



**Columbia University**  
**in the City of New York**

LIBRARY







CLARK'S  
FOREIGN  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

VOLUME XV.

*Neander's General Church History.*

VOL. V.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: SEELEY AND CO.; WARD AND CO.; JACKSON AND WALFORD.

DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.—NEW YORK: WILEY AND PUTNAM.

PHILADELPHIA: J. W. MOORE.

---

MDCCCXLIX.



GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH :

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR AUGUSTUS NEANDER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND AND IMPROVED ÉDITION.

“ Let both grow together until the harvest.” *Words of our Lord.*

“ Les uns Christianisant le civil et le politique, les autres civilisant la Christianisme, il se forma de ce mélange un monstre.” *St Martin.*

-----  
TRANSLATED BY THE

REV. HENRY STEBBING, D.D.,

AUTHOR OF “ HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.”  
-----

VOLUME V.

EDINBURGH :

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO. ; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO. ;

SEELEY & CO. ; WARD & CO. ; JACKSON & WALFORD.

DUBLIN : JOHN ROBERTSON.

-----  
MDCCCXIX.

PRINTED BY  
M'COSE, PARK, AND DEWARS,  
DUNDEE.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## VOLUME FIFTH.

THIRD PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST:  
FROM THE TIME OF THE ROMAN BISHOP, GREGORY THE GREAT, TO THE DEATH  
OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES THE GREAT, OR FROM THE YEAR 590  
TO THE YEAR 814.

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Peculiar activity of Christianity at this period, in comparison with its earlier  
ages. Disturbing elements of ecclesiastical tradition. Reaction. The Old  
Testament exposition of Christianity—how far carried out. ~~~~~ 1

### FIRST SECTION.

THE CONNECTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH WITH THE WORLD. ITS  
EXTENSION AND LIMITS.

#### I. IN EUROPE.

	Page.
<i>Means</i> for the extension of Christianity, ~~~~~	4
<i>Burgundians</i> , the—their Arianism. Influence of the Arians. Avitus of Vienne. Gundobad. Disputation (499.) Conversion of the Burgundians to the Nicene doctrines under Siegismond (517) ~~~~~	5
<i>Franks</i> .—Chlodwig's conversion (496)—inquiry into its causes. Its effects. Ampulla Remensis. Heterogeneous materials of the Church of the Franks. Childebert's law against idol-worship (554). Renewal of the Frank Church in Britain and Ireland ~~~~~	7
<i>Ireland</i> —rich in monasteries. Insula sanctorum—its religious studies and mis- sions. Abbot Comgall founds Bangor. Ninyas among the southern, Columba among the northern, Picts, found monasteries (565). St Columba founds a monastery on the island Hy, or St Iona. ~~~~~	11
<i>British Church</i> —its decay (Gildas). The Britons call the Anglo-Saxons to their aid. English Heptarchy. Gregory the Great. Edilberth, king of Kent —his Christian wife, Bertha. The Abbot Augustine sent by Gregory to the Anglo-Saxons (596). His reception by Edilbert. Takes up his abode in	

Canterbury. His miracles. Edilbert's baptism. Gregory's ideas respecting conversion. Augustine ordained by Etherick, bishop of Arles. Laurentius and Peter sent to Rome. Gregory's wise warnings to Augustine. He sends the abbot Mellitus with some monks to England. Augustine becomes archbishop. Different customs of the French and Roman Churches—Gregory respecting same. Gregory on temples and festivals—wishes to make London and York archbishoprics. Sabereth of East Saxony. Mellitus, archbishop of London. Gregory's idea of his own power over the Western Churches. Augustine desires to extend his primacy over the ancient British Churches. Abbot Deynoch of Bangor. Consultation between Augustine and the British bishops. Its results. National hatred between the British and Anglo Saxons. Augustine's death, 605. His successor, Laurentius. Edilberth's death (616.) Idolatry of his son Eadbald. Decay of Christianity in Essex. Bishop Mellitus banished. Vision of Laurentius. Eadbald converted and baptized. Northumberland. Edwin and Edilberga. Paulinus, bishop of York. The assembly of the Lords decides in favour of Christianity. Edwin dies (633). Oswald restores the welfare of the Kingdom and the Church. Aidan, of St Iona. Oswald's death (642.) The reverence with which he was regarded. Extension of Christianity to all the provinces of the Heptarchy. Sussex. Wilfrid of York	11
<i>Differences of polity of the British, Scotch, and Romish Churches.</i> Bede. Efficiency of the Scotch Missionaries	28
Synodus Pharensis (664)	29
The Scotch bishop Colmann and the Presbyter Wilfrid. Theodore of Canterbury and Abbot Hadrian. Council at Hartford (673)	29
Germany, seeds of Christianity from very early times in	31
Severinus, his family and birth-place—his influence and views. Influence of the pious hermits Goar, Wullach. Great efficiency of Irish missionaries. Colonies of monks. Abbot Columba, his activity in the French Church. Anegrey, Luxeu, Fontaine. Columba's rule—his controversies—his views respecting differences of ecclesiastical usages—he is banished by Brunehild and Dietrich II. from the kingdom of Burgundy—his wanderings—Wilimar—Gallas. Columba in Italy—his opposition to the Romish Church. Activity and death of Gallas (640). Magnoald. Fridolin. Thrudpert. Kyllena (Kyllian)	31
Bavaria Eustasius and Agil. The errors of Photinus and Bonosus among the Waraskarians, Bavarians, and Burgundians. Emmeran. Rudbert (Ruprecht.) Corbinian	47
Frisians, the abodes of the. Amandus (d. 679.) Eligius (d. 659). Livin (d. 656). The English receive instruction by means of the Irish monasteries. Egbert. Wigbert. Willibrord. The brothers Heuwald. Svidbert amongst the Boruchtuarii	50
Pepin of Heristal. Willibrord, Archbishop of Utrecht. Wulfram of Sens. Radbod (d. 719). Willibrord in Denmark and Heligoland (d. 739. Wursing Ado. Charles Martell. Want of missionaries in Germany	55
Boniface (Winfrid 680-755), the father of the German Church and German learning—His family and acquirements—His first journey to Friesland (715), Utrecht and Rome (718). Gregory II.—His residence in Thuringia and Hesse (722). In Rome (723)—His confession of faith, ordination, and oath. Importance of this oath to the German Church. Boniface and the independent Irish missionaries compared. Boniface in Hesse and Thuringia. The nature and effects of his influence. Oak at Geismar. Religious instruction. Daniel of Winchester's advice. Boniface's sermons	

and writings. Opposition to Boniface. Boniface in Rome (739) and Boniface provides for Bavaria—His Episcopate. Death of Charles Martell (741). Charlemagne. Pepin the little. New bishoprics. Regulation of Provincial Synods. Heresies. Adelbert.....	58
Clemens against the authority of the Church fathers and the Councils in respect to the marriage of Bishops, and other hindrances to marriage.....	76
Clemens's views on the descensus and the doctrine of predestination. Judicial proceedings of the pope Zacharias against Adelbert and Clemens (747.) Their final fate. Boniface's controversy with Virgilius and Samson—His frank declaration to Pope Zacharias on the corruptions of the Romish Church—His opposition to clerical organization—Made archbishop (732) and wishes Cologne to be his ecclesiastical see. Gerold and Gewillieb of Mayence. Mayence made an archiepiscopal see. Boniface desires to confer the archiepiscopal dignity on his pupil Lull. The decision of the pope. Pepin anointed king by Boniface (752). Boniface's anxiety for the English Church. Reform Synod at Cloveshove (747). Lull consecrated bishop. Boniface's letter to Fulrad—His controversy with Hildegard, bishop of Cologne—He visits Friesland (755)—His martyrdom (5th June 755).....	78
<i>Pupils</i> of Boniface—Gregory in Friesland—Abbot of a monastery at Utrecht—His death (731). Abbot Sturm founder of a monastery at Hersfeld (736), and Fulda (744)—His residence in Italy; his ability and his death (779).....	92
<i>Saxons</i> , the—Their opposition to Christianity increased by the bad methods chosen for their conversion. Wise counsels of Abbot Alcuin. Peace at Selz (804). Forcible conversion of individuals. Severe laws. Liudger pursues his labours as bishop in Friesland, Heligoland, and Munster (d. 809). Willebad among the Frisians and Saxons—In the Province Wigmodia (Bremen)—In Rome. Willebad, first bishop of Bremen (787 d. 789). <i>Avarians</i> (Huns). Their prince Tudun baptized. Arno, archbishop of Salzburg. Alcuin's advice to the Emperor Charles and Arno. Consequences of his mission. Hamburg.....	97 105

## II. IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

Contraction of the Christian Church. By Chosru-Parviz of Persia. Subjection of the same by Heraclius.....	108
<i>Muhammedanism</i> . Muhammed's first appearance (610).—Condition of Arabia. Muhammed's religious disposition. Characteristics of his religion. Defective apprehension of God. Fanaticism. Decline of the Ethic theory. Outward form of worship.....	109
Its want of the doctrine of the necessity of redemption, Muhammed's first views. His opposition to idolatry, and in later times to Judaism and Christianity. He wishes to restore a pure Theism and the simplicity of the earlier revelations. Muhammed's chief principles opposed to Christian morality. Connection of Muhammedanism with Judaism. Apology of the divines, especially in reference to free will and Christ's divinity. Extension of Muhammedanism. Monophytism of the Kopts. Melchites. The Christians persecuted by the Muhammedans.....	111
<i>Nestorians</i> , the. Timotheus, their patriarch in Syria. They send missionaries to the East Indies and to China. Kardag and Jabdallaha. Inscription on	

the efficiency of the Nestorian priest Olopuen in China. The Christian Church in Nubia under Coptic patriarchs.....	114
---	-----

## SECOND SECTION.

### THE HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

#### I. THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Ecclesiastical offices. Great importance to the Church, that they should be free from the influence of worldly power. King Chilperich's doctrine of the Trinity. Belief in a visible theocracy. Influence of the Frank princes at the nomination of bishops. Bishoprics are bought and sold. Degradation of Emeritus, bishop of Xaintes, and its consequences. The exertions of Gregory the Great to abolish the abuses in the distribution of ecclesiastical offices. Fifth Synod at Paris (615) .....	117
Consecration of Chlotar II. Boniface. Restoration of the free elections by Charles the Great. Influence possessed by the English and Spanish princes over the distribution of offices. <i>Ecclesiastical legislation</i> .....	121
Synods fall into general disuse. Gregory the Great and Boniface complain of this. The Imperial Diets give laws to both Church and State. Influence possessed by the bishops on the temporal enactments .....	123
<i>Deliverance of the Church from State Burdens.</i> Military service. Controversy between the Emperor Mauricius and Gregory the Great. Bondsmen are admitted to holy orders—reasons for this—ordinance against the continuance of this practice. Influence exercised by Christianity in the abolition of slavery. Opinion of the divines on this matter. Abbot Isidor of Pelusium. John Eleemosynarius, patriarch of Alexandria. Plato. Theodorus Studita. Gregory the Great. The Church protects slaves. The bestowal of freedom on slaves regarded as a good work.....	125
<i>Possessions of the Church.</i> Tythes. Increased by superstition. Insecurity of its freeholds. Its stewards. Advocati Vicedomini. Taxes on ecclesiastical property. War tax. Assistance rendered by bishops and abbots in time of war. Ordinance of Charles the Great in this matter .....	130
<i>Administration of Justice, &amp;c.</i> Influence of the Church on. Opinion of the Church on suicide. Alcuin opposed to capital punishment. Intercession of the Church on behalf of criminals. Eparchius. Asylums of the Church. Disrespect in which they were held. Chramenus. Ordinances respecting the treatment of criminals condemned to death in the asylums—respecting the care of prisoners. Ordinances in Spain respecting the influence of the Church. Advantages and disadvantages of the great influence of the bishops. Alcuin's complaint of ecclesiastics .....	132

#### II. INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

Increasing authority of the monks. Tonsure worn by ecclesiastics. Combinations of ecclesiastics after the manner of the associations of the
---

monks. Chrodegang of Metz, author of the canonical life of the priesthood—horæ canonicæ—capitula—establishment of the order of Chrodegang at Aix-la Chapelle (816)—its beneficial influence. Ecclesiastical visitations. Ecclesiastical courts in the French Church.....	136
Ordinationes absolutæ.....	140
Ordinance for the maintenance of the pastoral ministrations. Right of patronage. Established by Justinian. Its increase and abuse. Laws against it. Capitula ruralia under arch presbyters Great influence of the archdeacons. Institution of Metropolitans .....	141
Aversion of the French bishops to the same .....	143
<i>Papacy, the.</i> Importance of its development to the system of ecclesiastical theocracy. Gregory the Great—his manifold activity—his conduct towards princes—his zeal for the honour of the Roman Church and contempt of glory—his proceeding against Natalis, bishop of Salona—his recognition of the equality of all bishops—refuses to be styled Papa universalis. His controversy with the patriarch Johannes, <i>ἡστυετης</i> of Constantinople. Connection of the Papacy with the Eastern emperors—with the Lombards. Conversion of Theodelinde, Queen of the Lombards to the Romish Church (587). Connection of the Papacy with the Spanish Church. Reckared, King of the West Goths, converted to the Roman faith (589). Leander of Sevilla. Gregory the Great exercises a judicial power in Spain. King Witiza forbids appeals to Rome. Dependence of the English Church on the Roman. Pilgrimages. Connection between the Roman and French Churches. Example of the recognised decision of Pope John II. Gregory the Great. Boniface. Pallium. Influence of the Papal approbation of Pepin's consecration. Assistance afforded by Pepin to Pope Stephanus II. against the Lombards. Pepin annexes the territory which he wrests from the Lombards to the patrimonium Petri. Charles the Great. The Frank dominion in Italy. Consecrated by Pope Leo III. (800) .....	144
Alcuin's view of the spiritual power of the Papacy. The Emperor Charles desires to break with the Popes. His intentions respecting same. Lands belonging to the Church. Forged deeds of gift from Constantine the Great. Missi. Synods held at Rome to consider the affairs of Pope Leo III. Refusal of the bishops to judge the Pope .....	155

---

### THIRD SECTION.

#### CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

<i>Christianity</i> obtains only very gradually a real influence .....	158
Want of regular religious instruction. Synod held at Cloveshove to consider this matter. Decision respecting preaching in Chrodegang's order. Alcuin's opinion respecting Charles the Great. Alcuin on reading the Scriptures. The resolutions of Councils respecting preaching. Theodulf of Orleans very active in promoting religious instruction. Want of virtuous priests. Homiliaria. The homilies of Paulus Diaconus collected, with a preface by Charles the Great. Latin, the language of the Liturgy.....	158

*Superstition.* Search for oracles in the Holy Scriptures. Sortes sanctorum. Ordinance against. Ordeals. Introduced into the Burgundian law by Gundobad. Opposed by Avitus of Vienne. Favoured by Charles the Great. Justification by outward works. Charles the Great and Theodulf of Orleans opposed to this. Pilgrimages. Second Council at Chalons (813). Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans there. Saint worship. Decisions respecting same in ecclesiastical systems. Its heathenish elements. Gregory of Tours respecting Martinus of Tours. Frauds practised in respect to relics. Canonization of unworthy persons. ~~~~~ 165

*Festivals.* Presentation of Christ in the temple. Purificatio Mariæ in the Western Church. Assumptio Mariæ. Festival of the circumcision. Of St Michaelis. Dies natalis apostolorum Petri et Pauli. Birth of John the Baptist. Birth-days of Andrew, Remigius, and Martinus. Festival of all saints. Alcuin respecting ~~~~~ 172

Lord's Supper, the. Ideas of sacrifice connected with the same. Gregory the Great. Magical effects of. Ignis purgatorius. Sacrament of the last unction. Private mass. Reasons against ~~~~~ 173

*Church Discipline.* Private penance. Absolution bestowed without permission to partake of the sacrament. Libelli poenitentiales. Regulations for the treatment of ecclesiastical offences. Compositions. Origin of Indulgences. Their disadvantageous results. Synodical declarations respecting alms and other outward works—respecting ecclesiastical forgiveness of sins and priestly absolution. Theodulf of Orleans, and Haligtar of Cambray respecting. The severer kinds of penance ~~~~~ 176

FOURTH SECTION.

HISTORY OF THE SPREAD AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY IN A DOCTRINAL POINT OF VIEW.

I. IN THE LATIN CHURCH.

Gregory the Great—his mode of life. Improves church singing and the liturgy. A zealous preacher. His regula pastoralis. How far influenced by Augustine. His doctrine of predestination. Its practical application. Doubts respecting salvation. Evil consequences of this doctrine. Contrast between the pure Christian and the sensuous Catholic element. On miracles. On prayer. His ethics. His moralia. On love and the cardinal virtues. Opposed to the mere opus operatum. Respecting the new creation. On hypocrisy and sincerity. Of the relation between ratio and fides. On the study of the ancient literature. The commentary on the two books of the Kings ascribed to him touches on this point. ~~~~~ 182

Decline of the old learning. Libraries. Cassiodorus. Remarks. ~~~~~ 194

*Isidorus of Hispalis.* His writings—his influence ~~~~~ 195

*Theological learning in Ireland.* Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury. Abbot Hadrian. They assist in the establishment of schools. Venerable Bede (673-735). Egbert, archbishop of York. Aelbert, superintendent

of the school at York. Alcuin (735-804). His mode of life. Zeal of Charles the Great for knowledge. Alcuin, president of the schola palatina. His great intimacy with Charles the Great. He improves the Latin translation of the Bible. Becomes tutor to the Abbey of St Martin at Tours. His end -----	195
<i>Dogmatical controversies of this period.</i> A greater application of traditional learning than enquiry into doctrine in the age of Charlemagne. Renewal of the controversies between the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools in Spain. Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo. His controversies with the schismatic, Migetius.-----	201
Felix of Urgellis. Similarity of his dogmas to those of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Whether Felix borrowed from the writings of the latter. Possibility of the circulation of his writings in Spain. He apologizes for Christianity against Muhamedanism. Combats the interchange of the predicates of the two natures in Christ. In what sense is Christ the Son of God and the Son of Man. Ideas on the adoption. His appeal to the Holy Scriptures. Acceptance of the ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων. The union between God and Christ compared with the adoption of man by grace. Felix opposed to the recognition of Mary as the mother of God. Union of baptism with the spiritualis generatio per adoptionem. Gradual manifestation of God in the humanity of Christ. Agnoëtism -----	202
<i>Opposers of the theory of adoption.</i> Etherius of Othma. Beatus. Violence of the controversy. Conduct of Elipandus. Spread of the controversy to France. Characteristics of Felix of Urgellis. Condemnation of the theory of adoption at Ratisbone (792). Felix in Rome. Recalled. In Spain. His letters to Spanish bishops. Council at Frankfort (794). Alcuin. Felix defends the theory of adoption against Alcuin. His free views respecting the Church. Letters from Elipandus to Alcuin. Elipandus on the Roman Church. Pope Hadrian respecting the Apost. Decret., Act. 15. Alcuin's proposal for the refutation of Felix. Abbot Benedict of Aniana, Archbishop Leidrad of Lyons, and Bishop Nefrid of Narbonne, are sent to suppress the doctrine of adoption in the south of France. Their meeting with Felix at Urgellis. Felix declares himself vanquished in the synod at Aix-la-Chapelle. He is consigned to the care of Leidrad of Lyons. Felix remains true to his conviction (d. 816). Agnoëtism.-----	210
II. IN THE GREEK CHURCH.	
Condition of learning in. Free spiritual development repressed in. Collections of the written opinions of the older divines, Catenae, <i>σειραὶ</i> . Its predominant dialectical direction. John of Damascens. A mystical dialectical tendency furthered by monkhood. Spurious writings of Dionysius, the Areopagite. First used by the Severians. Presbyter Theodorus defends their genuineness. Their influence. Distinction between <i>θεολογία καταφατική</i> and <i>ἀποφατική</i> .-----	217
<i>Maximus</i> —representative of the dialectical contemplative tendency. Characteristics of his writings—respecting slavery—limit of the creation—purpose of the redemption—incarnation of the Logos in believers—natural power and grace—the union of the spiritual and human in believers compared with the two natures in Christ—development of the divine revelations—faith—faith compared with the kingdom of God—love—union of the theoretical and practical—prayer—eternal life and earthly existence—restoration -----	220

