the same city in A. D. 1059, they were allowed to continue their functions, as an indulgence on account of the state of the times, but that for the future if any one was ordained by one whom he knew to be a simoniac they should both be deposed.

When church livings were bought, the clergy would naturally endeavour to make the most of them, and get all the money they could in other ways; and as the interest of the more eminent of the clergy in councils was considerable, this also was an article which had its price. Damiani says, that he knew one of his brethren who rejoiced at the approach of a council, as of a harvest or vintage, and had emissaries to draw to him money from all quarters on such occasions.

Ratherius bishop of Verona in A. D. 974, complains that the priests and deacons divided among them all the revenues of the church, while the subdeacons, acolyths, and the rest of the inferior clergy had not enough to live on. By this means, says Fleury, the functions of the inferior clergy came to be discontinued.

I shall

I shall conclude this general account of the simony with which the clergy of this period are charged, with a particular account of an instance of it, as this will give us a clearer idea of the spirit and manners of these wretched times.

At the council of Thoulouse in A. D. 1059; the viscount of Narbonne complained that Geoffrey had been made bishop of that city at the age of ten years for a hundred thousand sous; promising to be a friend to his family, of which it was purchased, and that the see should not be a sufferer; but that when he came of age, instead of being in friendship with him, he had made a cruel war upon him, in which almost a thousand persons had been killed on both sides; that he had seized the castles and lands of the church, and given them to his friends; that he had seized the bishoprick of Urgel and given it to his brother for a hundred thousand sous; that to raise this sum the latter had sold the treasure of his church, and the valuable utensils belonging to it; and to secure himself, had put himself under the protection of the countess of Urgel. He further accused him of violating the truce of God after having sworn to observe it; that tho' he had proposed to refer their differences to the pope, he had paid no regard to the proposal, but had excommunicated himself and his wife and children, and laid all  
his

his estates under an interdict. "If" says he, "it was not for the fear of God, I would make no account of the excommunication of a man loaded with so many crimes, and anathematized by pope Victor" (supposed to have been at the council of Florence in the year before) "We know" he added, "that he has sold all the holy orders that he has conferred. He refused to consecrate the churches in my estates unless he received the salaries of them. Wherefore I make my complaint to God and you, and demand justice. If I do not obtain it I shall pay no regard to his excommunication, and shall not keep the truce in my estates." He then renewed his proposal to go to Rome; saying the bishop would not go except in bonds. What was done in consequence of this does not appear.

The history of Peter bishop of Florence A. D. 1063 is still more extraordinary. He was made bishop by his father, who was a nobleman of Pavia, purchasing that dignity for him. In consequence of this, the monks, with John Gualbert, founder of the celebrated monastery of Valambrosa near Florence at their head, supported by one Theuson a recluse, refused to communicate with him, considering him as a simoniac, and consequently a heretic. However, Damiani, tho' a great reformer, opposed them in this, because he  
had

had not been judicially condemned. The monks, not at all conciliated by the advice of Damiani, continued their opposition; and by the advice of Theufon, Gualbert made proclamation in the public square of the city, that the bishop was a simoniac, and by this means excited the people in general against him.

The bishop, seeing a great part of the clergy and the body of the people, animated against him, sent a number of armed men in the night to destroy the monastery of St. Salvi, which was near the city, and under the conduct of Gualbert. Him they did not find, but they fell sword in hand on the monks they found there, wounding some of them very dangerously, and stripping the rest. They then overturned the altar, plundered every thing they met with, and set fire to the lodges. The people, inflamed with this violent proceeding, took the part of the monks, and with Gualbert brought an accusation against the bishop at a council held at Rome A. D. 1063, under Alexander II, attended by more than a hundred bishops, offering to prove the charge of simony by the ordeal of fire. But the majority of the bishops favouring their brother, the pope would not depose him, or even allow of the trial by fire; tho' Hildebrand, then archdeacon, and afterwards pope Gregory VII, took the part of the monks.

The

The bishop, being acquitted at Rome, persecuted the monks with great violence, and also those of the clergy who refused to communicate with him; so that the archpriest and many others took refuge in the monastery of Septima, where Gualbert received them. But the party of the bishop was supported by Godfrey duke of Tuscany, who threatened his opposers with death.

The pope hoping to allay this disturbance went himself to Florence, but returned without any success. He found the monks clamorous for the trial by fire, and saw the wood they had prepared for the purpose; but he would not see the experiment. After this the clergy and the people in general, persisting in their purpose, assembled, and complained violently of the bishop, urging him to see the proof of his guilt by the fire. But, like the pope, he would not consent to this, and imprisoned or banished those who would not submit to him.

This measure increased the ferment, and preparation having been made for their favourite mode of trial by fire at the monastery of Septima, by making two piles of wood, ten feet long, five feet broad, and four feet high, separated by a space of six feet, which was also covered with hot embers; on the day fixed for it, a vast croud of people, with many women and children, not less than three thousand,

went

went to the place, which was seven miles from the city. All things being ready, after much solemn religious ceremony, and the recital of a prayer suited to the occasion, a monk of the name of Peter dressed in a clerical habit, which was loose and flowing, and holding a crucifix in his hand, very deliberately walked through a quantity of hot embers, up, it was said, to his ancles, without receiving the least hurt. Neither his garments, which were of linen, nor the hairs of his legs were so much as singed.

An account of this transaction was immediately sent to the pope by the clergy and people, desiring him to deliver them from their bishop, thus clearly proved to be a simoniac, and he thought proper to depose him. He not only submitted to the sentence, but became a monk in the monastery of Septima. The monk Peter, who went through the fire, was of the family of the Aldebrandini, and was made abbot of Ficile. He was afterwards made a cardinal and bishop of Albania, and always went by the name of *Peter Igneus*. By what means he went through the fire without receiving any hurt, it is impossible at this distance of time to discover. It is evident that the whole was under the management of the monks; and they made it answer their purpose. Some farther observations

servations on this supposed miracle will be found in the miscallaneous section of this period.

In both the instances we see with what readiness the clergy had recourse to arms; but the most violent thing of this kind that occurs in the course of this period was a fray that happened in the cathedral of Goslar in A. D. 1063, then the residence of the court, Henry IV, then very young, being present. The two parties were those of Hecilon bishop of Hildesheim, and Viclerad abbot of Fulda, and the occasion of it was nothing more than a dispute about placing the seats at vespres. Slight, however, as was the original cause, these great prelates interesting themselves in it, provided men with arms, determined each of them to carry their respective points; and not only did they fight in the church, but many were killed on the altar itself; the bishop from an elevated situation encouraging his men to fight without regard to the place, or the presence of the young king, who was with great difficulty got out. The bishop's men had the advantage, and drove the others out of the church. The citizens, however, took the part of the abbot, and were prepared to attack the bishop's men, when they came out, but night put an end to the combat, and favoured their escape. The abbot was most blamed as he came attended with so many armed men,

and it is thought that he would have been deprived of his abbey, but that he saved himself by money.

We shall the less wonder at the bishops and abbots of this period having recourse to arms, when it is considered that their great estates enabled them to live in the style of princes, and to make use either of the spiritual or the temporal sword as they saw occasion. Adalberon II bishop of Metz about A. D. 995 prosecuted with vigour those who plundered the possessions of the church, or of the poor; and when they despised his ecclesiastical censures, he employed, as the historian says, the arm of flesh, ravaging the lands, and demolishing the castles, of his opposers. \*

Robert archbishop of Rheims lived altogether like a prince, occupied with his temporal affairs and his pleasures. He even married a wife, with whom he lived in public, and had three children. He is much praised for his liberality, especially with respect to churches. He rebuilt his own cathedral from the foundation. He was archbishop forty-eight years, and died A. D. 1037. Towards  
the

\* The empire being full of disorder in the reign of Henry IV, Annon archbishop of Cologne was desired by the king and the nobles to take upon him the government of the state, and he soon put a stop to the violences.

the close of his life, he did penance for his uncanonical mode of living.

Otho the Great was particularly distinguished for his liberality to the church, influenced, it is said, by the superstition of his wife Adelaid. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 188. But it was not till the reign of Otho III that the principal bishops of Germany made great advances in their style and mode of living, in which they imitated, and equalled, the great lay lords. Like them they had professed cooks, magnificent hotels, and buffoons, and obtained of the emperor leave to hunt all kinds of wild beasts. *Sueur*.

When bishops resembled secular princes so much in their manner of life, it is not extraordinary that many of them should have been illiterate. The canons of the church of Bamberg having been expelled by the bishop who put monks in their place, and was excommunicated for that and other offences by the pope in A. D. 1075, one of the canons produced a verse in one of the psalms; and said that if he could explain it, not in any mystical or allegorical sense, but word for word, he would acknowledge him to be innocent, and worthy of the bishoprick; but it did not appear that he could do it. Stigand archbishop of Canterbury A. D. 1058 who on this promotion did not quit the bishoprick of Winchester, and several

abbeyes which he held, was illiterate; as it is said almost all the bishops of England at that time were. He thought of nothing but satisfying his ambition and avarice, trafficking in the most public manner for bishopricks and abbeyes. He was archbishop of Canterbury seventeen years.

Pluralities were very common in this period. The famous Dunstan was bishop of Winchester and London at the same time. As an excuse for it, it was alleged that St. John was bishop of Ephesus and of seven other churches.

We are not, however, to conclude that all the bishops of this period were equally licentious and illiterate. There were many great exceptions of bishops equally eminent for virtue and literature, especially in Germany in the reign of Henry II, who promoted many excellent men, as Meingaud and Poppon of Treves, Herebert and Pelegrim of Cologne, Villegise, Archambauld and Aribon of Mayence, Burchard of Worms, Ansfred and Athalbold of Utrecht, and many others enumerated by Fleury.

The civil and ecclesiastical power in those times contributed in their turns to advance each other. At a council held in Rome in A. D. 964, pope Leo VIII, with all the clergy and the people of Rome, granted to the emperor Otho and his successors the power of chusing a successor for the  
king-

kingdom of Italy, to confirm the pope, and to give investitures to bishops ; so that no patrician, pope, or bishop, could be chosen without his consent, under pain of excommunication, perpetual exile, or death. On the other hand the temporal princes, especially those of Germany, set no bounds to their liberality to the church. Hence the great principalities they are still possessed of in that country. In A. D. 999 Otho III gave the city of Verceil in Italy to every future bishop of that city ; which, Fleury says, is the first instance of civil power given so expressly to a church.

The power of giving implies that of withholding, and of taking away and controlling ; and this both the civil and ecclesiastical powers availed themselves of as circumstances favoured them. A happy use was made of the ecclesiastical power in the case of the emperor Henry II. Having declared his resolution to be a monk to Richard abbot of St. Vanes of Verdun, and taken the oath of obedience, the abbot said, “ I command you to  
 “ return, and take upon you the government of  
 “ the empire that God has put into your hands,  
 “ and that by your firmness in doing justice you  
 “ procure, as far as shall be in your power, the  
 “ good of the state.”

But the power of the clergy was shamefully abused in the business of excommunication, and

their making themselves the judges of the laws of marriage. Of this we have two remarkable instances in the history of the kings of France within this period, Robert and Philip. The former of those princes refusing to divorce his wife, whom he had been ordered to dismiss by pope Gregory, in a council held at Rome in A. D. 998, was excommunicated by him; and the consequence was that no person would have any intercourse with him, except two domestics, who however, threw into the fire all the vessels in which he ate or drank. This, at least, is related by P. Damien, who wrote sixty years after. In A. D. 1001 the king found it necessary to dismiss his queen.

In the case of Robert the excommunication was laid on by the pope, but in that of Philip the bishops of the country took upon themselves to control the king. This prince having put away his wife Bertha, and married Bertrade, who had been married four years to the count of Anjou, Ivo bishop of Chartres remonstrated with him on the subject, but the king persisted, and concluded the marriage; and to express his resentment against the bishop he made war upon him, plundering his lands, and seizing his person. On this pope Urban wrote to the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, reproving them for suffering such a crime, insisting on their going to the king and re-

monstrating with him, and their threatening him with the spiritual sword if he did not repent. The king still persisting, at a council held at Autun in A. D. 1094, the clergy excommunicated him, tho' his former wife Bertha being then dead, he had hoped that the second marriage would have been allowed.

Philip, being thus excommunicated by the council, sent deputies to the pope, assuring him that he had no criminal commerce with Bertrade, and threatening that, if he did not take off the excommunication, and restore to him his crown, he would withdraw from his obedience, and go over to Guibert the antipope. On this the pope, tho' apprized that what the king said was not true, thought proper to give him a respite till All Saints in A. D. 1095, taking off the excommunication, and permitting him to wear his crown as before. For it was then the custom on great festivals for the king to appear in his royal apparel, and to have the crown put on his head by a bishop. The king not being reclaimed by this indulgence, was excommunicated at the council of Clermont in A. D. 1095, but without any prejudice to his royal dignity. This brought the king to submit to the church; and having made satisfaction, and promised to dismiss his wife, he was absolved from

his excommunication at the council of Nismes in the year following.

Odo archbishop of Canterbury proceeded in a more violent manner with king Edwy. He not only took from him his favourite concubine, but abused her in a shocking manner, and sent her to Ireland. On her return he caught her again, and even put her to death in a miserable manner.

The clergy derived great advantage from their arbitrary constructions of the degrees of affinity within which it was lawful to contract marriage. In A. D. 1065 pope Alexander II held a council at Rome to settle this business, in consequence of a dispute on the subject in which P. Damiani had taken a considerable part; and it was settled, that the canon law for regulating marriage was essentially different from the civil law, which regulated the succession to estates. For whereas two brothers according to the civil law are in the first degree of relationship, according to the canon law they are in the second; and cousins german, who are in the second according to the civil law, are in the fourth according to the canon law; the one beginning with the common ancestor, and the other ascending to him, and then descending again.

The degrees of relationship, as was observed before, were extended beyond the bounds of nature by godfathers and godmothers at baptism being con-

considered as real relations, and by this means the limits of contracting marriage were much abridged; and this was no less so in the East than in the West. The emperor Nicephorus Phocas being said to have been godfather to a child of Theophania, whom he had married to his second wife, the marriage was thought to be unlawful on account of this spiritual relationship, and the patriarch Polyuctes would not receive him into communion.

The great contest between the civil and ecclesiastical powers which arose in this period, was about the right of *investiture*, or the disposal of bishopricks, and other church preferments. When the clergy became possessed of estates in land, given them by princes and great lords, it was natural that they should swear fealty to them, and even perform the same duties that were exacted of other holders of land, such as serving in the wars, or furnishing a number of men for the purpose. By degrees these services were remitted to churchmen as unsuitable to their character; but, still, as the lands were a gift, and the heirs of the grantor had an interest in the possession of the land, the new occupant, as in civil cases, was not admitted without his consent. This was evidently the case with respect to the pope himself. But at this time both the popes and other bishops of great power, feel-

ing their importance, began to be impatient of their dependence on the temporal princes ; and as church preferments had been generally given for money, by needy princes and lords, which was called simony, and universally condemned, tho' almost universally practised, it was now thought to be wrong to suffer their interference in this business in any respect ; on the principle that laymen, having no spiritual character, could not convey spiritual things ; as if the appointment of a bishop had been the same thing with the giving of holy orders. The universal custom, tho' now objected to, was against this maxim. In Germany in particular, where the dispute arose, when any bishop died, the prince had been regularly informed of it, and the clergy and people always waited for his consent before they proceeded to the election of another ; and he confirmed their election by the delivery of a ring and pastoral staff, as badges of their office, and then the new bishop took the oath of allegiance to the prince before he took possession of the bishopric.

As a custom universally established could not easily be broken, artful methods were at first used to evade it. After the death of Alexander II, who while he was pope retained the bishoprick of Lucca, Anselm, whom Alexander himself had recommended, was chosen in his place, and had been  
sent

sent before hand to king Henry IV to obtain the investiture, which shews that then he did not condemn the practice. But Anselm, who thought that the secular power ought not to give ecclesiastical dignities, managed in such a manner as to return, and take possession of the bishoprick, without the ceremony of receiving investiture, and in A. D. 1073 he went to Rome to be ordained. The king, however, sent to the pope to require that he would not ordain either him, or Hugh bishop of Die, because they had not received investiture. With respect to Anselm, the pope complied, but not with respect to Hugh, who had been chosen suddenly by the clergy and people in the place of one who was a simoniac, himself being then a layman, the pope's legate being then at the place, and approving of the choice. As he was then on a pilgrimage to Rome, he received his holy orders there.

Anselm was afterwards seized with a scruple, and went to Clugni, in order to become a member of that community; but being commanded by the pope, he left the monastery, and having given the ring and the pastoral staff which he received from the king into the hands of the pope, the latter restored to him his functions, allowing him to retain the monastic habit.

After

After this, in the progress of the differences between Gregory and Henry, the clergy took more courage, and openly asserted their independence on the civil power. At a council at Poitiers in A. D. 1078, the bishops and other ecclesiastical persons, were forbidden to receive investiture from kings, or other laymen. Victor III, in a council at Beneventum, decreed that, if any person received a bishoprick, or abbey, from any layman, he should be considered as no bishop or abbot. But Urban II, at the council in Rome in A. D. 1099, proceeded farther than this; for then an excommunication was pronounced against all laymen who should grant investitures of churches, and also against all the clergy who should receive them at their hands, or consecrate those who received them, and against all those who should do homage to laymen for any ecclesiastical dignity. "For," said the pope, "one cannot see without horror hands raised to the supreme honour of creating the creator, and offering him to his father for the salvation of the world, reduced to this infamy of submitting to hands continually stained with the touch of infamous things, rapine, and the effusion of blood." All the assembly cried, *Be it so.*

Notwithstanding the great power of the clergy in this period, there were still loud and just complaints

plaints of the seizing of their temporalities by lawless violence. This appears by the council of Leon in Spain in A. D. 1012, to have been as much the case in that country as in Germany, France, and Italy, of which Dittmar makes so much complaint. Abbon, the abbot of Fleury, complained that, even the advocates of the church, or those who held fiefs of it, in order to defend it, were themselves the greatest plunderers of it. "Whence," he says, "we see so many churches destroyed, and so many monasteries in ruins; because men presented themselves as the protectors of them, and on that pretence seize the greatest part of the revenues." At the accession of pope Gregory VI the temporalities of the see were so much diminished, that, excepting a few cities near Rome, and the oblations of the faithful, little remained for his subsistence; all the distant patrimony being occupied by usurpers. Rome itself was full of assassins and plunderers. They fought even at the altars, and on the tombs of the apostles, to carry off the oblations, and use them in feasts with their prostitutes. At Rome there was a singular kind of abuse, to which Gregory VII put a stop. There were sixty persons called *Mansionaries*, habited like priests, at the church of St. Peter, who made the pilgrims believe that they were priests, received their offerings, and gave them absolution; and

and at night, on the pretence of guarding the church, they went out, and committed all kinds of crimes.

We find a complaint similar to this in the east. It had been the custom in the beginning of the eleventh century to give a decayed monastery to a rich and powerful person, for the purpose of restoring it, that they might be its benefactors and protectors. But this was grown into such abuse, that they were considered as their absolute property, so that they received and enjoyed the revenues of them. By this means women sometimes became possessed of the monasteries of men, and men those of women; and as many secular persons were received into the monasteries as monks, so that the discipline was wholly relaxed. This abuse was rectified by the constitution of Alexis in A. D. 1027.

One principal cause of the great disorders and violences of these times, by which the clergy, as the most defenceless part of the community, suffered the most, was the independence of the feudal lords, and the weakness of the kings. For near two hundred years from the reign of Louis le Debonnaire the sovereign authority was little respected in France, Germany or Italy. Every lord thought he had a right to do himself justice by force of arms; and as causes of complaint were infinitely multiplied;  
there

there was nothing but violence, and it was not considered as any crime. They who were the most exposed were the merchants, artizans and labourers, and the rest of the common people, but especially the monks and the clergy, who were forbidden the use of arms.

Great evils, however, require, and always find, some remedy; because it comes to be the general interest that some should be applied, and in this case we find recourse had to various expedients. At a council of Poitiers in A. D. 1004, the lords promised, and gave hostages to observe one of its orders, which was that whoever injured a church, plundered the poor, or struck a disarmed clergyman, should be anathematized; and that for all usurpations that had been made in the preceding five years, or should be made for the future, they should demand justice of the prince, or particular lord, who should cause justice to be done; that if he was unable to procure justice, he should assemble the lords and bishops who assisted at that council, and they should march against him as against a rebel, and lay waste his estates, till he submitted to reason.

At the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, Odalric abbot of St. Martial, in order to procure peace among the lords, who were continually at war with one another, proposed to lay the whole country

try under an interdict till the lords should consent to it. To alarm them the more, the bishop of Castres said that a certain knight who had been excommunicated, and refused to be absolved, had been buried by his relations without any funeral rites in the church, but that the next morning the body was found thrown out of the grave; that the same thing took place repeatedly, after five attempts to bury him, and that at length they buried him out of the church yard. This story answered the purpose in that superstitious age. The lords were terrified, and swore peace among themselves.

In the time of king Robert they began to apply more effectual remedies to this great evil. At a council held at Elne in Rouffillon in A. D. 1027, it was ordered that no person should attack his enemy from three o'clock in the afternoon on saturday till day break on monday; that no person should attack a monk or clergyman travelling without arms, or any person going to church or returning from it, or travelling in company with women; and that no person should attack a church, or a house within thirty paces of it, under pain of excommunication.

After a dreadful famine of three years continuance, about A. D. 1030, several councils were held in which these abuses were reformed. The principal object was to procure peace, so that all persons

persons might travel without arms, whatever differences they might have; that churches should be sanctuaries for all crimes, but that of breaking this peace.

At length, in A. D. 1041, the lords not being able to make a settled peace, agreed to a truce called the *truce of God*, which was that from wednesday evening to monday morning no person should take any thing by force. It came to be called the truce of God, because it was thought that several persons who had violated it were punished in a miraculous manner.

This truce of God was confirmed and extended to other seasons at the council of Narbonne in A. D. 1054, under the penalty of anathema and perpetual banishment. At the same time it was forbidden to cut down olive trees, because they furnished matter for the chrisin, and the lighting of churches. Also shepherds and their flocks were not to be molested, churches and their revenues were to be held sacred, all clergymen and monks without arms, and merchants and pilgrims. The truce of God was decreed in Normandy under William the conqueror in A. D. 1080, and farther confirmed at a council in Rouen in A. D. 1096, when all persons above the age of twelve years were obliged to swear to it.

Thus, by the efforts of the bishops, the public tranquility was in some measure restored. Before this bishops, and even popes, were obliged to have recourse to arms. Gregory VI, finding excommunications useless, applied this remedy, and by this means made travelling in some measure safe. But the Romans having been long accustomed to plunder, said the pope was a blood thirsty man, unworthy of offering sacrifices to God. The cardinals themselves used the same language.

When those times of violence began to abate, there was a great emulation in France in rebuilding churches, and monasteries. At this time the cathedral of St. Martin at Tours was built in a magnificent manner by Hervé the treasurer.

---

#### SECTION IV.

##### *Of the Monks in this Period.*

**T**WO very considerable new orders of monks had their rise in this period; the Carthusians, and the Cistercians, tho' both of them on the general principles of the Benedictines.

Bruno, the founder of the former of these orders, was a canon of the church of Rheims, and a difference which he had with Manasses the arch-  
bishop.

bishop, whose irregularities gave him great offence, was the cause of his retreat. Discourfing with Roul le Vert, the provost of that church, and another person of the name of Fulcius, of the vanity of the riches and pleasures of this world, and of the joys of eternity, they all made a vow to quit the world as soon as possible, and take the monastic habit; but the execution being deferred till the return of Fulcius from a journey which he made to Rome, where he staid a long time, the zeal of Roul grew cool, and he continued at Rheims of which he was afterwards archbishop, but Bruno kept firm to his purpose.