Monothelitic controversies—their internal and external sources. The Emperor Heraclius proposes a formulary of union. Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, against. The opinion of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, respecting. Cyrus reconciled with the Egyptian Monophysites. Sophronius opposed to this union. Sergius' endeavours to suppress the controversy—His inclination to Monothelitism. Sophronius patriarch of Jerusalem (634). Honorius of Rome declares himself for Monothelitism, without wishing an ecclesiastical decision. His opinion of the controversy. Circular letters of Sophronius, declaring Dyothelitism. Edict of Heraclius.— <i>Ἐκθέσις τῆς πίστεως</i> (638), favouring Monothelitism. Confirmed by a <i>σύνδος ἐνδημούσα</i> at Constantinople. Maximus, head of the Diotheletic party. Theodore, bishop of Pharan, head of the Monothelitic party. Dogmatical interest of the last. Opposition of Maximus opposed to this. Approach of Monothelitism to Docetism. The Monothelites maintain the absorption of the human will in the divine. Maximus opposed to this. Various expositions of the old divines.	226
<i>Dyothelitism</i> , predominant in Rome and Africa. Maximus an active author. Gregory, deputy in Africa. Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, lays down his office (642). Disputes with Maximus.	237
Edict of the Emperor Constantine: <i>Τύπος τῆς πίστεως</i> (648). Paul, patriarch of Constantinople. Contents of the <i>τύπος</i> —Its consequences	238
Martinus I., Pope, a zealous Dyothelit. Summons a general Lateran Council (648). Which condemns Monothelitism. Olympius, Exarch of Ravenna. Calliopas, his successor (653). Martinus accused as a traitor to the state—His defence—Political accusations against him. Conduct of Calliopas. Martinus, having fled, is taken prisoner—Suffers patiently—is tried at Constantinople—Banished to Cherson—His death. Maximus taken prisoner by Anastasius. Political accusations. Mildness of the first proceedings. An attempt made to induce Maximus to yield. New union formulary. Eugenius, bishop of Rome. Maximus banished—Dies in consequence of ill treatment	239
<i>Difference between the Roman and the Grecian Churches</i> . Eugenius and Vitalianus of Rome. Increase of these differences since the time of Adeodatus of Rome (677).—Theodorus, patriarch of Constantinople; Makarius, patriarch of Antioch. Emperor Constantine Pogonatus—His letters to Domnus of Rome (678)	248
<i>Sixth general Council, the third at Constantinople, the first Trullanian</i> . The old fathers undecided respecting the controverted points. Two letters from Bishop Agatho of Rome to the Council, expressing Dyothelitism. Georgius, patriarch of Constantinople, declares himself convinced of the same. Macarius perseveres in Monothelitism Polychronius. Symbolical confirmation of Dyothelitism. The Monothelitic patriarchs of Constantinople and Honorius of Rome anathematized	250
<i>Second Trullanian Council</i> (conc. quiniseximum) under Justinian II.	253
<i>Brief exaltation of Monothelitism</i> by means of the Emperor Philip. Johannes, patriarch of Constantinople. Synod at Constantinople designs a symbol for Monothelitism. Insurrection in Italy	253
Triumph of Dyothelitism by means of the Emperor Anastasius II. The patriarch Johannes alters his opinion—His letter to Constantine of Rome.	254
<i>Monothelitism of the Maronites</i> . Controversies respecting image worship. Their general character. Theodorus Studita respecting the differences between these and the earlier controversies. History of the mode of thinking and acting in reference to these controversies. Gregory the Great	



respecting image-worship. His discussions with Serenus of Marseilles. Zeal of the later popes for image-worship. Superstitious reverence for pictures in the Greek Church. <i>Αχειροποιητα</i> . Reaction against	255
Emperor Leo the Isaurian. <i>Απολυτικα</i> rules against the Jews and Montanists—The consequences. Some bishops by study adversaries of image-worship. Constantine of Nakolia. Leo's proceedings and motives. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, favourable to image-worship. Leo's ordinance (726) against an idolatrous reverence for images. Discussions between Leo and Germanus. Reasons of the latter in favour of image-worship. Individual bishops oppose image-worship. Uneasiness of the people. Constantine of Nakolia enters into a discussion with Germanus at Constantinople. Thomas of Claudiopolis opposes image-worship. Letter to him from Germanus. Observations on this attack on image-worship. John of Damascus—His education—Writes a defence of image-worship. Revolt in the Cyclades under Stephen. All religious images are forbidden (730). Germanus lays down his office. Anastasius his successor. Terror of the bishops of the opposite party. Second and third apologies of Johannes for image-worship. Rise of Church communion between the two parties. Letter from Gregory II. to the emperor. Difficulty of carrying out the edicts. Removal of the most remarkable images. Uneasiness excited thereby. The picture <i>Χριστός ὁ αντιφωνητής—προσκύνησις</i> of the crucifix. The Emperor Constantine Copronymus (741). Revolt of Artabasdu. Restoration of image-worship. Constantine again becomes master of the empire (754). General Council at Constantinople (754). Theodosius of Ephesus. Rejection of the images of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. Reasons for this. Decrees against images of every kind, against art, and the arbitrary use of Church Councils. Creeds. War against pictures in the doctrine of the personality of Christ. Accusations against the enemies of image-worship of hostility to the Virgin and the saints. The Emperor Constantine in respect to this matter. Constantine of Sylens becomes patriarch of Constantinople. Execution of the decrees of the Council. Books burned on account of the pictures they contain. Pictures preserved by concealment. The monks oppose the decrees. Stephanus. Heavy proceedings against the monks. Andrew the Kalybite. Sketch of the bishops of this time. The Emperor Constantine hostile to monkhood. To the name of <i>Μαριαε, θεοτοκος</i> . The patriarch Constantine is deposed and executed. Result of the efforts of the Emperor Constantine	261
Emperor Leo. IV., the—his wife, Irene—her religious disposition and love for pictures—her oath not to worship images. Leo's character. Renewed influence of the monks. Consequences of this. Attempt to restore the worship of images. Leo's opposition to this, and his death. Irene governs for the young Constantine. Delay to the immediate introduction of images. Reverence of the Empress for monkhood. The patriarch Paul of Constantinople resigns—his probable motives to this course of conduct. Tarasius, secretary to the empire, proposed as his successor. Endeavours to obtain the patriarchate. Stipulates for the favouring of image-worship. This subject viewed in different ways by the friends and opposers of image-worship. Arrangements for a general Council. Negotiations for that purpose with Pope Hadrian I. Difficulty of obtaining the concurrence of all the five patriarchs. The monks Johannes and Thomas, the deputies of the three absent patriarchs. Theodorus Studita respecting	

this Council. Opening of the Council at Constantinople (786). Many opposers of image-worship amongst the bishops. Heads of this party. The army, and especially the body-guard, opposed to images. Secret discussions of the Iconoclasts—forbidden by Tarasius. Mutiny of the Iconoclasts against the Council. Mutiny of the body-guard. Dismissal of this body-guard and the formation of a new. The general Council summoned at Nice. Testimonies in favour of image-worship drawn from the doctrines of the church—from the Holy Scriptures. The Iconoclasts suddenly change their opinions. Mild character of the proceedings against these recanters. The monks opposed to this. Remarkable protestant disposition amongst the Iconoclasts. Decrees of the Council respecting images. The Assembly adjourns to Constantinople. Eight sittings there, in the presence of the Empress and her son. Publication of the decrees. Necessary reaction against this victory of the worshippers of images ~~~~~

*Sympathy of the Western Churches with these controversies.* The Iconoduli predominant in the Romish Church. Whether was the predominance of the opposite party in the French Church owing to its original principles, or a result of the times of Charlemagne? Discussion respecting images at Gentiliacum under Pepin. The result unknown. Judgment of Pope Paul I. on these discussions—what conclusions can be drawn from them in respect of image-worship? Conduct of the French Church under Charles the Great. Charles the Great opposed to the second Nicene Council. On what grounds. Opposition to the Council in the Libri Carolini. Their author. The Libri Carolini opposed both to extreme Iconoclasts and superstitious Iconoduli. Respecting the purpose and use of images. Respecting the Holy Scriptures; the sign of the cross; relics, and the use of lamps and incense. Declaration respecting the miracles effected by images. Respecting the confirmation of image-worship by dreams. Respecting saint worship. Against the Byzantine Basileolatric (king worship). Against the guidance of councils by a female. The Emperor sends these confutations to the Pope. The Pope's reply. Decree of the Assembly at Frankfort against image-worship. ~~~~~

288

314

### III. REACTION OF THE SECTS AGAINST THE PREDOMINANT DOCTRINES.

Remnant of the old sects in the East. Their opposition to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; but especially against their corruption by the interpolation of Judaical doctrines. ~~~~~

*The Paulicians.* Whether descended from the Manichaeans? Callinike and her sons Paul and John. Points of difference between Paulicians and Manichaeans. Points of agreement between same. Possibility of their connection. Critique on the history of Callinike and her sons. Origin of the name of the Paulicians. Constantine (Silvanus), author of the sect. Attachment of the Paulicians to the New Testament, and to the writings of St Paul especially. Their persecution under Constantine Pogonatus. Symeon appointed to direct the inquiry against them (684). Constantine stoned. Symeon being inclined to the opinions of the Paulicians, becomes at last, under the name of Titus, head of the sect. Its renewed persecution under Justinian II. (690). Symeon is executed. Paulus. Schism in the sect of the Paulicians by means of Gegnæsius and Theodorus. Gegnæsius tried at Constantinople and declared orthodox. The Paulicians op-

315

posed to image-worship: whether that was the reason of the favourable inclination of Leo the Isaurian to the same? John of Oznum. Fresh schism in the sect of the Paulicians under Zecharias and Joseph. Extension of their operations to Asia Minor. Baanes <i>δρουπαρος</i> . Sergius (Tychicus), the reformer of the sect. Consequences of his influence. False accusations of their adversaries against Sergius and the Paulicians. Whether Sergius called himself a Paraclete. The Emperor Nicephorus gentle towards the Paulicians. Reason of this. A party in the Greek Church disapproves of the bloody persecution of heretics. Theodorus Studita its representative. Persecution of the Paulicians under the Emperor Michael Kuropalates, and Leo the Arminian. Conspiracy of the Paulicians. <i>Κυνοχωριται, Αργαουται</i> . Irruption of the Paulicians into the Roman provinces. Sergius opposed to this. His murder. ~~~~~	331
Doctrines of the Paulicians. Dualistic principles. Whether they derived the creation of the world from the evil principle? Demiurgos and the perfect God. Various opinions respecting the creation of the heavens. The material world, the work of the Demiurgos. Constituents of human nature	337
Anthropogonie and Anthropologie of the Paulicians. Fragment of one of Sergius's letters. Meaning of the word <i>πορνεία</i> which occurs in it. Original connection of the soul with God. Continuance of this connection. Importance of the doctrine of redemption. Person and nature of the Redeemer. Doctrine respecting the corporeal nature of Christ. Monophysitism in the Armenian Church. Various constitutions of same. Controversy respecting the worship of the Virgin. The sufferings of Christ. Symbolic signification of the Crucifixion. Opposition to the reverence for the sign of the cross. Simplification of the religious services. Rejection of the use of the sacraments. They call themselves the Catholic Church, <i>χριστοπολιται</i> . Apostolical simplicity in church ordinances. <i>Προσευχαι</i> . Opposition to the priesthood. Church officers—apostles and prophets; <i>ποιμενες</i> and <i>διδασκαλοι</i> ; <i>συνεκδημοι</i> ; <i>νωταριοι</i> . Successor of Sergius in the government of the sect. <i>Αστατοι</i> . Morality of the Paulicians. Earnest moral spirit of their doctrines. Opposed to the ascetic precepts of the Greek Church. Respecting the Old Testament. <i>Προσκυνησις</i> of the books of the Evangelists—especial regard for the gospels of Luke and John.—Rejection of the epistles of Peter. Other antihierarchical sects.— <i>Αθιγγανοι</i> . ~~~~~	349



# CHURCH HISTORY.

---

THIRD PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH: FROM THE ROMISH BISHOP, GREGORY THE GREAT, TO THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES THE GREAT—THAT IS, FROM THE YEAR 590 TO THE YEAR 814.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

ANOTHER theatre was opened, at this period, for the world-transforming activity of the Gospel ; and we see it operating in a new and peculiar manner. In the earlier chapters of this work, we observed how Christianity united itself with the systems of culture in the old world, as exhibited under the form of Greek and Roman nationality ; and how, when the harmonious design, founded on the principles of nature and humanity, had reached its highest point, and then, by suffering itself to be perverted, was destroyed, Christianity was the means of introducing a new and divine element of life ; and of thereby reanimating the race lying under spiritual death, and of elevating it to a far higher degree of spiritual development than it had hitherto reached : whence a new creation was seen arising out of the new spirit, but retaining the old form.

But a people of an altogether ruder nature now present themselves to our notice ; and to these also Christianity is seen imparting the germ of all human culture in the seed of divine life ; not, indeed, as something already prepared from without, but so that it should develop itself, as something essentially fresh, from within, through the inward impulses of divine life, corresponding to the peculiar character of the people.

It is the most remarkable feature in this later movement of Christianity, that the new creation did not connect itself with a culture already existing, and derived from another root. On the contrary, here all springs forth fresh from the very root and essence of Christianity itself, and we come to the source whence flowed the whole peculiar life of the middle ages, and modern culture.

The form, indeed, in which these rude people became acquainted with Christianity, was not that of the pure gospel ; but the form of ecclesiastical tradition, transmitted from the early ages, in which, as the history of its development shews us, the divine word was mingled with many heterogeneous elements. Still, amid the wood, hay, and stubble of debasing human notions, concealed though it was by these foreign additions, the one ever firmly standing ground of faith in the redeeming love of the heavenly Father, revealed in Christ, and in Him as the redeemer of sinful mankind, could yet proclaim its divine energy for the conversion, the edifying, and illumination of humanity ; and, in such a way, that it might be implanted as a principle therein, being given, for this it was, as the element out of which the reaction must begin against all the strange and heterogeneous mixtures of which we have spoken.

We trace this reaction, in union with the development of church tradition, through the whole of the middle ages ; and while, on the one side, these strange elements assume continually a firmer consistency ; so, on the other, we see the reaction of the original Christian consciousness, which was directly opposed to them, becoming stronger and stronger, till it acquired the force of a process penetrating and renewing the entire church. Nor was there wanting at the same time a fountain of the divine word, in the letter of Scripture, not in like manner exposed to pollution, through which the church might learn to distinguish the original Christianity from its later additions, whenever it desired to complete the purifying of the Christian conscience.

The manifest mixture of Christianity with foreign elements, may be proved by this particular fact, namely, that the idea of the kingdom of God was lowered from the spiritual and inward to the sensual and outward : instead of the constant inward and spiritual communion with the kingdom of God by faith, a constant outward communion, by set and visible forms, was introduced ;

instead of the common spiritual priesthood, an especial outward priesthood was established as an essential medium of communion with the kingdom of God. Thus the idea of that kingdom was converted more and more into the form of the Old Testament theocracy ; and hence the church of Christ was obliged to assume the character of an outward visible theocracy, which necessarily involved a manifold mixture of Jewish and Christian principles.

But the Old Testament form which the church thus assumed, was a transition point for the rude people, who were not as yet able to receive the gospel in its pure spirituality, as the rule of life, and who needed the discipline of the law. They were hereby prepared for the attainment of spiritual maturity, to which the way was opened through the reaction grounded in Christian consciousness.

The new creation of Christianity which we have now to consider, had its beginning with the rude people, especially of German origin, who had formed their settlements in the ruined provinces of the Roman Empire, which they themselves had overthrown, and were now erecting another stage for the display of human progress in the West. It is of vast importance for the understanding of this whole new period of church history, to consider how Christianity was first planted here ; and we shall comprehend all that pertains to this subject under one point of view. Some of the details thus given belonged chronologically to the earlier centuries ; but we passed them over as having little connection with the development of Christianity in the old Romish-Greek world.

## SECTION FIRST.

## THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE WORLD: ITS INCREASE AND LIMITS.

## 1. IN EUROPE.

Many of the tribes of German origin, which during the migration in the fourth and fifth centuries, planted themselves in Gaul, were converted to the faith by their intercourse with the Christian inhabitants. Pious bishops and abbots, as, in the fifth and sixth centuries, an Avitus of Vienne, a Faustus of Rhejii, and a Cæsarius of Arles,<sup>1</sup> exhibited in these lands, by the example of a life of unwearied and devoted charity, the blessed influence of their faith. By the same means they gained for themselves the confidence of the leaders of the rude people, inspiring love and confidence in the people themselves, and thus contributing greatly to the further spread of the gospel.

Marriages were a further means by which the seed of Christianity was conveyed from one of these tribes to another. Thus the

<sup>1</sup> Cæsarius was distinguished by his zeal both for the bodily and spiritual welfare of the people among whom he lived; for the earnestness with which he communicated religious instruction to the people, in private as well as by preaching, and according to their necessities; and for the manner in which he relieved their temporal miseries, and redeemed those who had been taken as bond slaves. In order to render help to the distressed, he sold the vessels of the church, and even his own clerical vesture. Under the difficult circumstances produced by changes of government, and the conflicts between Burgundians, East-Goths, West-Goths, and Franks; and while living under the rule of Arian princes to whom, through difference of doctrine, he might naturally be an object of suspicion, he was yet able, by the reverence which his purity of life inspired, by the wisdom with which he managed different characters, and by the power of his charity exercised towards all, to establish his influence. Although political suspicion exposed him to persecution, his innocence was victoriously displayed in the end, and the honour which he gained among the princes of the foreign tribes became so much the greater. His life, written by his scholars, in the *Actis Sanctorum Mens. August.*, t. vi., as also the fragments of his sermons, of which we should like to see a complete critical edition, afford us a good view of his labours.



Burgundians, though not in the safest or surest way, had been converted at the beginning of the fifth century,<sup>1</sup> and soon after their settlement in Gaul. If not originally instructed in Christian doctrine by Arian teachers,<sup>2</sup> they were, at a later period, by their intercourse with Arian tribes, settled in these provinces and especially with the West-Goths, led to embrace the Arian creed.<sup>3</sup> Nor was it till the time of King Gundobad, who lived in strict friendship with Avitus, bishop of Vienne, a man who laboured with untiring zeal for the diffusion of the Catholic faith, and whom the king diligently consulted respecting religious matters, that the Burgundian princes adopted the Nicene doctrine. In the year 499 a disputation<sup>4</sup> was held between Avitus and the Arian clergy, by the order of Gundobad, whose son Siegismond, con-

1 Orosius, indeed, in his *Hist.* viii. 32, speaks of them as Christians; mentions the change which Christianity had wrought in the manners of the people; and the account of Socrates, writing so far from the scene of the events. vii. 30. There may be something true in this, but it is far from satisfactory.

2 This is, at least, conceivable; for we have no definite account of the beginning of their conversion, nor any better means of accounting for their later perseverance in Arianism.

3 The Arians having been driven out of the Romish church, were so much the more anxious to disseminate their doctrine among the people not yet converted to Christianity, or not yet firmly grounded in their Christian belief. We have already remarked how the anti-Nicene creed was likely to find acceptance among a rude people. We should certainly be unjust, did we pass an indiscriminating sentence upon the whole of these Arian missionaries and clergymen. According to that which is known to us from the life and writings of Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, and from the history of the persecution under the Vandals by Bishop Victor de Vita, belonging to that party, we may discover indications of a fierce zeal, to which the spread of Arianism was of more worth than that of the gospel. And Bishop Maximus of Turin warns people against those probably Arian priests, who made it appear a light thing for men to become Christians; saying that they deceived their hearers "*fallacibus blandimentis,*" favouring the custom among the German people of compounding by fines (*compositiones*) for every species of crime; and making a trade of absolution. *Ut si quis laicorum fassus fuerit crimen admissum, non dicat ille: age pœnitentiam, sed dicat; pro hoc crimine da tantum mihi, et indulgetur tibi.* Hom. x. in Mabillon, *Museum Italicum.* t. i. p. ii. pag. 28. But we are not justified in taking our view of the Arian clergy from such sources. The condition of the Burgundians speaks much more for than against them. When at the religious conference, held under king Gundobad, in the year 499, between the two parties, Avitus, bishop of Vienne, declared that God himself would testify by miracle at the grave of St Justus, in behalf of the Catholic faith, and the offer was made known to the king, the Arians, on the contrary, announced, *se pro fide sua manifestanda facere nolle, ut fecerat Saul, et ideo maledictus fuerat, aut recurrere ad incantationes et illicita: sufficere sibi, se habere Scripturam, quæ sit fortior omnibus præstigiis.* See Sirmond. *Op.* t. ii. p. 226.