Without waiting for the return of Fulcius, he went to consult Hugh bishop of Grenoble, who had quitted his bishoprick, and retired to the monastery of Chaise Dieu, where he passed a year; but by order of the pope had resumed the duties of his office. It was three years after this that Bruno with six companions visited him. He received them with great kindness, approved of their resolution, and advised them to fix themselves at *Carthusium*, a solitary place, surrounded with frightful mountains of difficult access near Grenoble.

In this place they made an establishment in A. D. 1084, and by their charter the bishop forbade any women to pass thro' the lands belonging to the

should hurt their abstinence. Their lay brothers were not obliged to such rigorous abstinence, or silence. The number of monks was fixed at thirteen, and that of the lay brothers at sixteen.

After Bruno had governed at Carthusium six years, he was sent for to Rome by pope Urban, who had been his disciple at Rheims, to assist him with his advice, leaving his charge of the monastery to Seguin the abbot of Chaise Dieu, to whom the place originally belonged. His monks followed him to Italy, but he persuaded them to return, and gave them Landuin for a prior, and he governed them ten years. Bruno himself, unable to bear the tumult of Rome, retired with Landuin, and some others, to the diocese of Squillace in Calabria, where count Roger gave them a forest of a league in extent. There he lived eleven years, and there he died.

The founder of the Cistercians was Robert, abbot of Molesme. He and several of his monks, reflecting that the rules of Benedict, to which they had sworn, were by no means conformed to in that monastery, and not being able to prevail upon the rest to submit to them, with the leave of pope Urban, they left the place, and fixed themselves at *Cistercium*, (in French *Citeaux*) five miles from Dijon in the diocese of Chalons. It was then a desert place, covered with wood and briars, which

#### SEC. IV. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

which they began to clear, and where they lodged themselves in wooden cells, with the consent of Gautier the bishop of the diocese, and Renaud Vicount of Beaune, to whom the land belonged. Here they established themselves the first of March A. D. 1098.

The archbishop of Lyons, seeing their extreme poverty, wrote to Eudes duke of Burgundy to recommend them to him; and he at his own expence finished the wooden buildings they had begun, and for a long time supplied them with all necessaries; and the bishop of Chalons gave Robert the pastoral staff in quality of abbot. By application to the pope Robert was afterwards induced to return to the monastery of Molefme; but they who remained at Citeaux chose another abbot, Alberic, who had been prior of Molefme; and was then prior of Citeaux.

There were three other great reformers of monastic discipline in France within this period, Richard abbot of Verdun, in the beginning of the eleventh century, Odilon abbot of Clugny, and William of Dijon.

Considering the varieties there are in men's dispositions and situations, we cannot wonder at the variety of forms in which men devoted themselves to what they considered as *religion*, in opposition

should hurt their abstinence. Their lay brothers were not obliged to such rigorous abstinence, or silence. The number of monks was fixed at thirteen, and that of the lay brothers at sixteen.

After Bruno had governed at Carthusium six years, he was sent for to Rome by pope Urban, who had been his disciple at Rheims, to assist him with his advice, leaving his charge of the monastery to Seguin the abbot of Chaise Dieu, to whom the place originally belonged. His monks followed him to Italy, but he persuaded them to return, and gave them Landuin for a prior, and he governed them ten years. Bruno himself, unable to bear the tumult of Rome, retired with Landuin, and some others, to the diocese of Squillace in Calabria, where count Roger gave them a forest of a league in extent. There he lived eleven years, and there he died.

The founder of the Cistercians was Robert, abbot of Molesme. He and several of his monks, reflecting that the rules of Benedict, to which they had sworn, were by no means conformed to in that monastery, and not being able to prevail upon the rest to submit to them, with the leave of pope Urban, they left the place, and fixed themselves at *Cistercium*, (in French *Citeaux*) five miles from Dijon in the diocese of Chalons. It was then a desert place, covered with wood and briars, which

#### SEC. IV. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

which they began to clear, and where they lodged themselves in wooden cells, with the consent of Gautier the bishop of the diocese, and Renaud Vicount of Beaune, to whom the land belonged. Here they established themselves the first of March A. D. 1098.

The archbishop of Lyons, seeing their extreme poverty, wrote to Eudes duke of Burgundy to recommend them to him; and he at his own expence finished the wooden buildings they had begun, and for a long time supplied them with all necessaries; and the bishop of Chalons gave Robert the pastoral staff in quality of abbot. By application to the pope Robert was afterwards induced to return to the monastery of Molefme; but they who remained at Citeaux chose another abbot, Alberic, who had been prior of Molefme; and was then prior of Citeaux.

There were three other great reformers of monastic discipline in France within this period, Richard abbot of Verdun, in the beginning of the eleventh century, Odilon abbot of Ciugny, and William of Dijon.

Considering the varieties there are in men's dispositions and situations, we cannot wonder at the variety of forms in which men devoted themselves to what they considered as *religion*, in opposition

to the licentious manners of those times. I shall mention two which took place in this period.

In A. D. 1091 many laymen in Germany renounced the world, giving themselves and their property to the service of particular communities, regular clergy, or monks, to live under their conduct. This being blamed by many, pope Urban wrote in approbation of it, as an image of the primitive church. There were also many young women who, renouncing marriage, put themselves under the conduct of some priest, or of a married woman, living in obedience, and great piety. Whole villages adopted this mode of devotion and endeavoured to surpass one another in sanctity.

In the eleventh century we find the institution of *lay brothers*. These were illiterate persons, who therefore could not be clergy, and devoted themselves wholly to labour. The first monastery that had these lay brothers was that of Valambrose. After this was that of Herfuage, and the abbot William is said to be the first institutor of this class of religious. The Carthusians also had them, and called them *bearded brothers*. They made solemn vows, and were real monks. For some time before this reading had been almost confined to the clergy, and almost all the monks were become so, whereas originally they were all laymen.

There

There were also in all monasteries a second class of persons called *donati*, or *oblati*, who, without making the profession, or wearing a habit different from that of other persons, gave themselves and their property to the monasteries, obeying the superior, and living in celibacy, in which respect they differed from *serfs*, who were married. For there were also *serfs of devotion*, or freemen who devoted themselves to the service of particular monasteries; and, as a mark of it, put the cord of the church bell about their necks, laid their head upon the altar, or put pieces of money on their heads.

In this period too the order *canons regular* was made more perfect, all private property being excluded; so that they were nearly in the same situation with monks. This regulation was made at a council held in Rome in A. D. 1063, under Alexander II.

Every thing that was thought to look like religion being in this age confined to monasteries, there was a great resort to them on a variety of occasions. Pope Alexander II having promised an indulgence for sins that were confessed, to those who should assist at the dedication of the monastery of Mount Cassin, when it was repaired in A. D. 1071, it drew together a prodigious number of persons. Not only the monastery itself, and the town, but the neighbouring fields were filled. Such, how-

ever, were the revenues of the place, and the liberality of the abbot, that they were all supplied by him with bread and wine and fish, three days before the dedication, and as many after it. This solemn dedication so much increased the reputation of the monastery, and of the abbot Desiderius, that all princes sent presents to it, and in two years the monks increased to the number of nearly two hundred.

Monasteries were far, however, from being free from abuse in this age. Ulric, in his account of the customs of Clugny, written in A. D. 1091, says, that one chief cause of it was parents who had many children relieving themselves of those who were lame, maimed, or who had any other bodily defect, by putting them into monasteries. Houses filled with those invalids, he says, could not observe any regularity; and that the observance of the rules was exact only in those monasteries in which the greater number of monks consisted of persons who entered them at mature age, and of their own free choice.

In this period, as well as in the former, we find examples of persons in the higher ranks devoting themselves to the monastic life. Cunegund, the wife of the emperor Henry II, took the vows in a peculiarly solemn manner after the death of her husband, in a monastery near  
Hesse-

Hesse-Cassel, living under the orders of her superior, and employing herself in curious needle works, &c. After her death she was canonized. Being accused of incontinence in the life time of her husband, it is said that she cleared herself by walking unhurt over a number of red hot plowshares. Hugo duke of Burgundy became a monk of Clugny in A. D. 1078. And William duke of Aquitain died in the monastic habit in A. D. 1030; as did the emperor Michael the Paphlagonian in A. D. 1041. The emperor Isaac Commenus became a monk in A. D. 1059, resigning the empire to Constantine Ducas.

Tho' the monks were higher in estimation than the secular clergy in all this period, they did not gain many essential privileges. However, at the council of Nismes in A. D. 1096, pope Urban asserted the right of the monks to the exercise of sacerdotal functions, not only within their own monasteries, but with respect to laymen, which, Fleury says, was intirely contrary to the antient customs.

In England the estimation of monks was perhaps higher than in any other part of the world. Before the time of William the Conqueror, monks were settled in all the cathedral churches; but this king was an encourager of the secular clergy, and Yauquelve bishop of Winchester, taking advantage

tage of this disposition, would have expelled all the monks, but he could not get the consent of Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury.

A great change took place gradually in the exercises and discipline of monks, which at this time was very striking. From the time of Lewis le Debonnaire bodily labour came to be considered as unworthy of monks, on account of most of them being then clergymen. To supply this defect of labour, the recitation of psalms was added to all the offices. Tho' bodily labour was required by the rule of Clugny, Ulric, who gives an account of it, says he saw nothing of it, but shelling beans, weeding the garden, and kneading the bread, and that not every day. They sung in going to their work, or returning from it, and also during the work itself. So much devotion, says Fleury, was good in itself; but it would have been better to have adhered to the antient customs, since so many offices lessened the time for study, as well as labour, and the offices themselves were repeated more negligently.

Much account was made of silence in this monastery, especially at meals. Nothing was said at certain hours, as between *prime* and *tierce*, or between *none* and *vespres*; and this interval was very short. Nothing was said in the church, the dormitory, the refectory, or the kitchen; and  
when

when necessity required that they should make themselves understood, they did it by means of signs.

To give a just idea of the character and manners of this age, it will be useful to recite the more remarkable instances of *austerity* that occur in the course of it; and the high esteem in which the most painful and disgusting austerities were held shews the prevailing opinions of the times.

Romuald, a famous solitary of Lombardy, at the end of the tenth century, said, that he who would be perfect ought to eat every day that he might feel hunger every day. For fifteen years he had been used to eat only on Saturdays and Sundays.

Of Nil, a solitary in Calabria, it is said that, one year he drank only once a month. He often fasted the whole of Lent, without eating or drinking, except receiving the eucharist. He slept only one hour in the night, and then recited the psalter, making five hundred genuflexions, after which he said the nocturnal prayers and the matins.

But the greatest champion of monkish austerity in this or any other age was one Dominic, the friend of P. Damiani bishop of Ostia, who published an account of him. His relations having sent a buckskin to a bishop, in order to get him made a priest, he abstained thro' life from acting

in

in that capacity, and devoted himself to the life of a hermit at Luccoli in Umbria, submitting to the directions of P. Damiani, whose cell was then near to his own.

For many years he wore next to his skin a coat of mail, which he never put off except for the sake of flagellation, and on this account he got the name of *cuirassier*. He never passed a day without repeating the psalter twice, whipping himself at the same time with both hands, a handful of rods in each. But during Lent, or when he did penance for any other person, he repeated at least three psalters a day, giving himself discipline in the same manner. He often repeated two psalters without intermission, always disciplining himself, and standing upright, without once sitting down, or ceasing one moment to beat himself. He made an hundred genuflexions in the recital of every fifteen psalms, or a thousand in the whole psalter. At one time he repeated the whole psalter eight times in the course of a day and night, but then he did not repeat every word audibly, but only mentally. And exerting himself to the utmost, he once repeated the psalter twelve times as far as the thirteenth psalm in one day.

Being informed that by repeating twelve particular psalms eighty times, and holding the arms in the form of a cross, a great penance might be redeemed;

deemed, he repeated those twelve psalms in that manner eighty times without resting himself. In repeating the psalms, he added the *canticles*, several other hymns, the Athanasian creed, and the litany, which were added to the antient psalters. It was a prevailing opinion that since ten years of penance were due for one homicide, twenty homicides would require a hundred years of penance, and that an hundred years of penance might be commuted by the recital of twenty psalters, accompanied with discipline. Also three thousand strokes with a whip were deemed equivalent to a year of penance; and a thousand lashes were given in the recital of ten psalters. Consequently, the one hundred and fifty psalms were equivalent to five years of penance, and twenty psalters to an hundred years. Dominic performed this penance of an hundred years in six days. At the beginning of Lent he once required of Damiani to impose upon him a penance of a thousand years, and he had nearly performed it before the end of it.

Besides his other austerities, Dominic wore four rings of iron, two on his thighs, and two on his legs; and after some time he added four others. Notwithstanding this severe penance, he lived to a great age, and died in A. D. 1062. From his example flagellation, which had been little used before,

before, came into fashion with religious people, women as well as men.

Rodolf bishop of Eugubio, another friend of P. Damiani, recited the psalter at least once every day, giving himself discipline with both his hands. He often charged himself with an hundred years of penance, which he performed in twenty days.

Tho' the great lords of this age often made very light of excommunications, and every thing relating to ecclesiastical discipline, we meet with some examples of a rigorous compliance with it. Otho III, as a penance for some crime which he had committed, walked barefoot from Rome to mount Garganus, fasting, and singing psalms all the way, wearing a hair cloth next his skin, tho' over it he wore a garment of gold and purple; and tho' he had a bed of slate in his room, he slept on a mat of reeds.

In those superstitious times even the laity, and independently of any penance, were made to restrain the gratification of their appetites, and submit to certain restrictions. Fasting in the forty days of Lent was universally exacted; and marriage could not be celebrated in this season of mortification, even tho' the consummation was deferred till it was over. At a council in Benevento in A. D. 1091 it was forbidden to celebrate marriage from *Septuagesima*, till the octave of Whitsuntide;

funtide, and also from advent to the octave of Epiphany.

Several persons, and some in the highest ranks of life, made a merit of living in continence even when they were married. When the emperor Henry II died in A. D. 1024 he sent for the relations of the empress Cunegund, and declared to them, that he restored her to them as much a virgin as he had received her. This emperor after his death was canonized. Also Edward the Confessor of England declared on his death bed, that he had lived with his wife as with a sister.

---

## SECTION V.

*Of the Progress of Christianity, and of the State of the Jews and Christian Sectaries in this Period.*

CHRISTIANITY made some progress in this period, tho' the manner of its propagation did not much resemble that in which it was promoted in the primitive times. But at this time it was a very different thing, and every thing relating to it was conducted in a different manner.

In A. D. 965 Micislas, duke of Poland, was converted to Christianity in consequence of his

having married Dobrava, a sister of Boleslas king of Bohemia, who was a Christian. The apostle of the Slavonic nations in general was Adalbert, the first archbishop of Magdeburgh, who also preached to the Russians. But the conversion of the Russians is most properly dated from the reign of Vladimir, who had married a sister of the Greek emperor in A. D. 989. Geisa, duke of Hungary, who died in A. D. 997, and who had married his son Stephen to Giselle sister of the emperor Henry II, embraced Christianity, and promoted the conversion of his subjects, and this was fully accomplished by Stephen himself. In the time of Constantine Monomachus, two chiefs of the Patzinaches, a Scythian nation, became converts to Christianity; in order to be assisted by the emperor against their prince who had used them ill; so that, as Fleury says, these conversions seem to have been a little interested.

Tho' there were not many martyrs in these conversions, yet a few persons are mentioned as having suffered in consequence of them. Brunon, who took the name of Boniface, of a noble family in Saxony, was put to death by the Russians, to whom he went to preach in A. D. 1009. \* Also Adalbert bishop of Prague was murdered, as he  
was

\* The writer of the notes to Mosheim says that he did not suffer martyrdom in Russia. Vol. 2. p. 230.

was preaching to the Prussians in A. D. 997. And Gotheschalck, prince of the Sclavi, was killed by his pagan subjects, when he was endeavouring to convert them in A. D. 1065. Several others suffered with him.

These national conversions could not be supposed to have been grounded on conviction; and accordingly there occur in this period several instances of relapses into idolatry. All the time of the Otho's the Sclavi between the Elbe and the Eider made profession of Christianity; but in A. D. 1013 they revolted from their subjection to the princes of Saxony, and at the same time renounced their religion, tho' they had professed it sixty years. The exaction of tythes was very near overturning Christianity in Poland in the beginning of the eleventh century. Some of the lords said that this religion was insupportable; they would not go to church, and driving the priests from them, returned to their antient superstitions. But Boleslas arrested the principal of them, and punished them with death. In A. D. 1047 the Hungarians, being dissatisfied with their king Peter, demanded permission to live as heathens, according to their antient customs, and to kill the bishops and priests. Their chiefs, it is said, thought proper to comply with their demands, but they were soon after brought back to the profession of Christianity.

The Jews were great sufferers by the prejudice and violence of the Christians in this period. The church of the holy sepulchre of Jerusalem being destroyed by the Saracens, and, as it was thought, at the instigation of the Jews, they were, in the beginning of the eleventh century, persecuted in a cruel manner in all Christian countries, at least in the West. It was resolved by common consent to banish them. Many were drowned, and put to death in other ways, and some destroyed themselves. The bishops forbade all Christians having any intercourse with them. Many to avoid death submitted to be baptized, but soon after returned to their former customs. It appeared, however, that the account of the guilt of the Jews in this business had no foundation in truth, and the bearer of the letter which produced all the mischief being discovered, he was severely whipped, and confessing his crime, was condemned to be burned to death.

In A. D. 1012 the emperor Henry banished all Jews from Mayence. It appears from the letters of Alexander II to the bishops of Gaul, that those Christians who went to fight against the Saracens made a merit of killing the Jews they met with. For this pope praises them for protecting the Jews from those persons, and highly condemns the practice.

The

The crusaders made a point of massacring all the Jews they met with in their passage to the holy land. The most moderate account says that going by Cologne, Mentz, Worms, and Spire, they killed or drowned, from April to July, five thousand persons, and compelled great numbers to renounce their religion. Christian historians say that fourteen hundred were burned in Mentz only, and as they made resistance, one half of the city was reduced to ashes. Those of Worms took refuge with the bishop, but he would not receive them, except on the condition of their becoming Christians. Those, however, who did so abjured Christianity when the storm was over. Many killed themselves. At Treves the women, seeing the crusaders approach, killed their own children, saying it was better to send them to Abraham's bosom than abandon them to the Christians. The bishop of Spire shewed more humanity. He not only protected those who took refuge with him, but caused some of those who persecuted them to be hanged. The annalists of Bavaria say that twelve thousand were killed in their country. Others make this number much greater. This persecution was not confined to Germany, thro' which the crusaders passed, but was a general one, extending to England, France, Spain, and Italy. With the account of this persecution the Jewish

historian R. Gans concludes his history; saying the stench of it was insupportable. *Basnage*, Vol. 9. p. 100. 193. 196. Abarbinel considers this as the most cruel of all the persecutions of his nation. A greater number of Jews, he says, left Spain on this account than left Egypt under Moses. *Ib.* 481.

We cannot expect much calm discussion of the question between the Jews and Christians in this period; and yet we find some recourse had to argument. In Africa a Jew asked leave of the Fatemite Calif Mouaz to have a conference with the Christians in his presence. This was granted, and it is said that the Jew was confuted by Severus, a celebrated doctor among the Jacobites. Several works of this Severus are extant, especially a history of the patriarchs of Alexandria, now in the public library at Paris.

About the year A. D. 1076, Samuel, a converted Jew of Morocco, wrote a treatise addressed to another Jew of the name of Isaac in favour of Christianity; alleging particularly the long continuance of their sufferings since the death of Christ, so much exceeding that of the Babylonish captivity, and distinguishing the two comings of the Messiah. *Pictet*, A. D. 1072.

In the beginning of the eleventh century there were several eminent Jewish doctors in Spain, and among

among them Isaac Alphosi, who came from Fez in Africa, and another Isaac, the son of Baruch. *Pictet*, A. D. 1004.

Notwithstanding the overbearing influence of the church of Rome, supported by all the secular powers of Europe, there were at all times, and especially in the lower orders of men, those who rejected the doctrines, and refused to conform to the discipline, of that church. Such were the disciples of Clement and Adalbert in a preceding period, and such were the Priscillianists in the West, and the Paulicians in the East. Both these sects were very numerous; and tho' grievously persecuted, they were by no means extinguished. We now find an union probably of both these under the appellation of *Manicheans*, in several parts of France, and it is certain they held several of the distinguishing principles of the Gnostics, from which those of the Manicheans were a branch. That remains of Priscillianists should now appear in France will not be thought extraordinary, since they were not only in Spain, but also in the south of France in a former period; but the Paulicians, persecuted in Asia Minor, were received in Bulgaria; and when they were driven from thence they went to Italy, and other parts of the West; and those who are now called Manicheans in France are said to have come from Italy. *Mosheim*,

Vol. 2. p. 346. They are frequently called *Populicani*, which some think to have been a corruption of *Paulicians* (*Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 347.) and *Patarini*, from *Patavia*, a district in the duchy of Milan.\* This term came at length to be used to denote all kinds of heretics. *Ib.* p. 285. In France they were called *Albigenses*, not, as has been supposed, from their chiefly residing in the town of Alby, but because their tenets were condemned in a council held there. *Ib.* p. 347.

We find the first distinct mention of them in the beginning of the eleventh century. We have no writings of theirs, by which to judge of their principles; but if we may at all depend upon the accounts of their enemies, they rejected the doctrine of the trinity, they disbelieved the creation of the world, supposing probably that matter was eternal, and the world formed out of it by some evil being. They denied that Christ was born of a virgin, by which they meant that his flesh was not derived from her but was a creation in her womb. They are said also to have denied the death and resurrection of Christ, but with respect to this it is probable they made the distinction of the antient Gnostics, believing that he died

\* Giannone says they were called *Paterini* from their readiness to suffer for their religion. Vol. 1. p. 663.

died only in appearance. But the greatest offence they gave was their rejecting the miserable but gainful superstitions of the times respecting the rites of the church, and the powers of the clergy. Baptism they said did not wash away sin, and they were the first who denied it to infants, while they administered it to adults. *Wall's History of Infant baptism.* Vol. 2. p. 177.

They maintained that the eucharistical elements did not become the body and blood of Christ by consecration, and that it was useless to pray to the saints. They condemned marriage from the principle that matter was the source of all evil, and that it is our great business to mortify the body; and they forbade eating flesh meat. Like the primitive Christians, they were charged, but no doubt falsely, with the promiscuous use of women, and with privately killing young children, and other enormities.

A society of these persons being betrayed by one who belonged to the court of the duke of Normandy (and who had pretended to join them) was brought before the council of Orleans in A. D. 1022; when, being charged with holding the opinions abovementioned, they declared that such had always been their belief, and they hoped that even that assembly would embrace their doctrines, as they were the pure truth. Being asked, among

other questions, whether they did not believe that God the Father created every thing out of nothing by his son, they replied, " You may tell these tales to those who have earthly thoughts, and who believe the inventions of carnal men, written on the skins of animals; but it is in vain that you talk in this manner to us who have the law written by the spirit of God in the inner man. But make an end, and do with us whatever you please."

The disputation with them at this council continued from day light till three in the afternoon, when they were threatened with being burned alive if they did not renounce their opinions, but they professed that they did not fear death in any form. After this those of them who were priests were formally degraded, and the queen, who had the charge of the door, with her own ring struck out the eye of one of them of the name of Stephen, who had been her own confessor. Of thirteen of them only one man, who was of the clergy, and one woman, who is said to have been a nun, recanted; all the rest went with the greatest cheerfulness to the stake, and were burned alive. It now appearing that one Theodat, a singer in the same church, who had been dead three years, was in the same heresy, they dug up his body, refusing him Christian burial. Others of these heretics

were

were burned at Thouloufe, and other places; for they were found in many parts of the West.