4 One of the most distinguished of the courtiers endeavoured, and not without reason, to hinder this disputation, saying, *Quod tales rixæ exasperabant animos multitudinis, et quod non poterat aliquid boni ex eis provenire.*

verted to the Catholic faith during his father's life, by the labours of Avitus, declared himself openly for it, when he came to the throne in the year 517.<sup>1</sup>

It was from this people that the seed of Christianity was transmitted to the race, which exercised, in this and the following age, the most important influence on the history of the West, namely, the Franks. Chlotilde, the daughter of the Burgundian king Gundobad, married the king of the Salian Franks, Chlodwig. This rude warrior, to whom religion probably seemed a matter of little weight, and who, as a heathen, might allow many kinds of worship to exist together, hindered her not in the practice of her religion, which she promoted with earnest zeal. She was anxious to convince her husband of the vanity of his idols, and to convert him to Christianity, by exalting the omnipotence of the only true God, whom the Christians honoured. But Chlodwig was accustomed, according to his heathen notions, to measure the power of the gods according to the success in war which they afforded the people by whom they were worshipped.<sup>2</sup> Hence the ruin of the Romish empire, from which the worship of the God of the Christians was derived, appeared to him as a proof of the weak-

<sup>1</sup> The question now arose, whether the churches which had hitherto been used by the Arians ought to be consecrated anew for the orthodox worship, as was the case with the heathen temples, and those belonging to heretics; and as it had been determined a few years before by the council of Orleans (Aurelianense) held an. 511, in reference to the churches used by the West-Goths as Arians. Avitus, however, opposed such a proceeding, partly from fanaticism, because, he said, that which had once been polluted by heretics could not again be consecrated to a holy purpose; but also from many striking principles of Christian wisdom, for cause would be given to the heretics if their churches were taken from them, to complain of persecution: *Cum Catholicam mansuetudinem calumnias haereticorum atque gentilium plus deceat sustinere quam facere. Quid enim tam durum, quam si illi, qui aperta perversitate pereunt, de confessione sibi aut martyrio blandiantur?* Nor is it impossible that their orthodox king might have a successor who was inclined to Arianism, and would excite a persecution against the orthodox, in retribution of the injustice which had been suffered: *Non sectæ suae studio, sed ex vicissitudinis retributione fecisse dicetur, et nobis etiam post mortem gravandis ad peccatum reputabitur, quicquid fuerit perpessa posteritas.* Or one of the neighbouring princes inclined to Arianism might think himself justified in thus showing his resentment against his Catholic subjects. The council, which was held this year, after the publicly-declared conversion of Siegismund, at Epaona, decided according to the views of Avitus. Canon 33.

<sup>2</sup> Avitus testifies, in his letter to this prince, ep. 41, that when the heathen princes were exhorted to religious conversion, they answered, that they could not forsake the religion transmitted to them from their forefathers. *Consuetudinem generis et ritum paternæ observationis.*

ness and nothingness of this Deity. He permitted her, however, to consecrate their first-born son to her God, and to have him baptized.<sup>1</sup> But the child died, and Chlodwig assumed this as a confirmation of what he had said of the God of the Christians. Still Chlotilde prevailed in having a second son baptized. This also proved sick, and Chlodwig prophesied its death; but the pious Chlotilde, whose faith nothing could disturb, prayed to her God to spare her child for his own honour among the heathen. The child recovered, and she announced it to her husband as a proof that her prayer had been heard.<sup>2</sup> The conversation and example of a woman, so zealous in and for her faith, could hardly fail, almost unconsciously to himself, to make, by degrees, a deep impression on the mind of her husband. To aid this influence, there was that also of some remarkable events, eminently calculated to work strongly on the senses and feeling of the rude Frank.

Martinus, bishop of Tours, was at that time an object of universal veneration in France. People were accustomed, in seasons of temporal or spiritual necessity, to seek help from God through his intercession. Afflicted with sicknesses, they hastened to his grave, over which a church had been built. Every year fresh instances were adduced of perjuries there confessed, or suddenly punished by divine judgments; of lunatics, paralytics, epileptics, of blind and dumb, there restored to the possession of their senses.<sup>3</sup> Even dust from the grave of Martin, pieces of wax candles burnt there, fragments of curtains hung before it, and similar things, sanctified by contact with the tomb, were regarded as a means for working miracles, and as a kind of amulets for the averting of

<sup>1</sup> With the witness which Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* ii. 27, bears respecting Chlodwig, still a heathen, in 486, namely, that he, in answer to the prayer of a bishop (probably Remigius of Rheims), promised to send back a beautiful vessel, which had been taken out of his church by the soldiers, as soon as his share of the booty was fixed. This agrees with what Avitus says to him, in his epistle, respecting the reverence which he shewed for the bishops while he was still a heathen. *Humilitas, quam jam dudum nobis devotione impenditis, qui nunc primum professione (after his late baptism) debetis.*

<sup>2</sup> Similar accounts are continually met with in the history of missions; compare, for example, what is related in the journal of the German missionaries in the East Indies for June 1832, and in the *Missionary Register* for the same year, p. 190.

<sup>3</sup> Gregory of Tours, at the end of the sixth century, collected all the accounts of this kind in his four books, *De Miraculis S. Martini*, which work, for all who wish to study the life and manners of the time, contains many curious things, and many which are interesting in a psychological point of view.

many kinds of danger. This veneration of Martin had extended even to Italy and Spain.

In much which regards these circumstances, apart from that in which fraud may have been concerned, we find nothing more than what has been related, among believing Christians, in all ages, respecting answer to prayer; except, indeed, that in this case, a strange trust in human mediation was added to pure Christianity. The whole may be ascribed, partly, to the influence of genuine confidence; to devotion; to the power of a spiritualized imagination working both on the bodily and mental faculties; partly, to the severe self-control exercised by those who sought the cure of their disorders;<sup>1</sup> while the ignorant, yielding themselves to the momentary impression, without closer inquiry, might easily mistake an accidental concurrence of circumstances for a causal connexion, and thus altogether neglect to seek the proper natural causes of the appearances and changes, permitting the extravagance of imagination still farther to enlarge the most wonderful of the stories told of the miracles wrought by Martin. If now and then a doubt was excited when the statement had too startling a sound, this was straightway attributed to the suggestion of the evil spirit.<sup>2</sup>

These wonderful things, exhibited at the tomb of Martin, were continually related by Chlotilde to her husband, as proofs of the omnipotence of the God whom the Christians worshipped. Chlodwig, however, to whom the whole must have appeared inexplicable, would not believe what she told him, till he could witness them with his own eyes.<sup>3</sup>

But thus, by many concurring impressions, Chlodwig was prepared for a change in his religious convictions, when this, which could not otherwise, perhaps, have been actually effected, was

<sup>1</sup> Gregory of Tours says, respecting the cure of the so-called demoniacs, and of those sick of fever, that they could only obtain a cure, si vere fuerint paritas et fides conjunctae. De Miraculis Martini. l. i. c. 8, and that one who returned to his former indulgences again became afflicted. c. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Gregor. Turonens. l. c. t. ii. c. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Nicetas, bishop of Triers, wrote to the Lombard queen, Chlodeswinde, the granddaughter of Chlotilde, Audisti ab avia tua Chlotilde, qualiter in Franciam veniret, quomodo dominum Chlodoveum ad legem Catholicam adduxerit, et quum esset astutissimus, noluit acquiescere, antequam vera agnosceret. Quum illa, quae supra dixi, probata cognovit, humilis ad Martini limina cecidit et baptizari se sine mora permisit. Bibl. Patr. Galland. t. xii.

brought about by a remarkable occurrence. He beheld his army, in the battle which he fought at Zülpich (Tolbiacum), A.D. 496, against the Alemanni, in the utmost danger. He had supplicated his gods in vain; when recollecting what had been told him of the omnipotence of the God of the Christians, he directed his prayers to Him; promised to devote himself to his service; and ascribed the victory which he gained wholly to His power. Overjoyed at the impression thus made on the mind of her husband, Chloltilde sent for Remigius, the venerable bishop of Rheims, who now found in Chlodwig a willing hearer of his statements. When he described to him the sufferings of Christ, the Frankish warrior, seized with indignation, exclaimed, according to his wont, "Would that I had been there with my Franks! I would soon have chastised the Jews." The festival of Christmas was chosen for the time of his baptism,<sup>1</sup> which was celebrated with great solemnity. It excited vast attention,<sup>2</sup> and was described in the most glowing terms of the poetic-rhetoric common to the age.<sup>3</sup> The example of the king affected many others; and more than three thousand of his soldiers are said to have been immediately baptized.<sup>4</sup>

Important, however, as was the conversion of Chlodwig, considering the constant increase of his power, for the extension of the Christian church, yet, like that of Constantine, it was of such a kind, that he rather allowed his former modes of thinking to be clothed in a Christian form, than become fundamentally changed by the spirit of the gospel. His worldly political interests occupied him too much; and he was too busy in warlike concerns to think deeply of the religion which he had thus adopted, or to be

<sup>1</sup> This appears from the letter of Avitus to Chlodwig, already quoted, and which was written shortly after his baptism, *Ut consequenter eo die ad salutem regenerari vos pateat, quo natum redemptioni suae cœli dominum mundus accepit.*

<sup>2</sup> As Gregory of Tours says, *Totum templum baptisterii divino respergitur ab odore talemque ibi gratiam adstantibus Deus tribuit, ut æstimarent, se paradisi odoribus collocari.*

<sup>3</sup> The misunderstanding of such expressions, and symbolical representations, gave rise, some centuries afterwards, to the well-known tradition of the miraculous preservation of the oil-flask, the so-called *Ampulla Remensis*, in connexion with the supposed confirmation of Chlodwig with the *Chrisma*, or kingly ointment.

<sup>4</sup> How important the conversion of Chlodwig was for the diffusion of Christianity among the people of German descent, appears from the congratulatory epistle of Avitus, above alluded to. He expects that now the entire people of the Franks will be converted; and he exhorts the king to promote the spread of the gospel by embassies. *Ut quia Deus, &c.*

able to learn its true principles, and apply them to himself. As the God of the Christians had appeared to him in the light of a tutelar deity in war, he was anxious to secure his further help, and this he believed he should be able to effect by bestowing rich presents on the church. He was well pleased in being furnished with a cloak for his sacrilege, when, in his war against the West-Goths, who were Arians, he could urge as a pretext for the undertaking, his pretended zeal for the honour of God.

The supposed conversion of vast multitudes, being effected through the influence of their princes, it was natural that much should be merely outward; and that, even when Christianity had assumed the place of the ruling religion among the Franks, there should still be found some votaries of idolatry. Thus King Childebert saw occasion, in the year 554, to pass a law against those who would not allow the images of the gods to be removed from their estates. The Frankish princes also sought continually to prove their piety by bestowing rich gifts on the churches and convents. But these institutions were thereby only the more exposed to the lust of the spoiler; while a further temptation was offered to mere worldly men to press themselves into the offices of the church. The numerous internal divisions, the wars and revolutions which took place in the Frankish kingdom, led to fresh barbarism, and retarded the civilizing influence of Christianity. As now that which may be legitimately accomplished by a church for the spread of the gospel is modified by its own internal condition, so, although the power of the Frankish kingdom greatly promoted the extension of Christianity, by facilitating and advancing the cause of missions, some proceeding from the church of the Franks, we must not look on this side for what was most remarkable in them, that shattered church itself requiring a new birth, which could only be effected by an influence from without. Then followed the collision which originated with those very countries whence the most remarkable missions were sent. Those islands which, on the one side, by their remote tranquil situation, were especially calculated to become the nurseries of Christianity, and Christian culture, and on the other, were adapted, for the same reason, to aid the communication of both temporal and spiritual good to mankind,—those islands, Great Britain and Ireland, were the seats in which, amid the solitudes of the cloister,

the men were formed who were especially fitted to become the teachers and guides of a rude people. We must, therefore, direct our attention, in the first place, to the history of Christianity in those islands, which took so important a part in the extension of the church.

With regard to Ireland, Patricius had left behind him a band of scholars prepared to labour in the same spirit. Ireland was the seat of monastic institutions so renowned, that they obtained for it the title of "Insula Sanctorum," or "the isle of saints." In these retreats the Holy Scriptures were diligently read, and ancient books were collected and studied with corresponding zeal. Hence arose missionary schools, as the convent at Bangor, founded in the second half of the sixth century by the venerable Abbot Comgall. A British bishop, Ninyas, having, at a much earlier period, planted Christianity in the southern provinces of the Picts, in Scotland, the Abbot Columba, about the year 565, came from Ireland, and established the gospel in the northern provinces of the Picts, a region separated from the southern by lofty mountains covered with ice and snow. The Picts whom he had converted gave him the island of Hy, lying to the north-west of Scotland, and afterwards reckoned among the Hebrides. Here he founded a monastery, which, under his government of thirty years' duration, acquired great reputation, and became a remote station for the cultivation of Biblical literature, according to the best notions of the time. The veneration for Columba conferred so high a degree of fame on this convent, that its abbots were allowed the chief part in the conduct of the neighbouring people and churches, even the bishops subjecting themselves to these officers, who were only priests. The island was named after him, St Iona (the names Columba and Iona being probably, the one the Latin, the other the Hebrew translation of an original Irish name), St Columba, and Columcelli, Colum Kill.

Whilst Christianity was thus being planted among the Scots and Picts, to the northernmost extremity of these islands, the Christian church in ancient Britain, or England, was shaken from its old and original foundations. The Britons, among whom Christianity, it is probable, was planted either directly or indirectly by missionaries from the East, in the latter part of the second century, had long been a Christian people, but many cor-

ruptions prevailed among all classes of the community. Unable to repress the ruinous invasions of their old enemies, the Picts and Scots, or to obtain help from the now powerless Romans, they had recourse, about the middle of the fifth century, to the Anglo-Saxons, a warlike branch of the great German race. But the Anglo-Saxons made themselves masters of the land, leaving the western division only to its ancient possessors, and founding the kingdom of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy. The Britons might have now done much for the conversion of the heathen people; but the hatred existing between the conquerors and the conquered prevented all such attempts. It was not till a century and half later that the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, a man full of zeal for the kingdom of God, and who, in the midst of a perpetual struggle with adverse circumstances, embraced in his view things far and near, formed the plan of founding a church among the Anglo-Saxons. An impression which he had received in his early years, that is before he was a bishop, and was still the abbot of a convent in Rome, inspired him with the first wish to accomplish this object. While walking one day about the marketplace, and noticing the foreign merchants offering their wares for sale, his attention was particularly attracted by the noble appearance of some youths who, brought from abroad, were about to be sold as slaves. He inquired respecting their country, and learnt, to his great affliction, that this people, so favoured by nature, were wholly destitute of the higher gifts of grace. His resolution was immediately taken to visit their land, in order to attempt their conversion; and this design he would have accomplished had he not been recalled, when some days on his journey, by the then Bishop of Rome, according to the wish of the Roman community.<sup>1</sup> But he could not give up the thought of this mission, and he seems to have been engaged with plans for its accomplishment from the very commencement of his career as bishop of Rome. Thus he instructed the presbyter, whom he charged with the administration of the church possessions in France, to employ a portion of the money collected in that country in the purchase of Anglo-Saxon youths, who might be offered for sale. They were to be sent to Rome, accompanied by a priest, who, in case of mortal sickness, might administer baptism to the sufferer, and such

<sup>1</sup> Beda, Hist. Ang. ii. 1.



as arrived at Rome were to be placed in convents, and there instructed and brought up.<sup>1</sup> Gregory probably intended to employ them, when they had become monks, as missionaries among their countrymen.

An occurrence in the meanwhile took place, which was especially favourable to this design. Edilberth, king of Kent, the most powerful of the petty monarchies comprising the Heptarchy, had espoused Bertha, a French Christian princess, and who, having free permission to practise the rites of her own religion, had brought with her a bishop, Liuthard. The missionaries received from this princess a ready and gracious support. Gregory, attentive to every thing which could further his designs, was probably encouraged by this circumstance to hasten the fulfilment of his plan. Thus in the year 596 he despatched a Roman abbot, Augustine, with a numerous train of followers,<sup>2</sup> among whom were the monk Peter, and the presbyter Laurentius, to England. Scarcely, however, had they fairly entered upon the journey, when, terrified by the difficulties and dangers with which, according to report, the way was beset, they sent Augustine back to Gregory, with an entreaty that they might be absolved from the task which they had undertaken. But Gregory admonished them in a friendly, though earnest letter,<sup>3</sup> to fulfil, with the help of God, the good work which had been commenced; since it was far better not to begin what is good, than, having begun it, to cease without effecting it. The greater the labour, the surer the reward of eternal glory. Gregory commended the missionaries on their journey through France, whence they were to embark for England, to the notice of the Frankish princes and nobles, whose relationship with the Anglo-Saxon rulers might enable them to prove useful to the undertaking. He also appointed them a native of France as interpreter.

In the year 597 Augustine landed with forty companions on the isle of Thanet, in the eastern part of Kent, and immediately acquainted the king with the object of their coming. The king arrived the next day, anxious to confer with them respecting the

<sup>1</sup> Ep. l. vi. ep. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine was abbot of the monastery which Gregory himself had founded when he retired from the world. *Monasterii mei prepositus*, l. iv. ep. 108.

<sup>3</sup> L. vi. ep. li.

nature of the design. Impressed, however, with the dread of sorcery, he would not venture to hold the conference under cover, but desired it to take place in the open air. Augustine happily soon inspired him with confidence, and the king acknowledged that he was convinced that men who came so far with the design of communicating to him what they believed to be the highest good, could only mean what was just. He could not, however, so easily and suddenly forsake the religion of his fathers and of his people. All that he could now do in recognition of their good will was this : he would allow them a residence and provision in his town of Canterbury ; and it should be permitted them to convince as many as they could of the truth of their religion, and then to baptize them.

The missionaries began their work with caution. They accepted only what was barely necessary for their support ; and their severe, unselfish course of life procured for them respect and confidence. An old ruinous church, existing from the time of the Romans, and dedicated to St Martin, afforded them their first station in the public worship of God. Here they baptized the new converts, and held their religious assemblies. It is certain that the diffusion of Christianity among the rude people was aided by a concurrence of circumstances, or by facts, which appeared to the multitude in the light of miracles, and were regarded as such by Augustine. Much might be effected by impressions of this kind, though not what is durable ; and the missionaries themselves might be deceived by the startling events of the moment. Yielding to the influence of his Christian wife, the king declared himself in favour of the gospel, and was baptized. He proclaimed, however, that though he publicly acknowledged the truth of Christianity, he did not intend to make his own convictions a law to his subjects. In this respect, he left every one to the enjoyment of his freedom, for Augustine had taught him, that the Christian's worship of God must be the fruit of unrestrained conviction, and not that of outward compulsion. It may be concluded, indeed, that Augustine had received instructions from the Roman bishop to promote the diffusion of the faith by admonition, by evidence, by heart-winning love, and not by force. His insight into the nature of divine worship, especially that of the

gospel, and the spirit of charity by which he was animated, had led Gregory to embrace these principles, although he by no means always acted in conformity with his theory.<sup>1</sup>

But the king was not backward in showing especial favour to those who followed his example in respect to religion. This example, and the influence of the prince, together with the sensible appeal of miracles, which it was believed occurred, induced a great number of people to be baptized, who, as was seen in the sequel,

1 We would here compare the instances of Gregory's conduct, in this respect, with each other. When blind zeal, or selfish desire and passion, using religion for a cloak, violently assailed the Jews in the free observance of their rites, secured to them in their synagogues by ancient law, Gregory appeared as their champion, and declared himself utterly opposed to such proceedings. To this conclusion, under the circumstances in which he was placed, he could only be led by pure love of justice, and by zeal for the preservation of legal order, because here an attempt was made to snatch from the Jews, by bold invasion, that which had been granted them by the laws. As the ground of his opposition to such a course, he says, l. i. ep. 19, "Hebræos gravari vel affligi contra ordinem rationis prohibemus; sed sicut Romanis vivere legibus permittuntur, annuente justitia actus suos, ut norunt, nullo impediendo disponant." And l. viii. ep. 25, "Judæi in his, quæ iis concessa sunt, nullum debent præjudicium sustinere." But he declares himself still more strongly against the attempt to convert the Jews by violence; for this reason, because the very opposite of that which was desired would be the result of such efforts. Instruction and conviction were the only means by which it should be sought to work upon them, l. ix. ep. 47. To the bishops of Arles and Marseilles he says: "Dum enim quispiam ad baptismatis fontem non prædicationis suavitate, sed necessitate pervenerit, ad pristinam superstitionem remeans, inde deterius moritur, unde renatus esse videbatur. Fraternalitas ergo vestra hujus modi homines frequenti prædicatione provocet, quatenus mutare veterem vitam majis de doctoris suavitate desiderant, adhibendus ergo est illis sermo, qui et errorum in ipsis spinas urere debeat et prædicando quod in his tenebrescit illuminet." And in a letter to the bishop of Naples l. xiii. ep. 12: "Cur Judæis qualiter caerimonias suas colere debeant, regulas ponimus, si per hoc eos lucrari non possumus? Agendum ergo est, ut ratione potius et mansuetudine provocati, sequi nos velint, non fugere, ut eis ex eorum codicibus ostendentes quæ dicimus, ad sinum matris ecclesie Deo possimus adjuvante convertere." And in ep. 35, "Eos, qui a religione Christiana discordant, mansuetudine, benignitate, admonendo, suadendo, ad unitatem fidei necesse est congregare, ne, quos dulcedo prædicationis et præventus futuri Judicis terror ad credendum invitari poterat, minis et terroribus repellantur." But Gregory did not always act in conformity with these expressed sentiments. Thus, for example, he ordered that the taxes, which weighed heavily upon the Jews who occupied estates pertaining to the possessions of the church in Sicily, should be lessened in the case of those who received baptism. He must have seen that a conversion brought about by such means was not a genuine one, but he thought, "Et si ipsi minus fideliter veniunt, hi tamen, qui de eis nati fuerint, jam fidelius baptizantur," l. v. ep. 7. And he directed that the peasants in Sardinia, who were still addicted to idolatry, should be compelled to renounce it by the imposition of intolerable taxes, "Ut ipsa reactionis suae poena compellantur ad rectitudinem festinare," l. iv. ep. 26. Those among the slaves who still adhered to heathenism were to be punished with corporal chastisement; the free with close imprisonment: "Ut qui salubria et a mortis periculo revocantia audire verba contemnunt, cruciatus saltem eos corporis ad desideratam mentis valeant reducere sanitatem," l. ix. ep. 85, l. viii. ep. 18.

were far from being grounded in the faith. It appears that on a single occasion, that is on a Christmas day, Augustine baptized more than ten thousand heathens, a circumstance, however, to which he appears to have attributed too great an importance.