More of these Manicheans, as they are called, were found at Arras in A. D. 1025, by some persons who came from Italy, when Gerard the bishop of that city caused some of them to be seized; and after questioning them, he put them in prison. Then, proceeding with great solemnity in the business, he ordered a fast of his clergy, in order to procure their conversion. On the third day after this, being Sunday, he went in great state to the cathedral church, and delivered a discourse on the subject. He then questioned them concerning the person from whom they learned their tenets, when they mentioned one Gandolf from Italy, saying that he taught them to receive no other scriptures than the gospels and the acts of the apostles. Having been informed that they rejected baptism and the Lord's supper, with the other ordinances of the church, he put questions to them on those subjects, and in reply to what the bishop had said with respect to them, they said, "Our  
" doctrine consists in abandoning the world, re-  
" pressing the desires of the flesh, living by the la-  
" bour of our hands, doing wrong to nobody, and  
" exercising charity towards our brethren. In ob-  
" serving these things we think we have no need of  
" baptism, and if we violate these things baptism  
" will

“ will not avail us.” They likewise urged the bad lives of the clergy who administered baptism.

To this the bishop replied with the usual arguments, alleging the baptism of the eunuch and of Cornelius, and saying that the unworthiness of the minister does not prevent the efficacy of the sacrament, &c. &c. Being probably terrified, for we can hardly suppose that they were really convinced, by what they must have often heard before (and from other accounts it appeared that they had been put to the torture, *Pictet*, A. D. 1025.) they acknowledged themselves to have been in an error, and the bishop continued his instructions on the subject of material churches, which they had treated with contempt, as mere heaps of stone, together with the altar, the incense, and the bells. He also explained to his audience the nature and use of the ecclesiastical orders; for they had despised all external worship, thinking it to be a matter of indifference who were their ministers, in what place they exercised it, or where they buried their dead; funeral ceremonies being the invention of avaricious priests. He also instructed them in the use of penance, which he maintained to be serviceable even to the dead. For, said he, a person may perform the penance which his friend was prevented from doing by death. He defended the necessity of grace against what he called the false righteousness.

righteousness of these heretics; from which it is probable that they had laid great stress on personal virtue, in opposition to every thing that superstition and false notions had substituted in the place of it. On this occasion he also defended the lawfulness of marriage, which they were said to have denied. He concluded with pronouncing a solemn condemnation of all the articles of their doctrine, and sent an account of this synod, as it is called, to a neighbouring bishop, who is supposed to have been that of Liege, to guard him against those heretics, who were so disguised in his diocese as to have passed undiscovered.

The emperor Henry I, finding many of these Manicheans at Goslar, when he celebrated the festival of Christmas there in A. D. 1051, by the advice of bishops and lords who were assembled on that occasion, ordered them to be hanged, lest their heresy should extend farther. We shall find, however, in the subsequent periods of their history, that this heresy was not to be prevented from spreading by these measures.

The controversy that chiefly agitated the Latin church in this period was that with Berenger concerning the eucharist. He was a native of Tours, and master of a school there. He also taught in that city after he was made archdeacon of Angers. He seems to have imbibed some of the sentiments

of

of the Manicheans; for he is said to have disputed against the baptism of infants, and also against marriage, as well as to have maintained the doctrine of John Scotus against Paschasius on the subject of the eucharist. Being opposed by Lanfranc, then prior of the abbey of Bec in Normandy, he wrote him a letter of friendly expostulation; telling him that if he condemned the opinion of John Scotus, as heretical, he must condemn Ambrose, Jerom, Austin, and many others.

Berenger was universally allowed to be a man of a most excellent private character. William of Malmſbury ſays he was regarded by ſome as a ſaint, and commended for having done an infinity of good works. Hildebert biſhop of Mans, who St. Bernard ſays was a man worthy of all reſpect, and a firm pillar of the church, wrote his epitaph; and greater praiſe could not be given to any man than is given to him in it. *Pictet*, A. D. 1050.

The firſt who publiſhed any thing againſt Berenger was Hugo biſhop of Langres, in A. D. 1050, who exhorted him not to maintain ſingular opinions. For, ſays he, you ſee the eucharift with other eyes than the generality of Chriſtians. By this time the doctrine of Paſchasius of the real preſence, and the change of the elements into the body and blood of Chriſt, was probably the general opinion, tho' it was a long time in becoming ſo.

Bereng.

Berenger's arguments against it must have made a great impression on many, and have excited much attention. For in a council held at Rome in A. D. 1050 his doctrine was condemned, and himself excommunicated. On this he retired to Normandy, where he had conferences on the subject of his doctrine with the clergy of Briene, and of Chartres, the former in the presence of William duke of Normandy. In these conferences, far from appearing to have been intimidated by the acts of the late council at Rome, he is said to have treated the church of Rome as heretical, not even excepting pope Leo.

Berenger, continuing refractory, was cited to appear at a council at Verceil in the same year, when pope Leo IX presided; but he did not attend. In this council the treatise of John Scotus concerning the eucharist was read, condemned, and publicly burned; and the opinion of Berenger was also censured. Two clergymen who then attended for him were said to have been confounded, so as to be unable to defend him, and they were arrested.

Notwithstanding these solemn condemnations, the opinion of Berenger continued to spread so much in France, as to give much alarm. King Henry hearing of it, by the advice of his bishops and lords, appointed a council to be held on the  
sub-

subject at Paris, and Berenger himself was ordered to attend. He did not, however, go thither, but continued with Brunon bishop of Langres, who was of the same opinion with him; but a letter of his to a friend, which had been intercepted, was read at this council, and was heard with much indignation; and his doctrine and the treatise of Scotus were again condemned. In consequence of this, the king, who was himself abbot of St. Martin's at Tours, ordered the revenue of Berenger from that abbey to be withdrawn. On this Berenger wrote a letter of remonstrance to that prince, by means of a friend, who had access to him, in which he said it was unjust in the council of Verceil to condemn John Scotus, who wrote at the request of king Charles the Bald, a prince who had the greatest zeal for religion, lest the errors of ignorant and stupid people should prevail.

This letter does not appear to have had any effect, and the firmness of Berenger did not hold out much longer. For at a council held at Tours in A. D. 1054, where Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, attended, Berenger and Lanfranc, who was for some time suspected of favouring him, being introduced, the former made a public recantation of his doctrine, and was received into communion. Also, at another council held in Rome in A. D. 1059, Berenger made a more solemn re-  
tracta-

tractation of his opinion, declaring that if he should ever think or preach otherwise than as the church prescribed he would submit to the severity of the canons. He even himself lighted a fire in the midst of the council, and threw into it the book which contained his opinions. But as soon as he was out of the council he wrote against the confession he had there made of his faith, inveighing against cardinal Humbert, who had drawn it up for him.

On this occasion Lanfranc addressed an epistle to Berenger, particularly reproaching him for teaching in private what for fear of death he had denied before the council; and in reply to Berenger's saying that, it was impossible that the same body of Christ could be in heaven at the same time that it was eaten by the communicants, he said, "It is a mystery of faith, useful to be believed, but not useful to be examined."

The doctrine of the eucharist was again discussed at the council of Rouen in A. D. 1074, and with so much warmth that Berenger, who was present, was near being killed. And about the same time Guimond, a Spanish monk and a disciple of Lanfranc, distinguished himself by writing against Berenger, beginning with reproaching him for his affectation of superior wisdom, when he was very young. What handle Berenger had given for this does not now appear, nor is it all to

the purpose. With respect to the argument, what is advanced by Guimond is particularly curious. In answer to the objection that all the communicants cannot receive a whole Christ, he says, that “not only does every single host contain a whole Christ, but every particle of every host; and tho’ a thousand masses were celebrated at the same time, all the communicants receive the one only indivisible body of Christ. It is,” he says, “only to the senses that a single particle of a host seems less than the whole, but the senses often deceive us.” He owns that it is difficult to *understand* this transmutation of the elements. But says it is not difficult to *believe* it, the only question being whether God wills the change. However he illustrates the subject by saying, that when a man speaks, the same voice is heard intire by the greatest multitude.

Some of the disciples of Berenger having maintained what they called the doctrine of *impanation*, which was that the real body of Christ, and the substance of bread and wine existed together, Guimond replied to them as well as to Berenger himself. He said the Berengarians could not be the true church of Christ, because they did not occupy a single city, or even a village. The question, he says, is of infinite moment, eternal life depending upon it, In the last place, he replies to those  
who

who said that the elements ceased to be the body of Christ to unworthy communicants. Durandus also, the abbot of Trouarn in Normandy, wrote against Berenger; but he advanced nothing new. Thus at this time ended the famous controversy concerning what was afterwards called the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, and which came to be the most distinguishing article of the church of Rome.

But tho' nothing more was *written* in the time of Berenger, something more was *done*. At the council held in Rome in A. D. 1078, being urged to renounce his error, he gave a short confession of his faith, and obtained a delay of his sentence till the next council in the Lent following. At this council some of the bishops maintained that the elements were only a figure, which looks as if Berenger was not without the support of some persons of eminence in the church; but this opinion was set aside, and it was agreed that the elements were the real body of Christ, and Berenger was induced to sign an ample recantation of all that he had taught to the contrary; and in consequence of this he was dismissed, and solemnly charged to teach nothing more concerning the eucharist, except with a view to recover those whom he had led into error. But, as before, he was no sooner in France, than he wrote against this last confession, as he

had done against the former, which had been extorted from him in the same manner.

In France Berenger must have had many and very powerful friends; for, notwithstanding his persisting in his opinion, we find him at a council at Bourdeaux in A. D. 1080; but what passed there is not said, except that he there gave an account of his faith. He lived eight years after this in a state of retirement near Tours, dying in A. D. 1088, and in communion with the church. He was much commended for his charity to the poor, and two of the best poets of the age composed magnificent epitaphs for him.

The opinion of Berenger did not die with him; for it was thought necessary to condemn it once more at the council of Placentia in A. D. 1095, when it was declared that the bread and wine, duly consecrated at the altar, are not only a figure, but changed truly and essentially into the body and blood of Christ.

The doctrine concerning the nature of the presence of Christ in the eucharist was not settled in the time of Berenger, and the confessions of his faith which he was required to give from time to time varied from each other. He adhered to that which he had subscribed in the two first Roman councils approved by Gregory VII. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 338.

Folk-

Folkheim abbot of Lobes, in the bishoprick of Liege, wrote against the real presence; and Hereger, who succeeded him, made a collection of passages from the Fathers against the doctrine of Paschasius. *Pictet*, A. D. 1007.

It is probable that, in this period, there were many of the disciples of Clement and Adalbert, who refused to communicate with the Romish church. For at a council held at Amalphi in A. D. 1089, the clergy called *Accephali*, or those who had no connection with the Catholic bishops were condemned, and also some vagabond monks.

There was some little discussion of the doctrine of the *trinity* in this period, in consequence of what was advanced by Roscellin, a celebrated teacher, but rather of logic, than of theology. He said that the three divine persons were *three things*, as distinct from each other as three angels, tho' they had but one will, and one power. Otherwise, he said, it would follow that both the Father and the Holy Spirit must have been incarnate, as well as the Son; that, indeed, strictly speaking, they should have been called *three Gods*, but custom had not authorized it. Lanfranc and Anselm he said were of the same opinion. As this was an age in which many persons began to speculate on metaphysical and theological subjects, this doctrine was considered in a council held by Renauld archbishop of

Rheims at Compeigne in A. D. 1092, and condemned; and Anselm, hearing what Roscellin had said concerning his opinion on the subject, sent to this council to disclaim it, and vouching the same for Lanfranc, who was then dead. He said he should not argue with Roscellin on the subject, giving this curious reason for it. "Our faith," he said, "must be defended by reason against infidels, but not against those who bear the name of Christians;" meaning probably that in their case it was sufficient to appeal to the authority of the church, which they allowed. Roscellin himself appeared at this council, and abjured his opinion; but, like Berenger, he still continued to teach it, saying he had abjured because he was afraid of being knocked on the head by the populace.

Anselm, who may be said to have been the father of that subtle method of reasoning on theological subjects which, being used in schools, afterwards obtained the name of *scholastic*, wrote a treatise to solve the question, "why God became man, in order to give life to the world by his death," when he might have effected the same purpose by means of an angel, or a mere man, or by his sole will and power; which shews, that the principle of what is now called the doctrine of *atonement* was by no means established at this time.