In obedience to the direction of Gregory, Augustine now proceeded to France, in order to receive episcopal consecration from Etherick, Bishop of Arles, and thus to enable himself to perform, in the new church, the proper functions of a prelate. He also sent his two associates, the presbyter Laurentius and the monk Peter, to Rome, for the purpose of affording Pope Gregory, to whom he had already, it is probable, given some general account of the vast success of the mission,<sup>1</sup> a more detailed narrative of what had been effected. They were also to desire of the Pope instructions how to proceed on some points of difficulty in arranging the affairs of the new church. They were anxious to give it a firm foundation through the approval of the papal see, and to obtain from him a fresh supply of labourers in carrying on the arduous design.

In the first, or one of the earliest letters, which Gregory wrote to Augustine, he testified the great joy which he felt at that which had taken place in England, and recognised it as the work of Him who had said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." He, at the same time, impressed Augustine with warnings, which give strong proofs of his Christian wisdom: "It might well rejoice him, that the souls of the English had been brought by outward wonders to inward grace; but he must be cautious to guard himself, in the consciousness of human weakness, against the invasions of pride." He reminded him of the words of the Lord to the disciples, when they had returned from their first mission, and testified their joy, that the evil spirits were subject to them through his name (Luke x. 20.) Jesus turned their thoughts from the selfish and transitory gratification, to that which is com-

<sup>1</sup> Gregory, in his epistle to Bishop Eulogius of Alexandria, l. viii. ep. 30, speaks of the conversion of the English by Augustine in the following terms, *Quia tantis miraculis vel ipsi vel hi, qui cum eo transmissi sunt, in gente eadem coruscant, ut apostolorum virtutes in signis quæ exhibent, imitari videantur.* He then gives him the news of the baptism of the multitude of people at the preceding Christmas. And so also in s. 27, in c. 36. Job. c. 21, *Omnipotens Dominus emicantibus prædicatorum miraculis ad fidem etiam terminos mundi perduxit: lingua Britanniae, quæ nil aliud noverat, quam barbarum frendere, jam dudum in divinis laudibus Hebræum cœpit alleluja resonare.*

mon and eternal; it being for the disciples of truth to delight in the good which is universal, and which is the object of all joy. As a means of resistance to the increase of spiritual pride, the pontiff recommended Augustine to exercise himself with the strictest discipline, and always to keep in mind the purpose for which the gifts spoken of were allowed him, that is, for the salvation of those among whom he was appointed to minister. He reminded him of the example of Moses, who, although God wrought so many miracles by him, was not esteemed worthy to enter the promised land. Miracles, he added, were no sure sign of election, for the Lord had said, that many of those who will appeal to wonders wrought in his name will not be acknowledged by him as his disciples at the last. (Matt. vii. 22.) The Lord has appointed only one sign upon which we may confidently rely, and rejoice in it as a sure proof of election, the sign, that is, of mutual love as his disciples. (John xiii. 35.) This, says Gregory, he wrote to him, in order to shew the necessity of humility. But with humility he might combine a sure trust in God: "I, sinner as I am," exclaimed the Pope, "have the most certain hope that, through the grace of our almighty Creator and Redeemer, thy sins have been forgiven thee, and that thou hast been chosen to obtain for others also the pardon of their iniquities."<sup>1</sup>

Gregory supplied Augustine with additional labourers. As a friend of monastic institutions, he chose monks for this purpose, and placed at their head the abbot Mellitus. Furnishing him with an admonitory letter to the king, he sent also presents to the monarch, and the pallium for Augustine, as a sign of archiepiscopal dignity. To these were added a copy of the Holy Scriptures, relics for the consecration of the new churches, various furniture for the same, and an answer to the questions laid before him: the latter indicated, in some degree, a confined spirit.

Among other things which had attracted the notice of Augustine, in his journey through France, was the difference between

<sup>1</sup> Lib. xi. ep. 28. The more Gregory was inclined to credit the wonders wrought in his time, and to recognise in such visible appearances the divine power working for the good of the church, by so much the more remarkable is it that he in nowise overvalued the worth of miracles for the extension of the kingdom of God, but constantly endeavoured to suppress the carnal desire of miracles, as opposed to the Christian idea of miracles, and the nature of the higher life. We shall explain his remarkable ideas on this subject in connection with our account of his general character.

many of the church ceremonies practised in that country and those of Rome. Hence he proposed to Gregory the question, "Why, since there is but one faith, should the usages of the church be so various?" Gregory replied, that, although he had been educated in the practice of the Romish rites, he should, by no means, confine himself strictly to those alone in the arrangements of the new church—that he should rather select what was good, wherever it could be found, whether in the Gallic church or elsewhere, for that things were not to be loved on account of the place, but the place on account of the things. A warning against a servile dependence on the Romish church not a little remarkable, as proceeding from the mouth of a Roman bishop.

We learn from Gregory's exhortation to King Edilberth, that it was his intention, at first, to insist on the demolition of all the idolatrous temples.<sup>1</sup> But when he had more maturely considered the subject, he changed his design, and sent a letter accordingly to the abbot Mellitus,<sup>2</sup> in which he stated that these temples, if built well, should not be destroyed; but that, having been sprinkled with holy water, and furnished with relics, they should be converted into temples of the living God, and that the people might thereby be induced the more readily to assemble, these having been their wonted places of worship.<sup>3</sup>

In the same manner, a compensation was to be allowed the rude, uncultivated people, for the loss of the festivals kept in honour of their gods. Holy days were to be instituted in memory of the consecration of churches, or of the saints whose relics they enshrined. On such days, the people were to erect green arbours around the churches, and there to eat their festive meal, rendering thanks to the Giver of all Good for these his temporal blessings; so that, a certain degree of earthly enjoyment being allowed them, they might the more easily be led to seek that which is inward and spiritual. It was impossible to subdue untaught minds at once.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L. xi. ep. 66.

<sup>2</sup> L. xi. ep. 76.

<sup>3</sup> Ad loca, quæ consuierit, familiaris concurrat.

<sup>4</sup> Gregory here appeals to the example of the divine procedure in the education of mankind, and sees in the Jewish system of sacrifice, referring to the true God, a correspondence with that which took place in the heathen worship.

When Gregory nominated Augustine as the first archbishop of the new church, he intended to make London the chief city of the province, which was to comprehend twelve subordinate bishoprics. The second metropolitan seat was to be fixed at York, when Christianity was sufficiently diffused. Each archbishopric was to be independent of the other, and to be esteemed of equal dignity, and subject only to the See of Rome.<sup>1</sup> He determined the rank of the dioceses according to that which the several cities had held during the government of the Romans. London and York were well known to him in connection with that period. Not so the city Dorovern, or Canterbury, as the capital of one of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. As might naturally have been expected, however, Augustine could not make London, which belonged to another principality, the chief city of the first archbishopric. He could only give this character to the capital of the kingdom in which he had first founded the Christian church. In this respect, therefore, there was necessarily a departure from the injunctions of the pontiff. Nothing, however, is known to us of what took place on this subject between him and Augustine. But through the influence of King Edilberth, whose niece was married to Sabereth, king of the East-Saxons, Christianity found an entrance into that province; and Augustine founded an archbishopric at London, in this part of the heptarchy, and conferred the dignity on Mellitus.

According to the directions of the Roman bishop, Augustine was to exercise the highest authority, not only in the newly-established Anglo-Saxon church, but also in that of the ancient Britons. Gregory contemplated the entire Western church from a point of view which he assumed as an inheritor of the spiritual power descending from St Peter. Augustine, great as was his pious zeal, does not appear to have been wholly free from pride and ambition. He would, on the one side, allow neither any partner in the dignity of his primacy over the whole English church, nor any spiritual authority independent of his own; while, on the other side, considering the small number of labourers employed with him in forming a church among the heathen, it was of vast importance for him to obtain the co-operation of the numerous clergy and monks of the British people. But as the latter had

<sup>1</sup> L. xi. ep. 65.

received Christianity not from Rome, but either directly or indirectly from the East, they had never been accustomed to venerate the Roman church as their mother, but regarded themselves as standing to her in an altogether independent relation. Their long separation from the other parts of Western Christendom served to confirm this feeling, and to increase the love of ecclesiastical independence. Some of their church customs also, derived from antiquity, were different to those which prevailed at Rome. Such as the time of keeping the festival of Easter; the form of the tonsure; and several of the rites practised at baptism. Augustine's prejudiced devotion to the Romish forms, and spiritual pride, were little calculated to favour a tolerant judgment of these differences, or to promote agreement. Deynoch, the abbot of the Anglo-Saxon Monastery at Bangor, whose opinion on church matters was of vast weight among his people, when required by Augustine to submit himself in all things to the orders of the Roman church, gave him this memorable answer, "We are all prepared to hearken to the church of God, to the Pope of Rome, and to every pious Christian, in such a way as to manifest to all, according to their several stations, perfect charity, and to uphold them both by word and deed. We know not what other obedience we can owe to him, whom you call pope, or father of fathers. But this duty we are ready to exercise towards him, and every Christian."<sup>1</sup>

It was the wish of King Edilberth, that the bishops of the neighbouring British province should hold a conference with Augustine on this subject. The meeting took place, according to an ancient German custom, under an oak.<sup>2</sup> It is characteristic of Augustine, that, when the British would not yield, he made a proposal that a sick man should be brought forward, and that both parties should attempt, by prayer, to effect his cure. An answer to the prayer should be regarded as the decision of divine justice. The British at length declared that they could not accept the proposal without the consent of a greater number of their brethren. But before they proceeded to convene a larger assembly, they consulted a pious hermit who was held in high honour, as to his

<sup>1</sup> The Anglo-Saxon origin of this word with the Latin translation in Wilkin's Collection of the English Councils, or in Bede's Hist. Eccl. Angl. ed. Smith, f. 116.

<sup>2</sup> The spot was still called in the time of Bede, Augustine's Oak. The Synod at Wigorn A.D. 601.



opinion on the subject. He answered them that they might follow Augustine, if he was a man of God. When they further asked him, by what sign they might know him to be a man of God? the hermit replied, that if he was gentle and humble of heart, after the pattern of the Lord, it might be concluded that, as a disciple of Christ, he bore the yoke of his master, and would not desire to impose any different yoke upon others. But if, on the contrary, he proved himself to be of a fierce and haughty disposition, it would at once be evident that he was not born of God, and that no heed must be given to his words. When they further asked, what were the signs of a gentle, humble man, he replied that they must, in the first instance, invite him to an assembly with his party; and that if he rose when they entered, they might recognize him as a servant of Christ. If, on the contrary, he remained sitting, although they were by far the more numerous party, they ought then to conclude differently respecting him.

This proof of humility Augustine did not give, and the Britons accordingly refused to enter into communion with him. It appears that he expressed his displeasure on this occasion, and said, "Well, then, since they will not own the Anglo-Saxons as brethren, or allow us to make known to them the way of life, they must regard them as enemies, and look for revenge." Through the natural hatred of the Anglo-Saxons to the Britons, which Augustine increased by ecclesiastical dissensions, the fulfilment of the above threat might be easily accomplished.<sup>1</sup> But the relationship of the Britons to the Anglo-Saxon and Romish church was of great importance to the history of the Western church in the following centuries. We meet with numerous traces at this later period of a reaction against the Romish hierarchy, arising from the independent spirit of the Britons in regard to the church.

Augustine died in the year 605, and, according to the wish which he had expressed, Laurentius was appointed his successor. But the new church, exposed to a continued change of circum-

<sup>1</sup> If, according to the received account in Bede, from which, however, the old Anglo-Saxon version differs, the attack made by King Edilberth upon the Britons, whose blood was largely shed, did not take place till after Augustine's death, and therefore is not to be ascribed to his direct influence, yet, considering his power over the minds of the Anglo-Saxons as opposed to the Britons, he must be regarded as not wholly free from an indirect share in the guilt.

stances, had, as yet, no firm foundation. We have already remarked, that many of those who had been converted to Christianity, were led rather by the influence and example of the king, or by a momentary, sensual impression, than by any deep-seated conviction. The death, therefore, of King Edilberth in 616, could scarcely fail to be attended with important changes. His son Eadbald returned immediately to the old idolatry, which imposed less restraint upon his immoral course of life. His example was followed by many others. A similar revolution took place in East-Saxony (Essex), where Christianity was still less firmly rooted. At the death of King Sabereth, his three sons declared themselves openly in favour of heathenism, which they had never, in fact, heartily renounced. They had refused to be baptized; but they would not allow themselves to be excluded from enjoying the beautiful white bread<sup>1</sup> which the bishop distributed at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. To this they might be induced, either by the agreeable flavour of the bread itself, or by the notion that it was possessed of magical properties, a belief to which they might easily be led by the manner in which the wonderful powers of the sacrament were popularly described. When the bishop of London, Mellitus, refused to indulge them in their wish, he was expelled with all his clergy. He retired to Kent, in order to consult with Laurentius what, under these circumstances, ought to be done. It was already agreed that with such a fierce opposition to its success, the mission must be given up. Already was Laurentius prepared to follow his companions, the bishops Mellitus and Justus, who had now taken their departure. But his conscience reproached him with the feeling, that he was about to renounce a charge committed to him by God. After ardent prayer and many tears, he laid himself down to rest on a straw pallet, the night before his intended departure, in the church of St Peter and St Paul. He fell asleep while painfully thinking of the future. During his slumber the apostle Peter appeared to him in a vision, and severely rebuked him for proposing to forsake the flock entrusted to his care.<sup>2</sup> The young king, Eadbald, could

<sup>1</sup> *Panis nitidus* is the expression in Bede. This may be understood as signifying that a particular kind of bread, as unleavened bread, had been introduced in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; but it may simply mean that white and fine bread, especially baked for the purpose, was employed.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible indeed that Laurentius, according to the principle of *fraus pia*, might

not, perhaps, wholly destroy in his heart the seeds of Christianity which had been planted there in his childhood. The impression then made upon him had only yielded to the force of sensual temptation. It can, therefore, be easily understood, how the awful picture which Laurentius gave of his vision, might work on his imagination, whilst the impression, still hidden in the depth of his mind, was restored to life. Laurentius took advantage of this state of feeling to reawaken the faith which sensuality had suppressed in the soul of the king. He allowed himself to be baptized; renounced idolatry altogether; and dissolved the unlawful connections into which he had entered.

Heathenism had a longer reign in the province of East-Saxony. Christianity, however, extended itself from Kent to another of the little kingdoms, that of Northumberland, which served as a capital for the further spread of the gospel. The king, Edwin, had married Edilberga, a sister of Eadbald, king of Kent, but on the condition that the princess should be allowed to bring with her Christian ministers, and to exercise the rites of her religion undisturbed. Paulinus was given her as a bishop; and the capital of the province, Eboracum (York) afterwards became the seat of the new diocese. The prelate laboured with the greatest zeal for the conversion of the prince and the people; but he found little favour with the latter till he had won the former to the side of the gospel. King Edwin, however, was not to be easily changed in his religious convictions. He required earnest proof. He was already convinced of the nothingness of the heathen gods, and had ceased to worship them. Still he did not, as yet, acknowledge Christianity, but declared that he must first know more of its doctrines, and consult carefully the opinions of the wisest of his people.

Edwin frequently occupied himself in retired meditation on the subject of religion. In a favourable moment, and when he was indulge himself in poetizing for the sake of working on the mind of the young king; whilst the other account is so natural that we see no sufficient ground for opposing it. If all happened as Bede relates, namely, that Laurentius showed the prince the marks of the scourge, this might certainly encourage the belief, that if Laurence did really see a vision, he yet employed some art and deceit to make the impression upon the king more powerful. But it is not considered by what means he might himself be deceived; while it is possible that the original fact may have been converted into a wonder by tradition. It should be remarked, that many accounts of such marvellous visions, employed in the way of punishment, were common in the early times of the church.

sunk in thought, Paulinus took advantage of the knowledge which he had accidentally obtained, of a vision which the king had seen in a situation of great peril and alarm. By these means he induced him to resolve upon calling an assembly of his priests and nobles, and at which Paulinus was to be present, for the purpose of deciding their religious disputes.

Many voices were now for the first time raised against the worship of idols. One of the nobles present employed this sensual comparison, in order to show how important it is for men to arrive at certainty on the subject of religion. "As when, in winter, the king, and his nobles and servants, are assembled for a feast, and they gather around the fire, in the middle of the hall, feeling nothing of the cold and the rough winter weather, while the storm and the snowdrifts rage without, and a sparrow flies quickly through the hall, in at one door and out at another, the moment which the bird passes in the warm hall, not feeling the rough weather, is to the whole of the long time which it has spent under the storm, and still must spend, the same as this brief moment of our present life is to that portion of time which has gone before, or is still to come, and of which we know nothing. We ought, therefore, of right, to adopt this new doctrine, if it can afford us more certainty in these things." Paulinus having delivered a discourse on the doctrine of Christianity, the high-priest himself was the first to demand the destruction of the idols, and riding instantly to the place which formed the centre of the idol-worship, he set the example for annihilating the ancient holy of holies.

But King Edwin, who was now zealously labouring for the extension of Christianity, met with his death in battle in 633. After this event, the condition of his people was far less prosperous. They were subject to a hostile power; and heathenism again enjoyed the ascendancy, till one of the royal family, Oswald, appeared as the deliverer of his people, and as the victorious restorer of the Christian church. While living as an exile among the Scots in Ireland, he had been instructed by pious monks in the knowledge of Christianity, and having been baptized, had imbibed, through their influence, the most ardent zeal for the promotion of the faith. Before entering into battle, he planted the sign of the cross; knelt before it in prayer, and supplicated God to give

victory to the righteous cause.<sup>1</sup> As he had now to thank his God for success against a force far surpassing his own in number, his resolution was the more firmly taken to do whatever might promote the honour of this God among his people. He appealed to the Scottish church, from which he had received his own knowledge of Christianity, and desired that a teacher might be sent to undertake the instruction of his subjects. One of those monks was chosen for the purpose, who had become distinguished by the severity of their discipline, and whose original foundation was in Ireland. But this severe man knew not how to adapt himself to the rudeness, the weakness, and necessities of the people who were to be cultivated by the influence of Christianity. His sternness repelled them. He despaired of being able to effect anything with them; and returning to his native land, he declared in an assembly of the principal clergy, that the people were too rude to receive instruction.

But among those present was a monk named Aidan, of the island of St Iona, the seat of the severest order of monks. But severe as Aidan was against himself, he was as full of love and tenderness towards others.<sup>2</sup> Thus he proved to the missionary, who had complained of the people to whom he had been sent, that his want of success might rather be imputed to his own error; that he had proceeded too roughly with such uncultivated hearers; that he had not, according to the advice of St Paul, fed them, as children, with milk, till, nourished by the word of God, they could attain to a higher degree of Christian life. All present at once felt that the rude people referred to needed just such an instructor as Aidan himself. He was therefore consecrated bishop, and sent to Northumberland. Till he had acquired sufficient knowledge of the English language, he confined his discourses to the courtiers and servants of the king,

<sup>1</sup> The spot where this battle was fought was long pointed out, and the memorial of it was regarded as holy. People sought the cure of their bodily diseases before the relics of the cross here spoken of.