Some,

Some, who were called *Anthropomorphites*, were found in this period. For RATHERIUS, bishop of Verona, wrote against them. This doctrine, it has been seen, was held with peculiar obstinacy by many monks in the East.

Towards the end of the tenth century an opinion prevailed that the world would come to an end in the year one thousand after Christ. Many of the donations that were made to the church about this time expressed this opinion; the writings beginning with the phrase *the end of the world being at hand*, &c. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 218. *Abbon*, the abbot of Fleury at that time, says he observed this error, and refuted it from the Gospels, the Revelation, and the book of Daniel.

About the same time many persons, fond of the ancient poets, abandoned the scriptures, and took their faith from them. This was too alarming an evil to be suffered to spread. One of these persons was condemned by the bishop of Ravenna, and others, it is said, were destroyed by fire and sword; but we have no satisfactory account of these transactions. At this time also there appeared, as it is said, several heretics, but their tenets are not mentioned, in Sardinia, "fertile in such evils, who corrupted some Christians in Spain; but they were exterminated by the Catholics." This deluge of errors was thought to

be the accomplishment of the prophecy of St. John, who said that Satan would be let loose after a thousand years.

---



---

## SECTION VI.

*Of the Intercourse between the Greek and Latin Churches in this Period.*

SOME communication between the church of Constantinople and that of Rome in this period was occasioned by a letter sent by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of the former of these cities, to John bishop of Trani in Apulia, in which he reproached the Latins for several of their customs, as their using unleavened bread in the eucharist, eating things strangled, and consequently blood, fasting on saturdays, &c. This letter being carried to pope Leo IX, he treated with great indignation this censure of the church of Rome, as if they who had been instructed by the apostle Peter had then to learn how to celebrate the eucharist. He particularly insisted upon the donation of Constantine, as an argument for the preeminence of the see of Rome, reproached the Greeks for making bishops of eunuchs, and shutting up the churches of the Latins in the East; whereas the Greeks were per-

permitted to have churches and monasteries in Rome, where they used their own customs without molestation.

At this time, however, the emperor Constantine Monomachus, wanting the assistance of the Western empire to oppose the Normans in Italy, wrote to the pope, to express his concern at the difference that subsisted between the two churches; and he obliged the patriarch Michael to write to the pope to the same purpose. This was towards the end of the year A. D. 1053. In return, the pope sent three legates, with letters to the emperor and to the patriarch. To the former he expressed his satisfaction in his overtures for peace and concord, he gave an account of his transactions with the Normans; and expressed his willingness to concur with the emperor in repressing them; but he complained of the patriarch Michael, for anathematizing those who administered the eucharist with unleavened bread, and for his attempts to bring into subjection to himself the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria; and added that, if he did not desist from his pretensions, he could have no peace with him. In his letter to the patriarch he complained of the same things in still stronger terms. The legates who carried these letters were received with every mark of honour; but there was too much pride on both sides for a reconciliation.

Cardinal Humbert, who was the chief of this embassy, on his arrival at Constantinople, drew up a long answer to all the accusations of Michael against the Latins. On the subject of eating things strangled and blood, he denied the charge; saying it was only permitted in case of famine. At the same time he also replied to somethings that had been written by Nicetas a monk, on the controversy between the two churches; and because Nicetas had said that communion breaks the fast, the cardinal concluded, that in his opinion the eucharistical elements were subject to the process of digestion, and the consequences of it, like other food; and for holding this opinion, which to him appeared so unworthy of a Christian, he called him a *Stercorarist*. In this treatise the cardinal also reproached the Greeks with the marriage of their priests, and on this account he calls them *Nicolaitans*. For the Greeks allow the marriage of a priest to a virgin before their consecration. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 286.

This controversy was not calculated to answer the purpose of the emperor; and by some means or other Nicetas was brought to retract every thing that he had written against the Latins, in the presence of the legates and of the emperor, and even to anathematize those who denied that the church  
of

of Rome was the first of all the churches ; and after this they received the communion together.

But the patriarch proving more refractory, so as even to refuse to have any communication with the legates, they went to the church of St. Sophia, and in the presence of the clergy and people laid on the great altar a writing which contained a formal excommunication of him, and then, going out, shook off the dust from their feet. After this, having regulated the Latin churches in Constantinople, and pronounced an anathema against those who should communicate with any Greek who censured the eucharist of the Latins, they took leave of the emperor with the kiss of peace. The act of excommunication contained a recital of all the charges of the Latins against the Greeks, and among them they particularly mentioned their taking from the creed the words *filioque*, their refusing baptism to children who died before the eighth day, and the communion to women in child bed.

Michael, not intimidated, but greatly provoked at this proceeding, caused a copy of the writing which contained the form of excommunication to be publicly burned ; and affecting not to believe that the legates were sent by the pope, he anathematized all those who had advised, published, or written, the excommunication, and all their accom-

accomplices. In this twelve metropolitans and two archbishops concurred with him. The original of the writing was not burned but preserved, as the patriarch said, for the perpetual condemnation of those who had uttered such blasphemies; and this anathema of his was ordered to be read every twenty-fourth day of July, being the day on which it was customary to read the decrees of the five general councils.

Thus ended the intercourse between the two churches, without producing any advantage to either of them, or in the least degree leading to a reconciliation. In a correspondence which Michael had with Peter the patriarch of Antioch immediately after this, he enumerated every article of difference between the two churches, magnifying their importance; and saying that what was most intolerable in the conduct of the legates, was their saying they did not come to Constantinople to be instructed, but to instruct, and make us adopt their opinions. At all times, and more especially at this period, the Greeks considered the Latins as little better than barbarians; so that the pride of the Greek patriarch could not but have been exceedingly hurt by such contemptuous behaviour of those whom he could not but regard with contempt.

Peter,

Peter, to whom Michael addressed himself on this occasion, appears to have been a man of more good sense and moderation, and he endeavoured to recommend the same pacific principles to his correspondent; freely telling him, that some of his charges were aggravated, and others mere calumnies, and desiring him to neglect all the rest, and only lay any stress on the addition the Latins had made to the creed. The question about leavened or unleavened bread in the eucharist, he said, was of little consequence, and should not be insisted on, lest the breach between the two churches, from which innumerable evils had flowed, should be made wider. To this friendly remonstrance Michael made no particular reply. He only said that he had thought it right to inform him, and the other patriarchs, of his situation, that they might better know how to conduct themselves, if they were applied to on the subject.

In Italy every thing was conducted according to the will of the popes. At a council at Bari A. D. 1098, where pope Urban was present, and which was attended by one hundred and eighty-three bishops, among whom was Anselm, then in a state of exile from England, the question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit was proposed by the Greeks, and openly discussed, they maintaining that it was from the Father only. But the  
pope

pope himself replied to them, making use of arguments drawn from a treatise which Anselm had just published on the incarnation; and calling Anselm himself to sit near him, and desiring him to speak on the subject, he complied, and delivered himself, it is said, with so much force and perspicuity, that all the assembly was satisfied, and pronounced an anathema against all those who denied that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, and not from the Father only. But this was not in Greece.

---

## SECTION VII.

### *The History of the first Crusade.*

**W**ITHIN this period of my history we have the commencement of a series of military expeditions, of which I must give a brief relation, since they were undertaken on the account of religion, such as then chiefly actuated the Christian world. Besides, they were in their own nature very extraordinary, and had many important consequences. The *crusades*, to which I refer, or expeditions made by the Christians of the West, with a view to wrest from the Mahometan powers the possession of Jerusalem and the holy land (to which,

which, as a favourite pilgrimage, there had long been a prodigious resort) appear the more extraordinary, as, at this time, not only were the European kingdoms in general in a state of war with each other, but even the particular lords in a state of almost constant hostility; so that it was not probable they would trust one another, or agree in any thing. Yet in this case, as if they had been all actuated by one soul, they at once overlooked all their differences, and united as one man in a series of distant and hazardous expeditions. But they were taught to consider them as of the most meritorious nature, and a certain road to heaven, whether, with respect to the event, they should be successful or not. Foolish and ruinous in the extreme as these expeditions are now universally considered, it does not appear that, at that time, or indeed long after, any person objected to them; and the habits of warfare, in which all the European states then were, sufficiently prepared them for this undertaking, and recommended it to them.

The first intimation that we meet with of any scheme of this kind is in a letter of Gregory VII to king Henry IV, in which he says, that he had been applied to by the Christians in the East, to relieve them from the oppression under which they then groaned, that he had endeavoured to excite  
all

all Christians to give their lives for their brethren, that there were already fifty thousand ready to march if they could have him to lead them, and that he was determined to go in person, even to the holy sepulchre, especially as the Greek church was desirous of being united to that of Rome, and as almost all the Christians in the East were disposed to receive their faith from it. He therefore asked the king's advice and assistance. For, says he, if I make this voyage, I must leave the Roman church to your care. Having received an embassy from the emperor Michael, he sent legates in return in A. D. 1074; and wrote to all the Christian princes in the West, urging them to march to the assistance of their brethren in the East. Such was the spirit and magnanimity of this pontiff, that, had it not been for his quarrel with Henry, he would, no doubt, have undertaken, and have gone thro' with, this expedition.

At this time the emperors of the East being much reduced, both by foreign enemies, and internal dissentions, they were very desirous of getting assistance from the West; and every attempt that they had made for an union of the two churches had never had any other object. At the council of Placentia in A. D. 1094, the emperor Alexis Comnenus sent ambassadors to pope Urban, earnestly begging his assistance, and that of all  
Christians

Christians against the infidel's, and in defence of the church, which was almost destroyed in the East. For the Mahometans were advanced almost to the very walls of Constantinople. The pope did not fail to second this application, so that many persons then took an oath to undertake the expedition, and aid the emperor according to their power.

But the immediate occasion of the crusade was a report of the state of Christianity in the East brought by a hermit of the name of Peter, of the diocese of Amiens, a man distinguished by his austerity, who always travelled barefoot, or mounted on an ass. From a principle of devotion he had made a pilgrimage to visit our Saviour's sepulchre at Jerusalem, where he was much affected to see the condition in which he found the holy place there; under the dominion of the Mahometans, the situation of the temple occupied by a mosque, and stables adjoining to the church of the holy sepulchre.

Conversing on the subject with Simeon the Christian patriarch, he asked him if there was no remedy for those evils. The patriarch replied, that they had no expectation of any assistance from the Greeks, who, tho' rich, were not able to defend them; but that there might be some hope if the Christians in the West, who were more powerful, would interest themselves in their favour. To this

Peter replied, that if he and his brethren would give him letters to the pope, and the Christian princes, informing them of the true state of things and requesting their help, he would not only deliver them, but would spare no pains to solicit succours for them; and to this they readily acceded.

With these letters Peter waited on the pope, and with his own hands he delivered the letters addressed to the princes of Europe, and he urged not only them, but all persons wherever he went, to comply with their contents. And such was his zeal and eloquence that by the time which the pope had fixed for a council to meet at Clermont in A. D. 1095, the subject had become generally interesting, and the minds of men were well prepared to receive any proposal relating to it.

When all business of an ecclesiastical nature was settled at this council, the pope addressed the numerous assembly of bishops and princes on this subject; informing them of the miserable state of Christianity in the East, and especially the dangers to which pilgrims were exposed in visiting the holy places at Jerusalem, exhorting them to turn their arms from one another against the common enemy of the Christian name, and by this means make satisfaction to God for their many murders, ravages, and other crimes; promising a full remission of all their sins, to those who would take arms in this  
cause,

cause, and assuring them that all their possessions would be under the protection of the church; for that, if any person should disturb them in their absence on this expedition, they should be excommunicated till ample satisfaction was made; and that the bishops and priests who did not join in this should be suspended from their functions.

Remigius, a monk of Rheims, who was present, says that when the pope had done speaking, all the assembly were so moved that, with one voice, they cried *Dieu le volt* (*God wills it*) Silence being obtained, the pope rose again, and said that this unanimity in their cry must have arisen from inspiration, and was a sure omen of their success. Those words he said should be those with which they should rush to battle. He then said that those who went on the expedition should distinguish themselves by wearing a cross on their garments, and that those who were not able to go in person, should assist by their money, and other means.