<sup>2</sup> There was, however, in Irish monasticism a principle handed down by Gildas, strikingly opposed to the spiritual pride of an excessive asceticism. *Abstinentia corporaliū ciborum absque caritate inutilis est: meliores sunt ergo, qui non magnopore jejulant nec supra modum a creatura Dei se abinent, cor intrinsecus nitidum coram Deo servantes, quam illi, qui carnem non edunt neque vehiculis equisque vehuntur, et pro his quasi superiores caeteris se putantes, quibus mors intrat per fenestram elevationis.* Wilkin's Concil. Angl. t. i. f. 4.

who assembled about him ; and as the king himself had learnt the Scottish speech during his banishment, he immediately translated what was delivered in that language into that of the hearers. As soon, however, as Aidan had learnt English sufficiently well to make himself understood, he traversed both the city and the country, shunning no labour, and making almost all his journeys on foot. Whomever he met, whether rich or poor, he asked them if they were still heathens, or if they were believers, and had received baptism. If the former happened to be the case, he immediately began to preach the gospel ; if the latter, he exhorted his hearers to prove their faith by good works. He accomplished much ; for his life was altogether in harmony with the zeal with which he preached. All that he did testified of that unselfish love which was ready for every sacrifice. Whenever he received any present from the king, or the nobles, he immediately distributed it among the poor, or employed it in liberating captives ; and to many of these he imparted religious instruction, till he had fitted them for the priesthood. He spoke freely the truth to the rich and powerful, rebuking all wickedness without respect of persons. Whether they were clergy, monks, or laymen, who came to visit him, he engaged continually in reading the Holy Scriptures. By the co-operation of the zealous king with such a man as this, the foundation of the church was firmly laid in his province. Oswald indeed, after a reign of eight years, found his death in battle against the heathen inhabitants of Mercia, in the year 642. But as his course of life had answered to the faith which he professed, and thereby recommended it to his people, so the manner in which he sacrificed that life to preserve their independence, could scarcely fail to deepen and strengthen the impression thus left on their minds. His memory was enshrined in the love and veneration of his people, and was soon invested with a species of sanctity. Miracles were supposed to be wrought at his tomb, or by his relics ; and the belief that such was the case speedily spread through the country.

Christianity extended itself, during the second half of the seventh century, from this province to the whole of the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. The work of conversion and instruction was carried on, partly by native and Frankish ministers, who laboured in dependence on the Romish Church ; and partly by British and

Scotch, who were accustomed to a freer course. The inhabitants of the province of South-Saxony (Sussex) were the last converted to Christianity. Their king, indeed, had been already baptized; but the people remained devoted to their old idolatry; nor could some Scotch monks, who had founded a monastery, and led a life of privation, succeed in winning thereby the confidence of their rude neighbours, or open a way for their doctrine. It happened, however, that Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, who was descended from an English family, had been deprived of his office by his king, with whom he was at enmity. He now sought a field for labour in the province of which we are speaking. And he understood better than the monks how to humble himself to the wants of the people. When he arrived, he found them in great misery, the want of rain having occasioned a drought, which was followed by a famine. The neighbouring seas and lakes, indeed, might have afforded them abundant nourishment; but the rude people were still uninstructed in fishing, except in catching eels. Wilfrid ordered all the nets that could be had to be brought together; and his people succeeded in taking three hundred fish of various kinds. One hundred of these he distributed among the poor; another hundred he gave to those who had lent the nets; and the third hundred he retained for his companions. When by such gifts as these, and by the instruction of the people in fishing, he had lessened the bodily sufferings of the inhabitants, he found them more inclined to receive his spiritual aid. A favourable impression also was made upon them by the circumstance, that on the day when he first baptized a large number of converts, heavy showers of rain, so long desired, streamed from heaven.<sup>1</sup> He took care by the instruction of youth, through the instrumentality of schools which

<sup>1</sup> It appears, however, that as such a concurrence of happy circumstances with the introduction of Christianity, or with the baptism of a heathen people, might be regarded as a divine sentence on behalf of the new religion, and favourably dispose their minds to its reception, so also the same kind of reasoning, according to which, in the following ages, men regarded concurring circumstances in the light of causes, when unexpected misfortunes happened, might prejudice opinion against Christianity. Thus the introduction of Christianity into East-Saxony, being followed by a desolating pestilence, this occasioned for a while the relapse of many to idolatry. Beda. iii. 39. We thus see the wisdom of what Gregory the Great said to King Edilberth of Kent, after his conversion, namely, that he must not expect a golden age of earthly felicity to follow his adoption of Christianity, but should bear in mind that great calamities are to be looked for in the last times. "Appropinquante mundi termino multa imminent, quæ antea non fuerunt, vide-

he instituted, to give Christianity a firmer and deeper hold upon the people.<sup>1</sup>

It has been already remarked, that the monks and clergy, who were natives of Scotland or Ireland, or who had been educated there, and the Anglo-Saxon or French bishops, who adhered to the interests of the Romish church, met and worked together in England. But we must here point out anew the distinction which existed between the polity of the British-Scottish and that of the Roman Church. The historian of the English Church, Beda, although of the opposing party, draws a most attractive picture of the pious, unselfish zeal of the Scottish missionaries. The veneration which they gained thereby, greatly promoted their influence in the diffusion of Christianity, and the advancement of Christian morals. Thus the clergy, and the monks especially, were received with joy wherever they came. The people gathered around them to hear the word of exhortation ; and they were even sought for the same purpose in their cloisters.<sup>2</sup> Although the founder of the English church, Augustine, gave great importance to the difference between the two churches, men afterwards learnt to regard it as of less weight, when considered in reference to that doctrine of salvation, for the diffusion and establishment of which the labourers of both parties were working. The difference which existed as to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter appeared in a striking point of view under Bishop Aidan ; when it happened, that even the king and queen, who had been instructed by different teachers, separated from each other in this respect, and thus while the king kept the feast, the queen still prolonged the fast.

The general veneration in which the bishop, Aidan, was held,

*licet immutationes æeris, terroresque de cælo, et contra ordinem temporum tempestates, bella, fames, pestilentia, terræ motus per loca. Vos itaque, si qua de his evenire in terra vestra cognoscitis, nullo modo vestrum animum perturbetis, quia idcirco hæc signa de fine sæculi præmittuntur, ut de animabus nostris debeamus esse solliciti, de mortis hora suspecti et venturo judici in bonis actibus inveniamur esse præparati.” Gregor. L. xi. ep. 66.*

<sup>1</sup> Beda iii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Etiam si in itinere pergens (Clericus aliquis aut monachus) inveniretur, adcurrerant et flexo cervice vel manu signari vel ore illius se benedici gaudebant, verbis quoque horum exhortatoriis diligenter auditum præbebant. Sed et diebus dominicis ad ecclesiam sive ad monasteria certatim non reficiendi corporis ; sed audiendi sermonis Dei gratia confluebant ; et si quis sacerdotum in vicum forte deveniret, mox congregati in unum vicani verbum vitæ ab illo expetere curabant. Beda. Hist., Aug. iii. 26.



rendered this difference of little weight. It could not be denied, as Beda finely observes, that, although the bishop could not depart, in the keeping of Easter, from the usage of the church which had sent him forth, he strictly followed the example of all the saints in fulfilling the works of piety, faith, and charity.<sup>1</sup>

But in the following age a plain distinction is to be observed between the influence exercised by the Romish and the Scottish churches ; and the manner in which this distinction was kept up, is a point of great importance in respect to the ecclesiastical relations and polity of England. Had the Scottish rule prevailed, England would have enjoyed a freer church-constitution, and a constant principle of resistance to the Romish hierarchical system would have been established from the first. But a victory was already prepared for the Romish ecclesiastical system by the mode in which Christianity was originally introduced into Kent. The activity of the missionaries and clergy, subsequently sent from Rome, or from France, contributed further to the same end. The greater the respect gained for the Roman church by these means, the easier was the introduction, and the universal establishment of its rites. Under Colmann, the second successor of Aidan, and also belonging to the Scots, great importance was given to this controversy ; and in the year 664, a disputation was held, in the presence of King Oswin, and of his successor, Alfrid, to determine the question.<sup>2</sup> The bishop, Colmann, who defended the Scottish usages, appealed to the example of the venerated father, Columba, and his successors, under whom those men had been raised, whose holiness was testified by the miracles which they had wrought. The presbyter Wilfrid, who spoke in support of the opposite party, replied, that miracles in and for themselves could be no proof of truth and holiness, for the Lord himself had said, that there were many who had wrought miracles in his name, whom he would not acknowledge as his disciples. "But far be it from him," he said, "to speak thus in relation to their fathers ; for it was better, even in regard to those whom they did not know, to think

<sup>1</sup> *Etsi pascha contra morem eorum, qui ipsum miserant, facere non potuit, opera tamen fidei, pietatis et dilectionis juxta morem omnibus sanctis diligenter exsequi curavit.* L. iii. c. 25.

<sup>2</sup> This assembly is known under the name of the Synodus Pharensis. It was held at a place not far from the city of York, afterwards called Whitby, on the sea shore.

good rather than evil. He believed, therefore, that those servants of God loved the Lord with pious sincerity, but erred from an uninstructed simplicity. Yea, even your Columba, whom we may also call ours as well as yours, though a Christian, a saint, and able to work miracles, ought he therefore to be preferred to Peter, whom the Lord named a rock ; upon which he founded his church, and to whom he has committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven ?”

Such was the effect of the reverence which the church already entertained towards Peter, as the apostle who held the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that this appeal decided the matter, the king himself fearing, that if he resisted the power of this apostle, he might find the gates of heaven closed against him.<sup>1</sup> The bishop, Colmann, who, like his predecessors, had gained for himself universal esteem by the fidelity with which he had exercised his stewardship, resigned his office rather than sacrifice the usages of the Scottish Church. But the dominion of the Romish customs was still further promoted throughout England by the influence of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury,<sup>2</sup> a man well deserving of esteem for the efforts which he made to promote the enlightenment of the people. He was a native of Tarsus, in Cilicia, had become celebrated as a learned monk, and lived till he was sixty-six years old in Rome. Consecrated to the dignity, by Pope Vitalian, he came to England in 669, as archbishop of Canterbury. Not entirely, however, assured of his adherence to the customs of the Romish church, brought up as he had been in that of the East, Vitalian appointed the Italian Hadrian as his companion, and in some degree as his overseer. With this associate Theodore went through all England, and arranged every thing according to the rule of the Romish ritual. He was the first who actually exercised the authority of a primate, bestowed by the Popes on the archbishop of Canterbury, over the entire English church ; and in the twenty-first year of his government, he succeeded in wholly suppressing the usages of the Scotch church in England. In this he was aided by

<sup>1</sup> The words of the king were: *Et ego vobis dico, quia hic est ostiarius ille, cui ego contradicere nolo, sed in quantum novi, vel valeo ejus cupio in omnibus obedire statutis, ne forte me adveniente ad fores regni cœlorum, non sit, qui reserat, averso illo, qui claves tenere probatur.*

<sup>2</sup> Beda speaks of his life and works in the iv. and v. books of his *English Church History*. These notices are collected in *Mabillon Sæc. ii., f. 1031.*

a synod held, in obedience to his wish, at Hertford, not far from London, in the year 673.<sup>1</sup> The influence of the English church operated, by degrees, on those of Scotland and Ireland. But the Britons, contracted every day within narrower limits, strove resolutely to preserve their independence, and the ancient customs of their church.

With regard to Germany, the portions of that country pertaining in ancient times to the Roman empire had early received the seed of Christianity. But when these districts were overrun by hordes of heathen barbarians, this seed was partly destroyed, and partly, by its mixture with Paganism, so deprived altogether of its original qualities, that it could no longer be recognised. The union with the Frankish kingdom, and with other tribes of German descent converted to Christianity, produced a new excitement; but, so long as all remained divided, and wanting the firmness effected by union and established ecclesiastical institutions, these dismembered provinces were insufficient to resist the stream of confusion and violence.

Among the men who diffused blessing and salvation, through the influence of religion, while waste and ruin were attending on the steps of the wandering tribes, Severinus deserves to be especially distinguished. A native, it is probable, of the West,<sup>2</sup> he had retired to one of the Eastern deserts, in the anxious desire to attain to the perfection of the inner life. But a secret divine call, on the other hand, impelled him to leave his solitude and repose, and to hasten to the succour of the afflicted people of the West, devoted, as it seemed, to every species of ruin. And often when the passion for a life of silent meditation reawakened in his soul, that voice which obliged him to remain in the midst of waste

1 See Beda iv. c. 5, and Wilkin's *Concilia Mag. Brit.* i. f. 41.

2 Nothing certain is known of his fatherland. He himself repulsed, either earnestly or in jest, those who inquired after his descent and country. To a clergyman who had sought refuge with him, he said, at first jestingly, in answer to such a question: "Now, if you suppose me to be a runaway, have the ransom in readiness to pay for me, if I am ordered to be delivered up." But he added seriously: "Know, however, that the God who called you to the priesthood commanded me to take up my abode among these men, threatened with so many dangers (*periclitantibus his hominibus interesse.*)" According to his speech, he was supposed to be a Latin, or a North African. He indicated sometimes, as if speaking of another, that he had been delivered, by the especial mercy of God, from great dangers in a distant province of the East, and been conducted to the North. See the Epistle of Eugippius to the deacon Paschasius, prefixed to the memoir.

and tumult sounded so much the more distinctly in the depths of his being.<sup>1</sup>

Severinus appeared on the banks of the Danube, and settled himself among the people of the district which now belongs to Austria and Bavaria, having his abode, as he himself relates, not far from Passau.<sup>2</sup> This was at a time when those regions were the scene of utter confusion. The period which succeeded the death of Attila, in the year 453, was marked by perpetual disquiet. One people drove out another,—one place after another was devastated by fire and sword; and the inhabitants, having been stripped of all they possessed, were driven into slavery. By a life of stern self-denial and severity; by the patient and even joyful endurance of every kind of hardship and privation, he set an example to the poor, disheartened people among whom he dwelt, which taught them how they ought to bear the afflictions to which they were exposed. Accustomed as he had been to the climate of the South, he travelled in the midst of a severe winter, and when the Danube was frozen over, barefoot from one tribe to another, in order to collect food and clothing for those who had been reduced to hunger and nakedness by the war. In the same manner he strove, by collecting the means of ransom, or by the employment of his powerful influence, to obtain the freedom of those who had been sold into slavery. Nor did he fail to warn the people of the dangers to which they were exposed; to admonish them to a timely repentance, and to place their trust in God. His prayer, full of faith, brought comfort to those who were suffering, whether from bodily or spiritual necessity; and his word, which was revered by the leaders of the rude people as a voice from a higher world, availed to the deliverance of the conquered.

In proportion to the resolution with which he had hardened himself to bear lightly all bodily necessities, and to resist all outward impressions by the force of the spirit, was the tenderness of his sympathy for the sufferings of others.<sup>3</sup> But the influence of his

<sup>1</sup> *Quanto solitudinem incolere cupiebat, tanto crebrius revelationibus monebatur, ne presentiam suam populis denegaret afflictis.* Eugippii vita. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Faviana is sometimes spoken of as the place of his abode. This city is represented by some of the early writers as Vienna; but others oppose this notion, and describe it as Astura, Lauriacum, or perhaps the Austrian Lorch.

<sup>3</sup> His scholar Eugippius says, in this respect, *Quum ipse hebdomadarum continuatis juniis minime frangeretur, tamen esurie miserorum se credebatur afflictum. Frigus quoque vir Dei tantum in nuditate pauperum sentiebat, si quidem specialiter a Deo per-*

example, his admonitions and rebukes, softened many hearts ; and food and clothing were sent to him from various quarters to be distributed among the poor. When this was the case, he assembled the needy crowds in a church, and apportioned to each person a share of the goods according to what he believed to be his necessity. Having offered up a prayer, he began the distribution with these words : " Praised be the name of the Lord," to which he added some Christian exhortations.<sup>1</sup> Many instances prove the power which the divine spirit within him exercised on men's minds. On one occasion, a horde of barbarians had plundered the entire neighbourhood of the city in which he dwelt, carrying off both men and cattle. The unhappy people who were left presented themselves weeping and clamouring before Severin. He inquired of the Roman officer, in command of the city, whether he had no armed force sufficient to pursue the robbers, and oblige them to resign their booty. The officer replied, that he did not consider his party able to cope with so large a body of the enemy, but that, if Severin desired it, he would make the attack, trusting, not to the strength of his weapons, but to the help of Severin's prayers. And Severin exhorted him at once to proceed in the name of God, and in the fulness of trust, since where the Lord in his mercy leads, the weakest will be as the strongest, and the Lord will fight on his side. But one thing he especially pressed upon him. It was, that whatever barbarians he took prisoners he should bring them to him unharmed. His wish was fulfilled. The prisoners brought to him were immediately freed from their fetters ; and, after they had been refreshed with meat and drink, he sent them back to their companions, bidding them say that they must cease from invading that district for the purposes of plunder, unless they intended to expose themselves to the punishment of God, who, it was plain, fought for his servants. His appearance and his words wrought with such force on the mind of a leader of the Alemanni, that he was seized with a violent trembling.<sup>2</sup>

*ceperat, ut in frigidissima regione mirabili abstinentia castigatus, fortis et alacer permaneret.*

<sup>1</sup> Eugippius relates, c. 28, by way of example, that Severin happened to receive through some merchants a supply of oil. This was a luxury rarely known in that district, and was of a price which rendered it unattainable by the poor.

<sup>2</sup> L. c. c. 19, *ut tremere coram eo vehementer cœperit, sed et postea suis exercitibus indicavit, nunquamse re bellica nec aliqua formidine tanto tremore fuisse concussum.*

When all the fortresses on the banks of the Danube,<sup>1</sup> in Bavaria, were threatened by the barbarians, the inhabitants successively besought Severin to take up his abode among them, in the belief that his presence would be their best protection.<sup>2</sup> The effect which followed the hearing of his prayers, so full of faith,—the impression created by the divine spirit within him, all tended to give him the character of a worker of miracles. He himself knew how to take advantage of these circumstances in the then existing state of the kingdom of God among the rude and severely tried barbarians. “Such things,” he said, “now take place in many quarters, and among many people, in order that it may be known that there is a God who worketh wonders both in heaven and on earth.” And, when great effects were looked for from the influence of his prayers, he said, “Why do you expect the great to proceed from the little? I know that I myself am utterly unworthy: would that I might obtain the forgiveness of my sins!”<sup>3</sup> Sometimes, when his prayers were asked for some temporal blessing, he would speak of the far greater importance of spiritual things. Thus he said to a monk, from one of the barbarous tribes, who besought him to intercede for the cure of his bad eyes, “Pray rather that thine inner sight may become clearer.” When a bishopric was offered him, he rejected it with the observation, that it was enough for him to have sacrificed his beloved solitude, and to have come, according to the divine call, into those regions to share the misfortunes of the afflicted people.<sup>4</sup>

The labours of such a hero of the faith, carried on among these tribes during a period of from twenty to thirty years, could not fail to leave many traces of the impression which he made upon them. It was scarcely less so in regard to the people, whose occupation of the district was of a mere transitory character.<sup>5</sup> Many

<sup>1</sup> In the Noricum Ripense.

<sup>2</sup> L. c. c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> L. c. c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> L. c. c. 9. The life of Severin by his scholar Eugippius, abbot of a Neapolitan monastery, in the *Actis Sanct. of the Rollandists*. Mens. Jan. t. i. f. 483.

<sup>5</sup> Among those over whom Severin exercised such influence, was Odoacer, who afterwards, as leader of the Heruli, established a kingdom in Italy. While still a youth, and possessing no particular rank among the barbarians, he happened to meet with Severin who foretold him his future greatness. When in the possession of power, he still set a high value on the word of Severin. In Italy he met with another man, who, surrounded by violence and devastation, laboured for the cause of humanity. This was Bishop Epi-

pious men who, in the sixth and seventh centuries, retired, in obedience to a fanatical impulse, and lived as hermits on the banks of the Rhine, won for themselves by their piety, or by the manifest proofs which they gave of their dominion over their sensual nature, the veneration of the people who had settled in this country, or traversed its provinces. By their friendly bearing; by their hospitality, sharing the produce of their land with the strangers; and by the influence of their pious lives, and spiritual power over the barbarians, they obtained credit for working miracles, and were enabled to employ the personal love and reverence which they thus acquired, in opening a way for the advancement of the gospel. To men of this class belonged the venerable Goar, towards the end of the sixth century. He fixed his abode in the place where, in after times, the city was built which perpetuated his name. Wulflach, or Wulf, a clergyman of Lombard descent, who, in the second half of the sixth century, took up his residence as a Stylite in the neighbourhood of Triers, excited the wonder of the people, prayed for their conversion, preached to the multitudes whom he assembled around him, and succeeded in persuading them to destroy their idols.<sup>1</sup>

But much as was done by the Frankish hermits, a far greater work was accomplished by the Irish missionaries, through their diligence in cultivating the land; in founding monasteries, which became the centres of conversion and instruction, and in providing for the education of the young. The largest debt of gratitude was due, in regard to the work of missions among the people of Germany, to the monks from England, and more especially to those from Ireland. The monasteries of the latter country were over-filled. Pious monks felt themselves called upon to exercise greater activity in the service of religion. Sufficient room was wanting in their native land for the employment of this zeal; and the love of travel, so common to the Irish,<sup>2</sup> thus served as a means for conveying Christianity and cultivation to a remote people. It was natural that the looks of those, who were impelled by the

phanus of Ticinum (Pavia) who gained great influence over him by his intercessions. See his life by Eunodius in Sirmond. Opp. t. i.

<sup>1</sup> See Gregor. Tur. Hist. Franc. l. viii. c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Natio Scotorum, quibus consuetudo peregrinandi jam pœne in naturam conversa est.* Vita S. Galli, l. ii. § 47. Pertz Monumenta Hist. Germ. t. ii. f. 30.

love of wandering, by innate energy, and the fire of Christian love, to leave their native land, should be directed to those vast wildernesses which were peopled by multitudes, to whom Christianity was either utterly unknown, or among whom the seed of the gospel, formerly received, had been trampled under foot by the distractions of the age. Thus whole colonies of monks journeyed forth, under the leadership of devoted men as abbots.<sup>1</sup>

Columban first gave an example of this kind, at the end of the sixth century, which incited many to follow him in the seventh. He was a native of the Irish province of Leinster (a terra lagenorum), and had been educated from early youth in the celebrated monastery at Bangor, founded by the abbot Comgall. When he reached his thirtieth year he felt himself impelled to undertake a more independent and energetic course, and to preach the gospel to the heathen people, of whom he had received information through the Franks. He felt, as the author of his life expresses himself, that fire in his breast, of which the Lord says, that he had come to kindle it upon the earth.<sup>2</sup> His abbot gave him twelve young men to aid him in his labours, and who were to be brought up under his spiritual instruction. With these companions, he set forth on his journey through France, about the year 590, with the design, it is probable, of preaching the gospel to the people inhabiting the borders of that kingdom.<sup>3</sup> But being entreated to take up his residence in France, the rude multitudes of its people having still so little knowledge of Christianity, he was induced to yield to the invitation. In furtherance of his design, he selected for his abode a desert spot, which could only be rendered fertile by the strenuous labour of his monks. By the difficulties which they would thus have to overcome, he hoped to accustom them to the exercise of self-denial, and the subjection of their sensual nature, and, at the same time, to set an example to the people which might induce them to undertake the cultivation of the land, the necessary condition to all social culture.

<sup>1</sup> Aleuin says, ep. 221, *Antiquo tempore doctissimi solebant magistri de Hibernia Britanniam, Galliam, Italianam venire, et multos per ecclesias Christi fecisse profectus.*

<sup>2</sup> The words of the monk Jonas, of the monastery of Bobbio, in Pavia (Mabillon *Acta S. O. B. Saec. ii. p. 9*), *ignitum igne Domini desiderium, de quo igne Dominus loquitur: ignem veni mittere in terram.*

<sup>3</sup> He himself says, in his fourth epistle to his scholars and monks, § 4, Galland. *Bibl. Patr. t. xii. Mei voti fuit, gentes visitare, et evangelium iis a nobis predicari.*



The care required for their bodily support constrained the monks to use extraordinary exertions in order to give fertility to the soil, the produce of which, with the fish which they caught, was their sole means of existence. But without the strength supplied by the faith of the man who conducted all their proceedings, and to whom all rendered an unconditional obedience, they must have sunk in the struggle with such difficulties. When Columban first took up his abode with his companions, in the ruins of the old castle of Anagrates (Anegrey), in the wilderness of the Voges, they were so utterly destitute of provisions, that they lived for several days on weeds and the bark of trees. But while he exhorted his monks to the most active exertion, Columban trusted, in the failure of human means, to the help of God, to whom he appealed confidently in prayer. And the manner in which he was delivered, by a concurrence of unexpected circumstances, out of the greatest necessity, strengthened the assurance of his followers, and led the people to regard him as a man extraordinarily favoured by God. When a neighbouring priest once visited him, and was shewn by Columban the corn laid up for the support of the monastery, he expressed his surprise at the small provision made for so large a company. Columban replied, "If men would but serve their Creator aright, they would suffer no hunger, as it is said in Psalm xxxvii., 'I have never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging their bread.' It is an easy thing for God, who with five loaves satisfied five thousand men, to fill our barn with meal." The more, indeed, discipline and spirituality were wanting to the monks and clergy of the Frankish church; the more, especially, the old monastic system, which corresponded to the Benedictine, had fallen into neglect, the stronger was the impression made by the new course pursued by Columban, and the more evident the revival of the monastic spirit in France. The sons of people of all ranks were sent to him for education; and he was obliged to divide his monks into three monasteries: the above named Anegrey: Luxeu (Luxovium) in Franche Comté, and Fontenay (Fontanæ.)

Columban's rule was altogether peculiar. It was framed with the view to employ the monks in severe labour, that they might thereby acquire hardness and self-control, qualities essential to their perseverance in conflicting with a wild nature, and to their

successful resistance in the difficulties which they had to encounter. Thus he demanded of the monks, "that they should go weary to bed; sleeping as they went; and that they should be roused up, before they had slept out their sleep." But although he insisted upon a life of severe self-denial, he forbade an excessive severity, one likely to enervate the body, and render the person unfit to fulfil the duties of his calling.<sup>1</sup> We recognise here the spirit of Irish asceticism, before alluded to. All, however, were to deny their own will, by the most unreserved and slavish obedience; and a discipline was established which, in its severity, controlled every movement of the body, and every expression of the lips, every transgression of the rule subjecting the offender to corporal chastisement.

But Columban did not govern by outward power alone. Venerated as well as feared, and inwardly beloved by the larger number of his followers, how greatly his word prevailed may be seen from the following example. Being recalled from the solitude, which he had again sought, by the sad intelligence, that so many distempers had broken out among the monks at Luxeu, that the few only had been spared who remained to attend upon the sick, he hastened forth, and finding all sick, he roused them up, and directed them to go to their labour in the barn, and thresh out the corn. A part of the monks, assured by the word of Columban that strength would not be wanting to them, began the work. He soon, however, told them that they must cease from further exertion, weakened as their limbs were by sickness. Refreshments were then set before them, and they were well. In justification of the severe discipline thus described, we must remember the vast number of rude spirits, here brought together, whose energies were to be directed to a particular object, and how much was required to form and discipline such a multitude. But although Columban desired to enforce, with stern severity, the most punctual observance of his rules, and many rites of outward devotion, which might tend to mere mechanism, he was, notwithstanding, far from confounding the essence of piety with any outward observances.

1 C. iii. The rule: *Ideo temperandus est ita usus, sicut temperandus est labor, quia haec est vera discretio, ut possibilitas spiritalis profectus cum abstinentia carnem macerante retentetur. Si enim modum abstinentia excesserit, vitium, non virtus erit, virtus enim multa sustinet bona et continet.*

He regarded the latter as means only ; and carefully reminded his monks, that all depended upon the disposition.<sup>1</sup> Although, again, they were daily summoned to the severest bodily exercises, their spirits were not to be allowed to sink under the weight of their earthly tasks ; but they were, every day, to be awakened to the consideration of divine things, and were to divide their time between prayer, labour, and the reading of spiritual writings.<sup>2</sup> Columban himself well knew how to connect the contemplative life with the greatest activity. Hence he would sometimes withdraw from the monastery into the thick forest, carrying on his shoulders a copy of the holy Scriptures, which he intended to study in his solitude. So also it was especially his custom to prepare himself in solitude, and with solemn prayer, for the celebration of the great festivals of the church. His exhortations to a spiritual life (*Instructiones variae*), breathe throughout the living spirit of Christian piety.<sup>3</sup>

Columban had to endure many violent struggles in the Frankish kingdom. His zeal for morality, and for the restoration of the old order and severity of monasticism, could not fail to create him many enemies in the then disturbed state of the Frankish church, and among a clergy, whose whole life, devoted to worldly sensuality, was in such striking opposition to his own. Hence it happened, that when he refused to dispense with the usages which he had introduced from his native country, he gave no slight offence to those who were anxious for the letter of the old church traditions, and for uniformity in all things. With a free spirit, he insisted upon his independence, asserting it in his controversy with Pope Gregory the Great, and Boniface the Fourth, as well as in that with the bishops of France. To the former of these popes he wrote, beseeching him not to degrade himself by a false humility, or by seeming to shrink from correcting what was wrong, out of respect

<sup>1</sup> In Instruction ii. he pressed upon their hearts the words of the monk Comgal. *Non simus tanquam sepulcra dealbata ; de intus, non de foris speciosi ac ornati apparere studeamus ; vera enim religio non in corporis, sed in cordis humilitate consistit.* And after having, in Instruction xi. described charity as the highest grace, he says, *Non est labor dilectio ; plus suave est, plus medicale est, plus salubre est cordi dilectio.*

<sup>2</sup> Reg. c. ii. *Quotidie jejunandum est, sicut quotidie orandum est, quotidie laborandum ; quotidieque est legendum.*

<sup>3</sup> In the first he says, *Non longe a nobis manentem quærimus Deum, quem intra nos sumere habemus ; in nobis enim habitat, quasi anima in corpore, si tamen nos membra sana sumus ejus.*

to his predecessors, as Leo the Great, seeing that a living hound might be better than a dead lion. The living saints might improve that which had not been improved by a greater than themselves. He adjured Boniface IV. by the unity of Christian communion, to allow them, as strangers in France, to follow their ancient usages. They were, indeed, he remarked, but as if still in their native land, and dwelling, as they did, in a desert, might retain the principles of their fathers without offence to any one. He urged the example of Polycarp and Anicetus, who had separated, without any harm to their mutual love, though each persisted in abiding by his own rule.

When a Frankish synod was held, in the year 602, for the purpose of discussing these subjects, Columban addressed the assembly in an epistle. He expressed his vexation that synods were not more frequently held, in accordance with the laws of the church, beneficial as they might prove for the correction of abuses. He thanked God that the controversy respecting Easter had, at least, occasioned the meeting of this synod; but he added, that he hoped the members would employ their time in the discussion of matters of far greater importance. He exhorted them to recollect that, as shepherds, it was their duty to follow the example of the chief Shepherd; that the voice of the hireling, who betrayed himself by not doing that which he imposed upon others, could not reach the minds of men; and that the mere word would avail nothing, without a corresponding life. The variety of usages and traditions had greatly injured the church; but, he added, if we only strive humbly to follow the Lord, we shall be able to differ from one another without offence, and to love each other with all our hearts, as true disciples of Christ. And soon will men discover that which is true, when all, with like zeal, are searching for the truth; and when no one thinks too much of himself, but all seek their glory in the Lord. "Once for all, I beseech you," he wrote, "that, as I am the cause of this difference, and have come to this land, as a stranger, for the sake of our common Lord and Saviour, so you would allow me to dwell quietly in these woods, by the bones of our seventeen departed brethren, as I have done for the last twelve years, and that thus we may pray for you, as we ought to do, and have hitherto done. May France unite us, as heaven will unite us, if we be found worthy of it. May the free

grace of God help us to shun the world, to love the Lord alone, and to long after Him, with the Father and the Holy Ghost." Then, having asked for their prayers, he adds, "But do not regard us as strangers, for we are all members of one body, whether we be Gauls, Britons, Irish, or any other people."

When Columban wrote this letter, he had reason to fear that, on account of the disputes which had arisen, he might be driven from the country. Nor was the letter itself, containing as it did a reproof of the worldly life led by the Frankish bishops, likely to create impressions favourable to his cause. Circumstances, moreover, arose which greatly aided his enemies in their designs against him. He had drawn upon himself the hatred of the powerful and licentious Brunehild, the grandmother of King Dietrich II., who at that time governed the Burgundian kingdom, in which Columban's three monasteries were situated, and who had hitherto afforded him his especial protection. Exposing the policy of Brunehild, and reproaching the king for his licentious life, he exhorted him to form a lawful matrimonial alliance.<sup>1</sup> When Columban opposed to all the threats and flatteries, by which it was sought to move him, an unbending will, and resolutely refused to modify the stern principles by which his monasteries were governed, he was at length, in the year 610, banished from the territory of Dietrich, and ordered to return to Ireland. But this command was not executed. He was on the point of travelling into Lombardy, with the intention of founding a monastery there, and preaching the true faith among the Arians.<sup>2</sup> But the invitation of a Frankish prince induced him to seek a place in his territory, whence he might conveniently proceed for the conversion of the

<sup>1</sup> When Columban, on a certain occasion, had come to the court of Dietrich, Brunehild ordered the King's illegitimate children to be brought forward, that the saint might bless them. He told her, however, that these offspring of an unholy union would not succeed to the kingdom, which greatly enraged her.

<sup>2</sup> The author of the Life of Columban relates, that the ship which should have conveyed him to Ireland was driven back by the waves upon the shore, and could not, for many days, be floated from the strand. This led the captain to believe that Columban's banishment was the cause of the mishap, and he refused to take him and his companions again on board. Dreading the wrath of God, no one dare execute the command respecting his banishment. He was left free to go whithersoever he would, and he received so much the greater honour. Columban himself, however, says in an epistle to his monks, § 7: *Nunc mihi scribenti nuntius supervenit narrans mihi navem parari, qua invitatus vehar in meam regionem; sed si fugero, nullus vetat custos, nam hoc videntur velle, ut ego fugiam.*

neighbouring people.<sup>1</sup> Settling himself, therefore, with his followers, in the district of Zurich, near Tuggen on the Limmat, he waited for an opportunity to undertake the conversion of the surrounding Alemanni or Suevi. But having excited the rage of the Heathen by the burning of a temple, they were obliged to save themselves by flight. Having arrived at the Castle of Arbon, on the Bodensee (Lake of Constance), which had existed from the time of the Romans, they found here a pastor and priest named Willimar, who rejoiced greatly at being thus once more visited in his solitude by Christian brethren. After having been hospitably entertained by him for seven days, Columban and his followers learnt that, at some little distance, surrounding the ruins of the old Castle of Pregentia (Bregenz), was a spot which, through the fertility of the land, and the neighbouring lake, abounding in fish, was peculiarly fitted for their designs. Thither accordingly they went, and there they founded a church, supporting themselves by agriculture and fishing, and winning the confidence and love of the heathen inhabitants by the readiness with which they imparted to them a share of what they gained.

Gallus, a young Irishman of noble descent, whom Columban had brought up, and who, during his residence in the Frankish territory, had learnt the German language, made especial use of this acquirement in preaching the truth to the people. The brethren continued these labours for three years, when Columban was again obliged, by the machinations of a hostile party, to flee. He now fulfilled the design which he had originally formed, and journeyed into Italy, where he founded the monastery of Bobbio, near Pavia.

Although the communities which found themselves in the midst of the Lombard Arians had by so much the greater cause to be at peace with each other, there still existed a ruinous controversy on the subject of the three chapters. Columban, therefore, and at the solicitation even of the Lombard monarch, addressed an epistle to Boniface IV., entreating him, with great plainness of speech, to bring the subject fairly before a synod, to defend the

<sup>1</sup> Agathias writes in the second half of the sixth century, *Hist. l. i. c. 7*, ed. Niebuhr pag. 28. The Alemanni, through their intercourse with the Franks, were, by degrees, turned from their worship of idols, *ἡ ἐπιμιξία ἤδη ἐφέλκεται τοὺς ἑμφρονεστέρους, οὐ πολλοῦ δὲ οἶμαι χρόνον καὶ ἅπανιν ἐκνικήσει.*

Romish church against the charge of heresy, and to put an end to the present divisions.<sup>1</sup>

It is easy to perceive from the style of this letter, that Columban's residence in France and Italy had affected the view which he took of his relation to the Romish church; or that his present intercourse influenced his position in regard to that church, and that he expressed himself now, when addressing the Pope, otherwise than he would have done in Ireland or Britain. Thus he calls the Romish church the mistress; and speaks in lofty terms of her dignity. Still, much of this may be regarded as merely matter of formal compliment; and he is far from ascribing infallibility to her decisions, or surrendering himself to them without appeal. He attributes to that church the honour which he allows her, because Peter and Paul were her teachers; and rendered her venerable by their martyrdom, and had committed their relics to her keeping. But he placed the church of Jerusalem still higher;<sup>2</sup> and he admonished her of Rome so to act as not to forfeit the honour she had received, for that she would retain her power only so long as the *recta ratio* continued with her. He alone can be the sure keeper of the keys of the kingdom of heaven who, through true knowledge, opens it to the worthy, and closes it against the unworthy. He who does the contrary can neither open nor shut. In the same manner, he warns the Romish church against the common notion that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter, seeing that this could avail nothing against the belief of the whole church.<sup>3</sup> To both parties he exclaimed: "Therefore, my beloved, agree with each other, and renew not ancient strifes; but rather keep silence, and consign these things forever to oblivion, committing any doubtful matter to the judgment of God. In regard to that which is mani-

<sup>1</sup> The manner in which Columban speaks shews how wanting he was in a correct knowledge of the ancient controversies. He speaks of Eutyches and Nestorius as related heretics.

<sup>2</sup> § 10. Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclesiarum, salva loci dominicæ resurrectionis singulari prærogativa.

<sup>3</sup> Vos per hoc forte superciliosum nescio quid præ cæteris vobis majoris auctoritatis, ac in divinis rebus potestatis vindicatis, noveritis minorem forte potestatem vestram apud Dominum, si vel cogitatur hoc in cordibus vestris, quia unitas fidei in toto orbe unitatem fecit potestatis et prærogativæ, ita ut libertas veritati ubique ab omnibus detur et aditus errori ab omnibus similiter abnegetur quia confessio recta etiam sancto privilegium dedit claviculario communi omnium.

fest, and may be decided by men, judge righteous judgment, and without respect to persons. Give honour one to another, that there may be joy in heaven and upon earth on account of your peace and union. I know not how a Christian can strive with a Christian on a point of faith, for to that which the one true believer says, rightly praising the Lord, will the other say, Amen! because he has the same faith, and the same love. Be, therefore, all of one mind, that you may both be one, and altogether Christians." Gallus, constrained by sickness, was obliged to allow his beloved father Columban to travel alone. This was greatly to his grief; but taking his net, he embarked in his boat on the lake of Constance, and proceeded to the priest Willimar, with whom they had enjoyed so hospitable a reception. The same hospitality was again evinced. Gallus was committed to the care of two clergymen. As soon as his health was restored, he besought the deacon Hiltibad, who, in providing for his companions by hunting and fishing, had become well acquainted with the country, to conduct him into the great forest in the neighbourhood, that he might there fix upon a spot for a hermitage. But the deacon described to him the danger of such an undertaking, the forest being full of bears, wolves, and wild boars. Gallus answered: "And who can be against us, if God be for us? The God who delivered Daniel from the den of lions, can also protect me from the claws of these ravenous beasts." Having prepared himself by a day of prayer and fasting for the perilous journey, he set forth on the morrow with prayer, and accompanied by the deacon. They had continued their journey till three o'clock in the afternoon, when Hiltibad exhorted him to rest, that they might strengthen themselves by taking some food; for they had brought bread, and they had a net for fishing in the streams, with which the forest abounded. But Gallus replied, that he would taste nothing till some place of rest had been indicated to him. They accordingly continued to wander on till sunset, when they arrived at a spot where the river Steinach, streaming down from a mountain, had hollowed out a rock, and where the water was seen to abound in fish. They caught several in their net; the deacon struck a light with a flint, kindled a fire, and prepared their meal. Gallus desired to offer up a prayer before partaking of the repast. He knelt down, but in kneeling he stumbled against a thorn-bush, and fell to the earth. Hiltibad



was about to raise him, but he replied: "No! Leave me here: this shall be my rest for ever: here will I remain." When he rose from his devotions, he made a cross of hazel wood, and suspended from it a little bag with relics. On this spot he now traced out the plan of the monastery, through the institution of which the land was cleared of wood and cultivated, and which, bearing his name, became so renowned in later times. Some years after the founding of this monastery, Gallus was elected to the vacant see of Constance; but he refused the dignity, and anxiously desired that a native of the country, a deacon, John, who had been brought up under his instructions, should be appointed. A vast multitude of people, both high and low, being assembled to witness the consecration, the abbot Gallus employed the opportunity to press some solemn admonitions on the hearts of the rude hearers, as yet only a short time converted from heathenism. He spoke in Latin, and what he said was translated by his scholar in an easy familiar style into the language of the people.<sup>1</sup> After having described to them what God had done to deliver them from the evils of the fall, he concluded with these words: "We who are the unworthy bearers of this message in these times, we adjure you, in the name of Christ, that as, at your baptism, you renounced the devil, his works, and his nature, so you may now and henceforth, through your whole life, renounce them altogether as becometh the children of God." He then shewed them particularly the sins which they ought especially to resist, and having described the judgments which they would bring upon the offender both in time and eternity, he concluded with the blessing: "May the Almighty God who will that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and who has imparted this message to your ears by the instrumentality of my tongue,—may he himself, by his own grace, make it produce fruit in your hearts."