When they had received absolution; and the benediction of the pope, they chose Adhemar bishop of Puy, a man well informed in both ecclesiastical and civil affairs, for a leader; and when, after some difficulty, he accepted the command, the pope gave him the powers of his legate. But soon after this they were informed that Raymond count of Thoulouse had taken the cross, and would

go on the expedition, with many knights ; so that the crusade had two leaders, an ecclesiastic and a layman. To encourage them, the pope again declared that, they who took the cross on that occasion should be excused from all other kinds of penance, in consideration of the danger of fighting, to which they would be exposed ; and he ordered all the bishops to preach the crusade in their respective dioceses.

In his future progress thro' France, the pope himself every where recommended the crusade ; and then he appointed the festival of the assumption of the virgin in that year for the time of setting out. Accordingly, on that day the crusaders began their march. The principal of them were Hugh, brother of the king of France, and count of Vermandois, Robert duke of Normandy, brother of the king of England, Stephen count of Blois, Raimond count of Thoulouse, Godfrey duke of Lorraine, with his brothers Baldwin and Eustace, and Baldwin de Bourgh, their cousin. There were many lords of a lesser rank, and an infinity of the lower noblesse. There were also bishops, and at the head of them Adhemar the legate of the crusade, William bishop of Orange, many abbots and monks, and even some recluses, who on this great occasion quitted their cells. Many of the common people, and even women and children, came from all parts,  
pro-

promising to obey, and serve the crusaders on the expedition.

A great advantage accrued ultimately to the community at large from many of the great landholders on this occasion selling their lands, and often at low prices, in order to equip themselves for this expedition. However, they cheerfully sold their possessions, and abandoned their wives and families, with every thing else that was dear to them. Public robbers confessed their crimes, with a view to make atonement for them in this holy war; some debtors went to avoid their creditors; some were, no doubt, induced to go from a principle of honour, and some were ashamed to stay behind; and many women went in the habit of men.

The first that set out was Gautier, surnamed from his poverty *Sans avoir*, on the 8th of March A. D. 1096, at the head of a great multitude on foot. Passing thro' Germany and Hungary, they came to Constantinople, followed by Peter the Hermit, with about forty thousand men from different nations. Many other companies set out the same summer. Peter was followed by a German priest of the name of Godeschalck, with fifteen thousand men; but so ill disciplined, that they got no farther than Hungary, where they were all cut to pieces. Soon after followed another com-

pany on foot, of about two hundred thousand, without any chief, and without discipline. These fell upon, and without mercy massacred, the Jews wherever they came, especially at Cologne and Mentz. Many Jews on this occasion killed themselves, and some submitted to be baptized in order to save their lives.

Robert duke of Normandy, and Stephen count of Blois, went by way of Rome, where they received the pope's benediction. Many of this company went no farther than Rome; others went to Bari, intending to take shipping there; but the season being unfavourable they were not able to do it, and the duke of Normandy passed the winter in Calabria with his countrymen. However, the count of Flanders with his company did cross the sea. Robert and Stephen embarked at Brindisi the fifth of April, which was Easterday A. D. 1097. Boemond was besieging a castle in Campania, together with count Roger his uncle, when he heard of the crusade. On this he took a piece of red cloth, and cutting it into small pieces, he distributed it in the form of *crosses* to his followers, who all instantly cried out *God wills it, God wills it*, as at Clermont.

The pope wrote to the emperor Alexis to inform him of the resolution that had been taken at Clermont, that the crusaders in all amounted to  
three

three hundred thousand men, and that Boemond led seven thousand of approved valour, desiring him to provide for their subsistence. But the emperor was alarmed at such an inundation of Barbarians, as the Greeks always considered the Western nations to be; and he was more especially afraid of Boemond, whose valour he knew by experience. He therefore treated them with every outward mark of honour and respect, but privately gave them as much obstruction as he could. This conduct giving the Latins just cause of suspicion, those who were encamped near Constantinople demolished the houses in the country, and even stripped the churches of their lead, in order to sell it to the Greeks. This made the emperor expedite their passing the Hellespont. But they behaved no better in Asia, where they plundered, and burned, both houses and churches.

Being landed on the shore of Asia, several of the chiefs held a consultation about their future progress, and in consequence of it, they laid siege to Nice the 14th of May A. D. 1097. Here they reviewed their troops, and found them to be one hundred thousand armed knights, and, including the foot soldiers and the women, they were six hundred thousand. Nice, which was then in the power of Soliman, a Turk of the Seljukian race, surrendered by capitulation on the 20th of June,

and was given to Alexis, to the great dissatisfaction of the army, who expected to plunder it. By the treaty they had made with the emperor, they were to cede to him all the places they should conquer from the infidels, and he was to furnish them with provisions. But as he had not performed his part of the agreement, they thought themselves discharged from performing theirs; and therefore in all the places which they took afterwards they put garrisons of their own.

They had taken Tarsus and the rest of Cilicia when Baldwin brother of duke Godfrey left the grand army, and going to the North, conducted by a noble Armenian, he proceeded as far as the Euphrates. The country, being full of Christians, readily submitted to him, and having taken Edeffa, he was crowned prince of it, and there founded a powerful state.

The grand army having passed thro' Syria, laid siege to Antioch on the 21st of October A. D. 1097. It was then a large city, inhabited chiefly by Christians, tho' it had been in the possession of the Turks fourteen years. After a siege of seven months it was taken by treachery on the 3d of June A. D. 1098; but the Turks keeping possession of the castle, and an immense army coming to its relief, the Christians were besieged in the city, and reduced to such distress that they fed on  
their

their horses and camels. In this state they continued twenty-six days, and in all probability would have been all cut off, had it not been for the pretended discovery of the lance with which our Saviour's side was pierced. Having got possession of this, they bid adieu to despair, and took an oath that, if God would deliver them from this danger, they would never separate till they had taken Jerusalem, and delivered the holy sepulchre. After this they marched out, and defeating the enemy, took their camp, in which they found an immense booty. This was the 28th of June A. D. 1098. Boemond remained at the place with the title of prince.

Immediately after the reduction of Antioch a contagious disorder carried off many of the crusaders, and among them Adhemar the pope's legate, who was exceedingly regretted. They then wrote to the pope, to give him an account of their proceedings, and to request that he would come in person to head them, in the city in which the Christians first acquired their name, and in which the apostle Peter had his first see. The pope, however, contented himself with sending them another legate, Daimbert archbishop of Pisa.

While they remained here there arose a dispute about the reality of the lance that had been discovered; when Peter Barthelemi, who pretended

to have had a revelation which led to it, demanded the proof of the fire ordeal. Accordingly a fire being lighted, he took the lance, and boldly advanced thro' it, seemingly safe and sound; but, as he died a few days after, the question remained undecided.

After the taking of Antioch, the crusaders made some other conquests, and marching towards Jerusalem, they arrived there on the 7th of July A. D. 1099; and tho' they were then only twenty thousand foot, and fifteen hundred horse, and the city was garrisoned by forty thousand men, furnished with every thing necessary, they took it on the 15th of July at three o'clock in the afternoon, which was noticed as being the day and the hour of the death of Christ. Godfrey was the first to enter the city, together with his brother Eustace, by getting upon the wall, from a tower which they had brought near it. Presently after the count of Thoulouze entered at another place, and then the whole army, making a dreadful slaughter of the infidels, of whom they killed about ten thousand in the mosque which was situated on the ruins of the temple, and as many in other places.

Being now in possession of the place, the great object of the expedition, they bathed themselves, and marched barefoot, groaning and shedding many tears, till they came to the holy sepulchre,  
where

where they were met by the Christians in the place singing hymns. It was a wonderful spectacle, say those who were present, to see with what devotion the crusaders visited the holy places, some on their bare knees, and all of them endeavouring to exceed the rest in what was considered as an act of religion. The bishops and priests then performed mass in the church, praying for the people, and giving thanks to God for such great success. The day of this conquest was then ordered to be celebrated by a solemn festival every year.

Eight days after this Godfrey was chosen king of Jerusalem, and being, on this occasion, offered a crown of gold, he replied, that he could not wear a crown of gold in that city in which the king of kings had been crowned with thorns. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 237. After some dispute, Daimbert the legate was chosen patriarch, the former patriarch Simeon being then in Cyprus, and ignorant of all that had passed. From Daimbert Godfrey received the investiture of the kingdom of Jerusalem, as Boemond did that of Antioch. After the return of the greater part of the crusaders, who had now accomplished their vows, Godfrey and Tancred, who remained with him, had no more than three hundred horse, and two thousand foot. The cities subject to them were very few, and separated from one another by places in the possession of the  
Mahomet

Mahometans, who killed, or made slaves of, them whenever they took any of them. They also abandoned the cultivation of the ground ; not caring if they starved themselves, provided they could furnish the Christians. The Franks were no where safe except in cities, very well fortified, being liable to be plundered in the night, and murdered even in their houses. Such was the beginning of the kingdom of Jerusalem, which, however, subsisted eighty-eight years.

---



---

### SECTION VIII.

*Articles relating to the public Offices, and Discipline.*

THE articles under this title that occur in the course of the present period are not of much importance, but they are sufficiently numerous to require a section for themselves.

We have seen in a former period the desire of some popes to forbid the use of the living languages in the offices of public worship, and we find the same in this. Pope John XII, in order to prevent the Bohemians from using the Greek ritual, as the Bulgarians and Russians did, charged the prince not to use the Sclavonic tongue in divine service,

service, but the Latin, which accordingly he did. Also Gregory VII absolutely refused Wratisslas king of Bohemia the use of that language, for the same purpose, tho' the people had requested it; saying it was the will of God that some things should remain in obscurity, lest they should be despised by the common people; that antient custom was no excuse, since the primitive church had dissembled many things, which were corrected afterwards, when religion was more confirmed, and extended. "Wherefore," says he, "we command you by the authority of St. Peter, to oppose with all your might the imprudent request of your subjects."

This pope shewed the same zeal for the introduction of the Roman ritual into Spain. This had been done partially before, in a former period. And it had been agreed on at a council held at Yacca in A. D. 1060. In A. D. 1080 it was received by Sancho, the first king of Arragon, and after some threatening on the part of Gregory VII, it was also received by Alphonfus IV king of Leon and Castile. This, however, the king was not able to accomplish without difficulty, on account of the opposition that was made to it by the clergy, and even the nobility and common people. After some dispute on the subject, it was agreed to decide the business by appointing champions

to fight for the two rituals. Tho' the king's champion was defeated, his queen would not allow him to give up the point till they tried the ordeal of fire; when, it is said, both the missals being thrown into the same fire, that of Spain, or the Mosarabic, was not injured, but the Roman was consumed. Still, the king would not yield; but ordered the Roman ritual to be used in his dominions. Many churches, however, retained their former offices. This is the story related by Rodriguez archbishop of Toledo, but who lived one hundred and fifty years after the event.

The Roman ritual was not, in all respects the same that was used in other churches; as the creed was not recited in divine service. When the emperor Henry II was crowned at Rome, he asked the reason of this, and was answered, that as there had not been any heresy at Rome, there was no occasion for it. At the request of the emperor, it was recited at a solemn mass.

A new festival, that of *all the faithful dead from the beginning of the world to the end of it*, was introduced in this period, by Odilon abbot of Clugny. It soon passed into other churches, and afterwards into all Catholic churches.

It appears by the offering of king Robert to the church of St. Agnes in Orleans in A. D. 1029, that the dedication of bells was then called *baptism*, and that oil and chrism were used on the occasion. In A. D. 968 John XIII consecrated the great bell of the Lateran church at Rome. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 316.

It was about the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century, that *small wafers* were used in the administration of the Lord's supper. It was a curious conceit of Durandus to say, that they ought to be made in the form of denarii, because Christ was sold for thirty of those pieces of silver. *Pictet*, A. D. 1054. At this time all communion was in both kinds.

In the tenth century the consecration of the elements began to be made with a low voice. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 767.