It was in this manner that Gallus laboured for the salvation of the surrounding Swiss and Suabian tribes, till the year 640.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The sermon is found among others in Galland. *Bibl. Patr.*, t. xii.

<sup>2</sup> The very old and simple memoir of Gallus, written in Latin, which it is often exceedingly difficult to understand, is found in the last collection of the *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, by Perts. iii.; and was the work of the Abbot Walafrid Strabo, of the ninth century. *Acta s. ord. Bened.* t. ii.

Shortly before his death, his old friend, the priest Willimar, had entreated him to visit him in the castle of Arbon. Weak as he was, he exerted his little remaining strength, and preached there to the assembled multitude. His sickness prevented him from returning to his monastery, and he died at Arbon.<sup>1</sup>

He left scholars behind him, who followed his example, labouring for the improvement of the people, and of the country, and founding monasteries, which led to the general cultivation of the land. Among these followers of Gallus, especial mention must be made of Magnoald (Magold, or, as he was called for shortness, Magnus), who, probably as a youth of German descent, associated himself with Gallus in the castle of Arbon. He founded the monastery at Füssen (Faucense Monasterium) on the Lech, in the upper circle of the Danube, and this was the principal scene of his labours.<sup>2</sup> We observe that, for the most part, these men lived to a great age, the consequence of their simple mode of life, and of an activity, which, with all their struggles, tended to increase their bodily strength. During this long life, rarely under seventy years, they were enabled both to extend and to establish their undertakings. The number of such men, who passed from Ireland to the Frankish territory, was doubtless great, the names of all not being known to us. It is only of a very few that we have any exact information.

Soon after the death of Gallus, a monk, named Fridolin, came from Ireland. He laboured among the people on the borders of Alsace, Switzerland, and Suabia, and founded the monastery of Seckingen on the Rhine.<sup>3</sup> The monk Thrudpert came also about the same time from Ireland.<sup>4</sup> He journeyed to Brigau, in the Black Forest, where he wished to establish a monastery; but it seems that he was murdered by some of the people, whom a prince of the country, favourable to his enterprize, had placed under him to cultivate the waste. A ~~highly~~ <sup>very</sup> dedicated ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> his name, St Hubrecht, preserved his memory.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to the old tradition, he was ninety-five years of age. This may not be correct, for he was a youth when he accompanied Columban from Ireland.

<sup>2</sup> This is the statement of the very doubtful memoir, written in late times, in the *Actis Sanctorum*, Septemb. vi.

<sup>3</sup> So the questionable account of his life. Mar. vi.

<sup>4</sup> It is remarkable that the names of the last two have rather a German than an Irish sound. They may have been changed in popular pronunciation.

<sup>5</sup> Acta s. 26 April.

Another Irish monk, Kyllena (Kilian), in the latter half of the seventh century, appeared as a missionary in one of the Frankish provinces which had, it is probable, already received the seed of the gospel when it pertained to Thuringia.<sup>1</sup> He heard in the admonition of Christ to leave all and follow him, a call addressed to himself to embrace the life of a missionary. Entering upon his journey with several companions, he came to Würzburg, where he found Duke Gozbert, who received baptism at his hands, and was followed in this respect by many of his people. But Gozbert, contrary to the rule of the church, had married Geilane, his brother's widow. For this, it appears, as soon as his faith seemed sufficiently matured to suffer the reproof, he was reproached by Kilian. Gozbert determined to dissolve the marriage; but Geilane, learning the circumstance, took advantage of the absence of her husband in a war, and ordered Kilian to be murdered. If the occurrences were as here described, they shew that the missionaries, in zeal for their calling, were so confined in their views, that they were unable to distinguish the divine and human.

We have no connected or certain information respecting the diffusion of Christianity in Bavaria, properly so called, after the death of that man of God, Severinus. Many seeds, however, must have been scattered here from the neighbouring missionary stations. It may be also supposed, that Irish missionaries were not altogether wanting to this province. Columban had imparted an especial missionary spirit to his followers. A Frankish synod also, held in the year 613, felt that the call to extend Christianity was to extend pure Christian knowledge among the neighbouring people, and they committed this work to Columban's successor, the abbot Eustasius of Luxeuil, and the monk Agil.<sup>2</sup> They appear to have continued their missionary course as far as Bavaria, and to have found among the people not idolatry alone, but an heretical form of Christianity, the errors, as stated, of Photinus and Bonosus.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is also no account worthy of credit respecting this man. The older and more simple memoirs in *Canisius Lect. Antiqu.*, t. iii., do not deserve to be so considered. They both speak of Kilian's journey to Rome, to obtain the sanction of the Pope to his missionary undertaking. This scarcely agrees with probability in the case of an Irish monk.

<sup>2</sup> Named by the French *S. Aile*: Afterwards abbot of the monastery *Resbacum*; *Rébais*.

<sup>3</sup> The road to Alsace, the boundaries of Switzerland, led them on, perhaps, farther

From what is said of the doctrines of the latter, it may be conjectured, that some Irish missionary had introduced the opinion, not very offensive in early times, that Mary bore other sons after the birth of Jesus. But the question arises, whether those who describe the doctrine of Bonosus had a right notion of the subject, and were able to distinguish it from that of Photinus. In every case it was their object to combine with the latter the denial of Christ's divinity, and the assumption that he was mere man.<sup>1</sup> We may now suppose, either that the people being but newly converted, had formed for themselves this view of Christian doctrine,—such a view being not unfitted to find favour with the rude understanding of the natural man,—or that unskilful missionaries, perplexed themselves, gave rise to this notion.<sup>2</sup> For when once such a violent passion for missionary undertakings had taken possession of men's minds, it was not unlikely that some who had no proper qualification for the work, would enter upon it, influenced only by the love of imitation, by avarice, or other unholy motives.<sup>3</sup> It is probable, however, that such opinions were the fruit of errors planted among these people in very early times. We find traces of them, indeed, at the end of the fifth century,—indications,

towards Bavaria. It was one object of their journey to reach the Maraski, whose territory is thus described in the life of Saint Salaberga. Mabillon O. B. sæc. ii., f. 425. *Qui partem Sequanorum provinciæ et Duvii (fl. Doubs) amnis fluentia ex utraque parte, incolunt.* According to the memoir of Eustasius, by the monk Jonas, Eustasius devoted himself, in the first instance, to the Maraski, among whom he found only the errors referred to; and among the Bavarians simply idolatry. But according to the memoir of Salaberga, Eustasius went to the Bavarians in the first instance, whom he found infected with these heresies. In the Life of Agil also (f. 219), the journey is similarly described, but nothing is stated respecting the existence of these opinions among the Bavarians.

<sup>1</sup> The author of the life of Salaberga describes the heresy very distinctly. *Purum hominem Dominum nostrum Jesum esse absque Deitate Patris.* Here there is, indeed, no difference between the doctrine of Photinus and Bonosus; and as the other writers say, *Photinus vel Bonosus* they may not have been conscious of any distinction.

<sup>2</sup> How heretical notions may spring from the midst of an entirely uncivilized people when instructed in Christianity, is remarkably shown in the case of the Islanders of the South Sea. See the account. *Missionary life in the South Sea*, by F. Krohn, Hamburg, F. Perthes, 1833, and the *Missionary Register* for 1832, pp. 99 and 365.

<sup>3</sup> Thus, for example, it is related in the life of the abbot Eustasius, that one Agrestius who had been secretary to the Frankish king Dietrich II., being suddenly seized with a feeling of intense grief, resigned all his earthly possessions, and retired into the monastery of Luxeu. There he was filled with a passionate desire to become a missionary. It was in vain that the abbot Eustasius represented to him that he was not yet sufficiently prepared. He proceeded to Bavaria; but remained there only a short time, not having been able to effect any good.

1811

that the advocates of Photianism had endeavoured to establish themselves, in connection with the Arians, among the Burgundians. It may be questioned whether Arianism itself gave this direction to the natural understanding, leading it, through the denial of the Redeemer's peculiar dignity, to further excesses; or whether that such a sect having been secretly planted at an early period, in the Roman dominions, now sought a place of refuge, and fresh converts, among the newly-converted tribes.<sup>1</sup>

About the middle of the seventh century, a bishop, named Emmeran, travelled from Aquitania to Hungary, in order to attempt the conversion of the Avars. But the Bavarian duke, Theodo I., it is related, represented to him, that the desolating wars then being carried on, rendered his undertaking hopeless. He besought him, therefore, to remain in Bavaria instead of prosecuting his journey;<sup>2</sup> and to labour in improving the religious condition of the people of that country, in which the seed of Christianity already existed, but mixed with heathenism. Emmeran worked for three years in this province. He then proposed to visit Rome, wishing to end his days in a place which he accounted holy. But the son of the duke, whom he had offended by some accusation, assailed him, and subjected him to the death of a martyr.<sup>3</sup>

At the end of the seventh century, Bishop Rudbert (Ruprecht), descended from the royal family of France, travelled from Worms

<sup>1</sup> The bishop Sidonius Apollinaris of Clermont speaks (epp. l. vi.; ep. xii. Opp. Sirmond I. f. 582) of the labours endured by Bishop Patinus of Lyons for the conversion of the Photinians, among the Burgundians. It may be conjectured, however, that he here confounds the Photinians with the Arians. But from a letter of bishop Avitus of Vienne to the Burgundian king, Gundobad, ep. 28., Opp. Sirmond II., f. 44, it appears, that some who actually denied the pre-existing divine nature of Christ, perhaps peculiarly Photinians, had sought to convert the king to their opinion, and hence he enquired of the bishop Avitus.

<sup>2</sup> The name of Emmeran's bishopric is not once mentioned in the first memoir of his life, written in the eleventh century, and which Canisius has inserted in the third volume of his *Lectiones Antiquae*. This memoir appeared in its present form not before the eleventh century; and although an older narrative formed its groundwork, even this earlier work does not reach to the time of Emmeran, while these later compositions are always but little to be depended upon. A clear view of Emmeran's fate and labours is not to be derived from these meagre histories.

<sup>3</sup> The actual cause of the persecution is hid in obscurity. According to the memoir, Emmeran, out of mercy to the guilty ones, took upon himself the shame attending the pregnancy of a daughter of the duke; but when afterwards he repudiated the pious fraud, he was not believed.

to Bavaria, in answer to the invitation of Duke Theodo II. He prayed the duke to grant him permission to prepare himself a hermitage in a wild spot of land, which was full of the ruins of noble buildings, erected in the time of the Romans, and where the fallen city of Juvania had once stood. Here he laid the foundations of a church and monastery, the origin of the bishopric of Saltzburg. Having accomplished thus much, he returned to his native land, in order to obtain help in his numerous undertakings. Provided with twelve new missionaries, he hastened back to the scene of his labours, which he continued till when, in extreme old age, he believed that he had given a sufficiently firm foundation to his design. He then, having appointed a successor, returned to his own diocese, where he desired to end his days.<sup>1</sup> These devoted men were followed by the Frankish hermit, Korbinian, who took up his abode in the district which subsequently formed the diocese of Frisia.

The wild, powerful, and warlike Frisians occupied a territory bordering on that of the Franks. Besides the district which still bears the name, they had occupied many other parts of the Netherlands, and the neighbouring Germany. Hence, either through the conquest of a portion of the country, which formed part of France, or through its mere vicinity, some of the more zealous Frankish bishops extended their labours to the Frisians. Of this number was Amandus, a man whose ardent zeal wanted the accompaniments of consideration and wisdom. Having been consecrated bishop in the year 627, without being appointed to any particular diocese (*episcopus regionarius*), he chose for the scene of his labours the country bordering on the Scheldt, then belonging to the Franks. He arrived at the place called Gandavum, (Ghent), and found idolatry there in full vigour. But he was not able to subdue the savage character of the people. He provided himself with an order from the Frankish king Dagobert, according to which all that prince's subjects were to be baptized. By his efforts to execute this command, and to make the people, whom no enactments could compel thereto, attentive to his preaching, he exposed himself to the severest persecution and ill-treatment, and was in danger of losing his life. But he strove to ex-

<sup>1</sup> We have but very scanty information respecting these missionaries, and that of a late date. *Canis. Lect. Antiq.*, t. iii., p. 2.

cite a better feeling in his behalf by benevolence. Thus he redeemed captives, instructed and baptized them. Deep was the impression which he made upon the rude multitude, when, having in vain endeavoured by his intreaties to save a thief from the gallows, he ordered the body of the criminal, after the execution, to be carried to his chamber, and there restored it to life. Being now regarded as a worker of miracles, many came freely to him, and were baptized. The people began to strip their idolatrous temples, and Amandus, aided by the presents of the king, and the united gifts of pious men, was enabled to convert them into monasteries and churches. Instead, however, of following up these first happy results of his procedure, and extending or securing the circle of his labours, where so much was still to be done, and so much encouragement had been received, he allowed himself to be urged forward by a wild, fanatical and fiery zeal, and to seek a martyr's death among the savage Slavonians. He commenced his journey towards the Danube; but he returned, having been unable to find any fit scene for his exertions, affected rather, it would seem, with indifference or contempt, than with passionate indignation; and seeing no occasion for dying as a martyr, he resumed his labours in his earlier sphere of labour.<sup>1</sup> At length, he obtained a definite bishopric, that of Maestricht (Trajectum.) With untiring zeal he traversed his diocese; admonished the clergy to the exact fulfilment of their duties; and preached to the heathen who dwelt in his territory or the neighbourhood, continuing these labours till his death, which happened in the year 679.

One of the most distinguished of the Frankish bishops, engaged in missionary undertakings, was Eligius.<sup>2</sup> The account of his life, prior to his consecration, shews, that amidst all the rudeness of the Frankish people, and the sensual tone of their religious spirit, a seed of living Christianity was still existing among the old Christian families. It was from one of these that Eligius was descended.<sup>3</sup> While a worker in gold, he had already, both by his

<sup>1</sup> The source of this notice is to be found in the old memoir, in the Actis. S. Ord. Bened. Mabillon. Sec. ii.

<sup>2</sup> S. Eloy. His life, composed by his scholar Audoen, is better calculated than most of the other memoirs of this time to give a clear and conceivable image of the man himself. It is inserted in D'Achery Spicileg., t. ii. Nov. ed.

<sup>3</sup> He was born at Chatelat, about five miles from Limoges, in the year 588.

remarkable skill, and by his eloquence and integrity, won the especial favour and confidence of King Chlotar II., and he had great influence at his court. But the interests of the gospel were to him even then the chief object of his concern. As he laboured in his art, a Bible lay open before him. The rich rewards which he received for his skill, he employed in promoting the interests of religion, and in works of charity. When he heard of captives, who were often led forth in troops for this purpose, about to be sold as slaves, he hastened to offer the necessary price. Thus occasionally more than a hundred at one time, men and women, obtained through him their freedom. He gave them their choice, either to return to their homes, to remain with him as free Christian brothers, or to become monks. In the first case, he provided them with money for their journey; in the last, the most gratifying to him, he made it his especial care to obtain them a good reception in a monastery. Even while still a layman, he employed his Christian knowledge, of which he possessed more than many of the clergy, in instructing the people. Thus his calling was already known far and wide; and whoever came, whether from Italy or Spain, desiring to confer with the king on any important affair, they first sought counsel of Eligius. The resources of his art he fondly employed for the interests of religion; and hence, according to the taste of the times, he adorned the graves of the saints with sumptuous monuments.

In the year 641, Eligius was consecrated bishop of the extensive diocese of Vermandois, Tournay, and Noyon, which bordered on a country still occupied by heathens, while there were many in the diocese itself, a large portion of the rest of the population being either still heathens or only partly converted, and merely Christians by name. He continued to labour in his office during eighteen years, that is, till 659, when he considered himself called upon to attempt the conversion of the rude multitudes not only within, but beyond the boundaries of his diocese. Great were the insults and persecutions which he endured in these visitation journeys. His life was in danger, but he finally overcame all opposition by his charity, gentleness, and patience. That which his scholars, who wrote his life, state respecting the actual contents of his sermons, shews that he was far from attributing any worth to a mere outward conversion, or to the adoption of Christian



ceremonies. On the contrary, he carefully warned his hearers against being satisfied with such appearances, and insisted altogether upon the necessity of an entire change of mind. "It is not enough," he said among other things, "to bear the name of Christians, if you perform not the work of Christians. The Christian name is only useful to him who keeps the commands of Christ constantly in his heart, and fulfils them in his conduct." He reminded his people of their baptismal vows; appealed to their consciences as to the meaning of those vows, and what was required for their fulfilment. He warned them against particular vices, and exhorted them to perform the several kinds of good works. He declared that love was the fulfilling of the law; and that the glory of the children of God consisted in their loving even their enemies for His sake. He warned them against the remains of heathen superstition, and against deceiving themselves by auguries, and lucky or unlucky signs.<sup>1</sup> They were to be contented, whether commencing a journey, or engaging in any other business, with making the sign of the cross, in the name of Christ, that being the symbol of the faith, and with repeating, in trust and devotion, "our Father;" when no power of the enemy would be able to harm them. No Christian ought to consider on what day he went out, or on what day he returned, God having made all days. No one ought to hang an amulet about the neck of either man or beast, even though the amulet might have been made by a spiritual person, and although it might be said that it was a sacred thing, and contained passages of Scripture, for in reality it contained not the grace of Christ, but the poison of the devil. In a word, the grace of Christ must be the great object of our desire, and on the strength of his name we must trust with our whole strength. Christ must be ever in our hearts, and his sign upon our foreheads: the sign of Christ is a great thing, but, as before said, it avails those only who strive to fulfil his commandments.

Livin was one of those who laboured at this period. He was descended from a noble Irish family;<sup>2</sup> and having become a mis-

<sup>1</sup> Similiter et auguria, vel sternutationes nolite observare, nec in itinere positi aliquas aviculas cantantes attendatis.

<sup>2</sup> Boniface, who wrote his life, affirms that he derived his information from the lips of three of the scholars of Livin, but his narrative deserves little credit, and is of small value. Livin is represented as having been baptized by Augustin, the founder of the English church; but, to judge from the relation in which he stood to the British church, this is far from probable.

sionary among the savage tribes of Brabant, he met in 656 the death of a martyr, according to his own prediction.<sup>1</sup>

Monks from England must have felt an especial impulse, through their connection with the German people, to make known to them the tidings of salvation. This connection, moreover, must have tended, in many respects, to facilitate their proceedings. Many young Englishmen visited Ireland, in the latter part of the seventh century, partly in order to lead a quiet and severe spiritual life among the monks of that country, and partly to become imbued with their extensive erudition. They were received by the Irish with Christian hospitality, and provided with every thing necessary to their sustenance, and with books. Among them was one named Egbert. Being seized with mortal sickness, he made a vow, that, if God spared his life, he would not return to his native land, but devote the remainder of his days to the service of God in a foreign land. He afterwards resolved to set out, with a large party of companions, for Germany, but, just as he was on the point to sail, he changed his mind.<sup>2</sup> His companions, however, persisted in their resolution; and thus the first obstacle to the work was created by the preacher who eventually laid the foundations of the German church. At the head of the party was a monk named Wigbert. He remained two years among the Frisians, who at that time still asserted their independence. But the wild character of the people, and of their king, Radbod, opposed too obstinate a resistance to his efforts, and he returned, without effecting his object, to his native land.

The same work, however, was undertaken with happier results by another Englishman, the presbyter Willibrord. A pious education had early kindled the fire of love in his soul. When twenty years of age, he travelled to Ireland, there to complete his studies. He remained in that country twelve years,<sup>3</sup> when he

<sup>1</sup> His poetical epistle to the abbot Florbert in Ghent:

Impia barbarico gens exagitata tumultu  
 Hic Brabanta furit meque cruenta petit.  
 Quid tibi peccavi, qui pacis nuntia porto?  
 Pax est, quod porto, cur mihi bella moves?  
 Sed qua tu spiras, feritas, sors læta triumphi,  
 Atque dabit palmam gloria martyrii.  
 Cui credam novi, nec spe frustrabor inani,  
 Qui spondet Deus est, quis dubitare potest?

<sup>2</sup> Beda iii. 27, v. 11, 12.