It appears by the writings of Fulbert, in the beginning of the eleventh century, that it was the custom for priests, at their ordination, to receive from the bishop one host, of which they took a part every day, so as to consume the whole in forty days, in imitation of our Saviour's appearing to his disciples forty days after his resurrection. In some churches a host served them seven days.

The discipline of *penance* was a great article in the religion of those times, and a source of great gain to the priests. In this period we first read of the *commutation of penance*. By a law of king Edgar, in the time of Dunstan, a fast of one day was valued at a denier (penny) which was sufficient for the maintenance of one man. A day of fasting might also be redeemed by the recital of two hundred and twenty psalms, or six genuflexions, and one hundred and sixty paternosters, that is, the recital of the Lords prayer. One mass was equivalent to twelve days of fasting. A rich man might relieve himself by making other persons fast for him, so as to accomplish in three days a fast of seven years; but then, besides this, he was prescribed many painful exercises, and great alms. It was the custom also to commute penances for sums of money, and land given to the church, which was a great means of enriching it.

Burchard bishop of Worms composed a book of canons to direct the imposition of penance, and the compensation for it. According to his rules, a person who could not fast for one day with bread and water was to sing fifty psalms on his knees in the church, and maintain a poor man that day, when he might take any nourishment, except wine, flesh, or fat. An hundred genuflexions were equi-

equivalent to fifty psalms, and the rich might redeem that with money. But these redemptions were allowed only when the penance could not be complied with. Some time before this penances performed by others were condemned at anational council in England in A. D. 747, because it was said, that if they were admitted, salvation would be more easy to the rich than to the poor, contrary to the exprefs declaration of the gospel.

There are, says Fleury, no instances of voluntary flagellation before the eleventh century. This flagellation in public was opposed by Stephen, who had been a monk of Mount Cassin; but he dying suddenly afterwards, P. Damiani the great advocate for this practice, said it might be a punishment for that offence; tho' in other respects he was a worthy man.

These articles relating to penance naturally lead to the mention of various other superstitious practices, and the opinions on which they were founded.

The invention of the *rosary*, consisting of a number of beads on a string, is ascribed to this period, in order to keep an account of the number of prayers, and salutations of the virgin which persons were to repeat. A compleat rosary consisted of fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer and one hundred and fifty salutations of the virgin; and

what was called *the crown* consisted of six or seven repetitions of the Lord's prayer and ten times as many salutations. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 224.

Ratherius, bishop of Verdun, speaks of some persons who attended mass on Mondays, in preference to other days, because on that day the angel Michael celebrated mass before God. Damiani mentions it as the pious opinion of many eminent persons, that the souls of the dead do not suffer on Sundays, and that on this account they said mass in honour of the angels, to engage their protection of the dead, and those who were to die.

Robert king of France, to prevent the guilt of perjury, which was then very common, made the lords swear on a crystal *reliquiare*, ornamented with gold, but without any relics in it; and another of silver, in which was the egg of a griffon; as if the validity of the oath, says Fleury, depended upon the relics on which it was then the custom to swear.

At the council of Airy in A. D. 1020 it began to be the custom to take relics to councils, in order to add to their solemnity and obligation.

*Pictet.*

As an instance of the most elaborate superstition that I have met with in this period, I shall mention the manner in which the wafers for communion were prepared at the monastery of Clugny.

ny. They took the best corn, which they chose grain by grain. They then washed it carefully, and put it into a sack, which was kept for the purpose. A servitor of approved purity carried it to the mill, every thing belonging to which was washed. He then put on a garment called the *albe*, and an *amict*, which covered his head and face to the eyes. In this manner he ground the corn, and sifted the flour. Two priests and two deacons, clothed in the same manner, kneaded the dough in cold water, that it might be more white, and they formed the wafers; a novice held the marked iron on which they were baked, and they sung psalms during this labour, which was always performed before dinner.

That superstition takes the place of moral virtue, we see exemplified every day; but that it should lead to the commission of actual crimes, is not so common. Yet in this period the Celtiberians, fearing that St. Romuald, a famous hermit, would leave their country, after having in vain endeavoured to detain him with them, formed a design to murder him, that at least they might have his relicks, for the protection of their country.

Superstition, however, was often a great and successful excitement to valour in battle, and the Normans after they embraced Christianity, were particularly distinguished for it. Robert Guiscard

passed the night before a battle which he fought in Epirus, with all his army, in the church of the martyr Theodore, where they received the communion. In a similar manner did William the Conqueror prepare his army before the battle of Hastings, by which he gained the crown of England.

It is, however, to the credit of this period, that in it Agobard wrote a treatise against the ordeal, and other kinds of superstition which prevailed in his time. *Pictet*, A. D. 1002.

---

## SECTION IX.

### *Miscellaneous Articles.*

**I**N this period we see more of the dawning of arts and sciences, and of literature in general, than could well have been expected from the complexion of it in other respects.

1. In the beginning of the eleventh century Guido, a monk of Arezzo, invented the use of notes in music, by means of which it was said that a child might learn in a few months what a man had not been able to learn in several years, which was of great consequence with respect to church music. The author of this ingenious art, writing concern-  
ing

ing it to a monk of Pomposia, who had assisted him in it, he says, whether seriously or in pleasantry, does not appear, "I hope that they who come after us will pray for the remission of our sins; since, instead of ten years, in which it was difficult to obtain an imperfect knowledge of psalmody, we now make a chanter in one year, or at most in two." He says that pope John XIX sent for him, and was wonderfully pleased with his invention.

Tho' the *gamut* was not wholly of Guido's invention, he greatly improved it, by affixing to the letters certain syllables, extracted from a hymn to John the Baptist for the purpose of intonation, which was the origin of *solfaing*. He also reduced the staff to four lines, by using the intermediate spaces together with them, at the same time prefixing certain letters, viz. F and C at the beginning, which was the origin of *cliffs*. *Williams*, p. 39.

The disputes between the Greek and Latin churches, and also those between the popes and the emperors, in this period, were the means of promoting inquiry and discussion, and of many persons applying to literature. The study of divinity was particularly attended to by the monks of Mount Cassin, at first by having recourse to the Fathers, but afterwards in a more logical way;

the works of Aristotle having been introduced among Christians by the Arabs. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 487.

In A. D. 820 the Caliph Almamon applied to the emperor at Constantinople for books in the Greek language, and those he got translated into Arabic; but the Arabs confined themselves to books relating to mathematics, natural philosophy, and medicine. They particularly attached themselves to the works of Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Galen. Many of these books Charlemagne and others got translated from Arabic into Latin; and soon after schools were instituted in which this kind of knowledge was taught. Salerno was particularly distinguished for Arabic literature, in consequence of the easy access to this place from the East and from Africa. On this account it soon had the greatest reputation of any school in Europe, especially for medicine. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 489. Gerbert a native of France, afterwards pope Silvester II, distinguished himself by his application to this kind of literature, especially mathematics and astronomy, which he derived from the Arabs in Spain, having spent some time in the university of Cordova and Seville; and his example induced many to apply to the same source of information. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 199.

2. Lanfranc was a great restorer of letters in Normandy. Many studied under him at the monastery

naftery of Bec, especially Anselm, his successor in the see of Canterbury. Anselm was, without dispute, the best metaphysician the church had ever had before him, at least since Austin, as his writings now extant testify. In one of his works he gives the metaphysical arguments for the being of God, and went before Clark in the subtle but unsatisfactory arguments *a priori*. "God," says he, "must necessarily have existence; for he is "possessed of all perfections, and *existence* cannot "be denied to be one."

Odo, before he was made abbot of St. Martin's at Tournay, distinguished himself by teaching the sciences. He chiefly excelled in logic, of which he composed three books. Following the doctrine of Boethius, and the ancients, he maintained, that the object of this art was *things*, and not *words*, as some of the more moderns, boasting to follow Porphyry and Aristotle, pretended. Of this class was Rainbert, who taught logic at Lisle, and decried the doctrine of Odo. This was the commencement of the two sects of *Nominalists* and *Realists*, so famous in the schools afterwards.

We find some persons beginning to collect books, and form libraries. Bouchard bishop of Worms, in the beginning of the eleventh century, had more than an hundred volumes of ecclesiastical

authors, and an hundred and fifty of profane writers, which was then considered as a great library.

At what time the bible was divided into chapters as now in use does not appear; but Humbert, legate from pope Leo IX in A. D. 1054, quotes those of the old testament as they now are. The division into verses was made by R. Stephens after the revival of letters.

3. Architecture, and other ornamental arts, had been neglected in Italy more than five hundred years before the time of Desiderius, who rebuilt the monastery of Mount Cassin; so that he was obliged to send for workmen from Constantinople.

4. It will give my readers some idea of the nature of the legends, or fabulous lives of saints and martyrs, which were imposed on the world in ignorant and credulous ages, to be told that at the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, it was solemnly discussed whether St. Martial should be ranked among the *apostles*, or *confessors*; when, as Fleury says, his whole history was founded on a legend, composed under the name of one of his disciples called Aurelian, and which was not known before the tenth century. In this history it was said that Martial was a relation of St. Peter and St. Stephen, that by the order of Christ he

was baptized by Peter himself, that he was made a bishop by Christ after his ascension, and sent by him into Gaul, after he had received the Holy Spirit at the day of Pentecost. The debate terminated with his being called *an apostle*. But when the archbishop Aimon, who presided, was proceeding to pronounce an anathema against those who denied it, the bishop of Limoges, who had contended for his being only a confessor, obtained a delay of the sentence. *Fleury*, Vol. 12. p. 487.

5. In this age the trial by *ordeal*, received immediately from the Northern nations of Europe, but which came originally from the East, where it is practised to this day, was in the greatest credit, notwithstanding the decrees of councils and popes against the use of it; and in this period occurred (as was recited in *Section III*) a case of a seeming miracle by means of it, perhaps the best attested of any since the age of the apostles. With respect to it I would observe that Mr. Fleury copied this account from a letter of the people and clergy of Florence to pope Alexander II; but tho' it is said by Mr. Berington, in the *Introduction* to his *History of Abelard*, to be attested by the historians of the age, it is probable that they all had it from this one source.

Improbable as it must appear *a priori*, that the divine Being should give countenance to such

a practice as this, the fact is certainly not impossible. But when it is considered that all the people of Florence, their magistrates, and the monks, were interested in the success of the trial; and that the only account we have of it was drawn up by themselves, some doubt will remain both with respect to the circumstances previous to the trial, and the issue of it; so that the chance of safety might be something greater than is represented, and the monk might not have come off quite so well. Nothing also is said of the direction of the wind, or of there being any current of the air, at the time, and much would depend upon that. Besides, if a real miracle was depended upon, why was not the monk placed in the middle of a burning pile, and made to continue there till it was burned out. Why had he any chance of escaping unhurt, which the distance of the burning piles certainly gave him.

To gain our entire credit, the miracle should have been performed in the presence of the enemies as well as of the friends to the issue of it; and if they did not join in the report, it should appear from the circumstances that they were unable to contradict it. The bishop's resignation might arise from the consciousness of his guilt, and of his extreme unpopularity, without any conviction of the truth of the miracle.

Mosheim

Mosheim makes no mention of this extraordinary fact, and Baronius places it in A. D. 1063, and not in 1075 where Fleury, followed by Mr. Berington, places it; a difference sufficiently remarkable. The truth of Christianity does not rest on such miracles as these.

This, too, was very different from the case of Shadrach Meshach and Abednego at Babylon, when their enemies who threw them into the furnace were consumed; and when, after continuing evidently a considerable time, the king himself ordered them to come out, and then made a solemn decree, in favour of their religion; reciting, and acknowledging, the miracle as the occasion of it.

Successful and satisfactory as the issue of this trial by ordeal is said to have been, it does not appear that more recourse was had to it afterwards, tho', no doubt, many similar occasions must have occurred.

*The End of the first Volume of the second Part.*









0025997858

931

P933

v. 1.

Priestley  
A general history of the Chris-  
tian church from the fall of

931

P933

1

Call: 1163-64/3

Nov 1190-91

MAY 18 1943