<sup>3</sup> See Alcuin: Life of Willibrord.

felt himself impressed with the conviction that he ought not to live merely for his own improvement, but to labour for the salvation of others. The reports which he heard of the people of German descent, as the Frisians and Saxons, among whom there was such a wide field for exertion, with so few labourers, determined his course. The conquests which Pepin, the mayor of the palace, had gained among the Frisians, some of whom he had rendered independent of the Franks, afforded more favourable opportunities for a mission into that country. Willibrord set out with twelve companions, and others followed. Of this number were two brothers, Heuwald, who died as martyrs among the Saxons. Willibrord being desired by Pepin to commence his labours in the northern district of his kingdom, he first proceeded to Rome, in order, according to the profound reverence which the English felt for the Roman see, to begin his great work with the sanction of the Pope, and to provide himself with relics for the consecration of new churches. His companions, in the meantime, were not inactive. One of their number, Sbidbert by name, a man of mild disposition, was ordained bishop. He laboured among the Westphalian tribes of the Borughtuarii, but was driven away by the invasion of the Saxons. Pepin gave him the island of Kaiserswörth, on the Rhine, for the site of a monastery.

When Willibrord returned from Rome, he commenced his work, with favourable auspices, in the Frankish districts of Friesland. Pepin had resolved to give a firm foundation to the new church, by establishing a bishopric, the seat of which should be the ancient city of Wilten (Wildeburg, the Roman Trajectum, Utrecht.) For this purpose he again sent Willibrord to Rome, that he might be ordained as an independent bishop for the new church, which he desired to enjoy the rank of a metropolis, or archbishopric.

The fame of Willibrord's activity in these regions, inspired Bishop Wulfram of Sens with the desire of visiting the same scenes. He set out accompanied by numerous followers, and, seeking the Frisians who were not yet subject to the Franks, baptized many of that people. An instance of his activity is related which may be deserving of credit, although little confidence can be placed in the general accounts of his life.

King Radbod, it is said, professed himself ready to receive baptism; but, before the rite was administered, he desired a solution

of the question, whether, when he himself entered heaven he should find his predecessors there, those who were kings before him. When the bishop replied, that those who had died without baptism were certainly condemned to hell, Radbod exclaimed, what should he do with some few poor people in heaven?—he would abide by the religion of his fathers! Although the wild, capricious prince only sought, it is probable, a pretence to escape, in a half jesting manner, from his profession of Christianity, yet this trait may serve to show, how by confining the view of Christian doctrine within the narrow principles of the church, the diffusion of the gospel itself was rendered slow and difficult. The efforts of Willibrord with the Frankish king proved equally vain. But the laborious missionary travelled beyond the limits of Radbod's territory, and proceeding towards the north, reached the borders of Denmark. Here he was equally unsuccessful, except that he purchased thirty children of the natives. These he instructed; and when he landed on the island dedicated to the old German idol Fosite (Fosite's Land, Heligoland), he wished to establish his abode there in order to baptize them. But to disturb anything dedicated on the holy island to the Deity, was regarded as a heavy offence. When Willibrord, therefore, ventured to baptize the children in the sacred fountain, and his companions slew some of the consecrated animals, the rage of the people was violently excited against them. The one of the party on whom the lot fell, was offered to the idols, and King Radbod dismissed the rest into the Frankish territory.

The sphere of Willibrord's activity may have been somewhat extended in aftertimes. Radbod, the greatest enemy of the Christian church among the Frisians, died in 719, and Frisia became more and more independent of the Franks. Willibrord's zeal also subsequently received support, in a manner not unworthy of notice, from a man of distinction among the people, and who was himself a zealous Christian. This was Wursing, whose surname was Ado. While he was still a heathen, he beheld revealed to him the countenance of the heavenly Father, who leads all those who obey him to his Son. For Wursing, even as a heathen, strove to fulfil the law of God, inscribed in the heart; and thus he was a friend of the poor, a defender of the oppressed, and a righteous judge. But whilst without fear of man, he supported

the right, and opposed himself to the injustice practised by Radbod and his ministers, he drew upon himself the persecution of the prince, and was constrained to flee with his family into the neighbouring territory of the Franks. He found here a friendly reception: here he learnt the doctrines of the gospel; was convinced of their truth, and was admitted with his whole family into the Christian church. After the death of Radbod, Charles Martell, the mayor of the palace, bestowed on him a fief on the borders of Friesland, and sent him back to his native province, that he might there further the diffusion of the Christian faith. He settled in the neighbourhood of Utrecht, and laboured zealously, with his whole family, to promote the cause of the gospel.<sup>1</sup> Wilibrord carried on his work as bishop of the new church above forty years, and died at the age of eighty in 739.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding the individual exertions which had been made, on various sides, for the planting of Christianity in Germany, these single and disconnected experiments, wanting a common centre, and the firm band of the church, uniting all into one whole, could effect little permanent good among vast masses of uncivilised people, and in the midst of such distracting circumstances. To secure the diffusion of Christianity among these people for the future, one or the other of the  $\eta$  things had to be secured. Either there must have been several distinct missionaries, working merely in obedience to the power of the divine word implanted in their minds; divided among many spheres of labour, but striving continually to enable the Christian church to acquire in its development a definite form among the people, and to render Christianity like a pervading leaven to the multitude, working outwardly from within. It was thus the Irish and British missionaries laboured. Or, on the other hand, it was necessary that some man should come forth, who, armed with power for action, and with prudence, might carry on the whole work, according to one plan; thus quickly establishing a common German church, in a definite visible form, and securing its extension by a settled system of outward rites, and its adhesion to the great body of the

<sup>1</sup> See Altfrid's Life of S. Liudger, in the beginning, *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, by Pertz, t. ii. f. 405.

<sup>2</sup> Bede says of him, in the year 731, *Ipse adhuc superest, longa jam venerabilis ætate, utpote tricesimum et sextum in episcopatu habens annum et post multiplices militiæ cœlestis agones ad præmia remunerationis supernæ tota mente suspirans.*

Roman communion. This did, in reality, take place, and it was the work of Boniface, whom we must, therefore, though many single missionaries preceded him, regard as the father of the German church, and of the Christian civilization of the country.

Winfred, which was his proper name,<sup>1</sup> was born at Kirton in Devonshire, in the year 680. He sprang, it appears, from a not obscure family, and was destined by his father to some civil employment. But his mind was peculiarly susceptible to religious impressions; and while he was still a boy he was seized with the love of a monastic life, as he delightedly listened to the discourses of the monks who, according to the custom then prevailing in England,<sup>2</sup> were in the habit of visiting the families of the laity, to further them in their Christian faith and conversation. Winfrid's father was at first opposed to his design; but was afterwards led, by peculiar circumstances, to give his consent; and Winfrid received his spiritual and theological education in the two celebrated monasteries of Adscancester (Excestre) and Nuteselle. The qualities of his mind were eminently practical. He was early distinguished, in a remarkable degree, for prudence and skill in the management of affairs; and hence he was employed by his monastery, as its representative, when any difficult business was to be transacted abroad. But the love of travel, so common to the monks of those islands, combining with a higher impulse, a desire to labour for the salvation of the heathen, urged him to leave his native country.<sup>3</sup> In the year 715 he set out on his journey to Friesland; but the consequences attending the war between the mayor of the palace, Charles Martell, and the Frisian King, Radbod, so unfortunate for the French, proved an invincible obstacle to his undertaking, and after spending the whole summer, and a part of the autumn in Utrecht, he returned to his monastery. The monks were anxious to place him in the now vacant office of their abbot; but he could not renounce the in-

<sup>1</sup> The name Bonifacius, by which he was usually known after his episcopal ordination, he had perhaps already assumed when he entered the monastery.

<sup>2</sup> In illustration of this see above. In the life of Boniface by his scholar the presbyter Willibald, in Pertz *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, t. ii. c. 1 s. 334, it is said, *cum vero aliqui, sicut illis in regionibus moris est, presbyteri sive clerici populares vel laicos prædicandi causa adiissent.*

<sup>3</sup> He himself says in a letter to an English abess, *Postquam nos timor Christi et amor peregrinationis longa et lata terrarum ac maris intercapedine separavit.* Ep. xxxi.

spiring call to a missionary life. Following, therefore, the example of the early English missionaries, he set out, in the autumn of the year 718, for Rome, where he received from Gregory II., to whom he had been recommended by his wise friend, bishop Daniel of Winchester, a commission to preach the gospel to the heathen in Germany. He made his first experiment in Thuringia, to which a great part of the Frankish territory then pertained. But what he here learnt convinced him, that, to accomplish his purpose, he must secure the co-operation of the Frankish government. He therefore sought the friendship of the mayor of the palace, Charles Martell. The favourable prospects which the death of Radbod in 719 opened to the Frisian mission, induced him to travel into Friesland, where he aided the labours of Willibrord with the happiest consequences. The latter, now greatly advanced in years, anxiously desired to name him as his successor; but Boniface considered it his duty to reject the proposal. He still felt himself bound by an inward, divine call to establish the knowledge of salvation among the people of Germany, whose wretched condition he had observed with his own eyes. This feeling so entirely occupied his thoughts, that it manifested itself as a heavenly message, in dreams and visions, and he fixed his earnest gaze upon the great harvest which he was to reap among the heathen people of Germany.<sup>1</sup>

Obedying this call, he commenced his journey in the year 722, to Hesse and Thuringia. At Ameneburg, in Upper Hesse, he baptized two native princes, Detdig and Dierolf, and founded the first monastery. In Thuringia, in a district devastated by wars with the neighbouring Saxons, he encountered many difficulties and dangers, and could scarcely provide for himself and his com-

<sup>1</sup> I learn this circumstance from a letter of the abbess Bugga to Boniface, who was then still a presbyter. Ep. ii. Having praised God for the mercy which he had manifested towards him, in such various ways, *te transeuntem per ignotos pagos piissime conduxit*, she adds, *Primum pontificem gloriosae sedis ad desiderium mentis tuae blandiendum inclinavit; postea inimicum catholicae ecclesiae Rathbodum coram te consternavit, demum per somnia semetipso revelavit, quod debuisti manifeste messem Dei metere et congregare sanctorum animarum manipulos in horreum regis caelestis.* The period here referred to agrees altogether with the chronology of the life of Boniface, as derived from other sources. We have, first, his journey to Rome, and his appointment to the Pope to missionary labours; then the death of Radbod, an event so favourable to mission among the Frisians; and then the divine call to the heathens in Germaniam, firm'd by the dream.

panions sufficient food to sustain life.<sup>1</sup> Having informed the Pope of the results of these his labours, he was summoned to Rome, and proceeded thither in 723. Gregory II. had formed the design of consecrating him bishop of the new church. But he wished, in the first instance, to convince himself generally of his orthodoxy, and he therefore desired him to give an account of his doctrines. But partly because he was not accustomed to the Roman pronunciation of Latin, and partly because he dare not suppose himself able to find fitting expressions, in speaking,<sup>2</sup> for a dogmatic confession, he besought permission to give the statement of his faith in Latin. This was granted him; and the Pope, being well satisfied both with the confession and with the manner in which he described his labours, solemnly ordained him bishop of the new church, to be founded in Germany,<sup>3</sup> necessarily, at first, without assigning him any definitely marked out diocese.<sup>4</sup> His operations were to be confined to no particular place. He was to travel about among the people, and to lengthen his stay wherever he saw occasion.<sup>5</sup>

Through this ordination, Boniface became pledged by an oath to render ecclesiastical obedience to the Pope, in the same manner as the Italian bishops, belonging to the old patriarchal diocese, with such modifications only as were rendered necessary by the different position of an Italian bishop, and a bishop of the new German church.<sup>6</sup> He took the oath at the grave of the Apostle Peter.

1 See Liudger's Life of the abbot Gregory, at Utrecht, § 6.

2 This is probably the meaning of what Boniface said: *Novi me imperitum jam peregrinus*: he having lived long among a rude people, and been accustomed to speak only German during that time. L. c. Pertz. p. 343. It is said of the written confession—*Fidem urbanae eloquentiae scientia conscriptam.*

3 Boniface, however, appears to have been, by his means, resolved at first to end his days in Germany. He could, therefore, have had no intention to become the head of a new church. Thus it appears from his fourth epistle, ed. Würdtwein, in which he exhorts a friend in England to the diligent study of Scripture, that he proposed to visit his native land again. *Si Dominus voluerit, ut aliquando ad istas partes remeans, sicut propositum habeo, per viam (perhaps vitam) spondeo, me tibi in his omnibus fore fidelem amicum, et in studio divinarum Scripturarum, in quantum vires suppeditent, devotissimum adjutorem.*

4 *Episcopus regionarius* was his proper title.

5 Still, in the year 739, Gregory III. wrote to him. *Nec enim habebis licentiam, frater, incepti laboris utilitate in uno morari loco, sed confirmatis cordibus fratrum edocui te, ut in omnibus fidelium, qui rarescunt in illis Hesperiiis partibus, ubi tibi Dominus aperuerit*

6 *salutis, predicare non deseras.*

The form of such an oath is preserved in the Pope's Journal of Transactions, at the



It was, in substance, as follows: "I vow to thee, the first of the apostles, to thy vicar, Pope Gregory, and his successors, that, with God's help, I will continue in the unity of the catholic faith, and in no wise consent to aught which is contrary to the unity of the catholic church, but will, in all ways, persevere in keeping my pure faith, in co-operation with thee, and in adhering to the usages of thy church, which has received from God the power to bind and to loose; and so I promise to thy vicar and his successors. And if I at any time learn that the conduct of the officers of the church is opposed to the ancient ordinances of the Fathers, I will hold no intercourse or communion with them, but will rather hinder their proceedings to the best of my power, and where I cannot restrain them, will give information thereof to the Pope."<sup>1</sup>

This form of oath was of by so much the greater importance in the formation of the new German church, as the peculiarly conscientious character of Boniface inclined him to its strict observance. It was now to be distinctly determined, whether the German church was to be committed to the old system of the Roman hierarchy, and thus to be framed in strict conformity with the principles of Western Christianity, or whether a reaction was now to commence with the German church, attendant upon a freer development of Christianity itself. The latter would have taken place, had the liberal-minded British and Irish missionaries been able to gain the upper hand among the German people. The danger which threatened it on this side, was well known at Rome, and the oath prescribed to Boniface was intended to avert it. Boniface, it was hoped, would prove a powerful instrument of the Romish ecclesiastical system, and serve effectually for the suppression of the free institutions, the especial work of the British

beginning of the eighth century, and published by the Jesuit Garnier at Paris in 1680, as *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*. It is inserted in C. G. Hoffmann's *Nova Scriptorum ac Monumentorum Collectio*, t. ii. Lips. 1733.

<sup>1</sup> This last passage had especial reference to the circumstances under which Boniface was to labour. And here there was a remarkable alteration in the original oath, which was founded upon the ancient relation in which the Pope stood to the Byzantine empire. It ran thus at first—*Promitto pariter, quod si quid contra rem publicam, vel piissimum principem nostrum a quolibet agi cognovero, minime consentire; sed in quantum virtus suffragaverit, obviare et vicario tuo, domino meo apostolico, modis, quibus poterero, nuntiare et id agere vel facere, quatenus fidem meam in omnibus sincerissimam exhibeam.*

and Irish missionaries. The object for which he was sent was not merely the conversion of the heathen, but the recovery of those who had been led astray by heretical teachers, their restoration to orthodoxy, and conformity to the discipline of the Romish church.<sup>1</sup>

It is worthy of remark, that the church from which that Christian spirit arose, which was destined to burst the fetters of the Romish system, was on the point, even at its very beginning, of taking a similar course.

But superior as those missionaries were in Christian knowledge and spiritual culture, whom he had now to oppose, to Boniface himself, it may be asked, whether they understood so well the position and the real necessities of the rude people among whom the Christian church was now to be established? whether they knew so well what means were to be employed, or how the foundations of a church were to be laid which should be able to defy destruction? Educated, however, as Boniface had been in the belief of the Romish theocracy, and in the punctual observance of a monkish obedience, he had no other standing point but this, his Christian conviction, from which to act; and in proceeding accordingly, he believed that he was providing best for the good of the new church. Under the guidance, indeed, of a higher spirit, the development of the church had been long so carried forward, that it

1 In an ancient record, the object of sending Boniface is thus stated, *Ut ultra Alpes pergeret, et in illis partibus, ubi hæresis maxime pullularet, sua salubri doctrina funditus eam eradicaret.* S. Acta S. Mens. Jun. t. i. f. 482. Willibald also speaks in his life of Boniface of the influence of such clergymen in Thuringia, *qui sub nomine religionis maximam hæreticam pravitatis introduxerunt sectam.* § 23. Pertz, *Monumenta* ii. f. 344. Compare also the admonition contained in the epistle addressed by Gregory III. to the bishops of Bavaria and Alemannia. He tells them that they were to receive Boniface with all becoming reverence as papal legate; to adopt the liturgy and creed which were according to the rule of the Roman Apostolic Church; and to guard themselves against admitting the doctrine of the Britons arriving among them, or of false priests and heretics. Ep. xlv. In his epistle to the German bishops and dukes, the Pope speaks of the mission of Boniface, as partly intended for the conversion of the heathen; and partly, *et si quos forte vel ubicunque a rectæ tramite fidei deviasse cognoverit aut astutia diabolica suos erroneos repererit, corrigat.* We sometimes, indeed, meet with the ordinary legal forms of expression, proper to the *Liber Diurnus*, in the official letters, preserved unchanged, although but little suited to the new relations of the church. This is the case with regard to the letter to the Germans, ep. x. on the hindrances to ordination. *Non audeat removere Afros passim ad ecclesiasticos ordines pretendentes, quia aliqui eorum Manichæi, aliqui rebaptizati sæpius sunt probati.* Which warning might, perhaps, be proper for the times of Gregory the Great, but could scarcely be applied, in a proper sense, to the churches in Germany.

was now necessary that the people should be led to the purity of evangelical freedom, either through a legal Christianity, or a gospel in the form of Judaism.

Supported by the recommendatory epistle of the Pope, Boniface proceeded, in the first instance, to the court of the mayor of the palace, and having secured his co-operation, he journeyed into Hesse and Thuringia. It appears, as we have before remarked, that Boniface must have found the principles of Christianity already known in the latter province. This is mentioned in the letters with which Boniface was charged by the Pope,<sup>1</sup> who solemnly commands the Thuringians to erect churches, and a house for the new bishop.<sup>2</sup> From the epistles also which he addressed to some of the great men, and other believers in the province, it is easy to perceive that a contest was already being carried on between the heathens and the Christian party. Thus he praises the Christian dukes for not allowing themselves to be moved by the threats of the heathen to take any part again in the service of idols, but rather to perish than to do aught which was contrary to the evangelical faith.<sup>3</sup>

Boniface now brought back the chiefs, who had fallen away, to the profession of Christianity. In the same manner he strengthened the wavering; and laboured effectually in suppressing the spirit of heathenism still dominant among the people, and in effecting the general diffusion of the faith. By the year 739, Boniface had baptized nearly a hundred thousand inhabitants of hea-

1 Willibald also says, in his life of Boniface, not that he first established Christianity here, but that he restored it. He says that the bad management of the land, under the dukes who were independent of the Franks (since the ruin of the Thuringian kingdom in 531), promoted the revival of heathenism, and induced the people to subject themselves again to the idolatrous Saxons. He says of Boniface, *Senioris plebis populique principes affatus est, eosque ad acceptam dudum Christianitatis religionem iterando provocavit.* § 23.

2 Willibald speaks first of an ecclesiastical establishment, consisting of a church and a monastery, founded by Boniface at Orthorp (Ohldruf, in the duchy of Gotha.) But this was a somewhat considerable institution, and Boniface had then made great advances. It is probable, therefore, that this was not the first church, of which the foundations were laid in this country. The little church in the neighbouring village of Altenberga, connected by tradition with him, was, probably, the first which he built on coming from Hesse to Thuringia. See Löffler, *Feier des Andenkens an die erste Kirche in Thüringen.* Gotha 18ü2.

3 Ep. viii. *Quod paganis compellentibus vos ad idola colenda fide plena responderitis, magis velle feliciter mori, quam fidem semel in Christo acceptam aliquatenus violare.*

then Germany ; and this had been effected, as Gregory III. remarked, through his own efforts and those of Charles Martell.<sup>1</sup> In this conversion of masses of the people, much may have been only superficial. The suppression of the idolatrous worship ; the destruction of all its monuments appealing to the senses ; the laws passed against all heathen customs ; the legal support given to Christian rites and Christian education ; all this must have contributed to further the work ; which was no less promoted by the care taken in affording religious instruction by means of the schools instituted in connection with the monasteries.

No trace exists of any attempt made by Boniface to employ the power of the mayor of the palace in compelling the people to be baptized.<sup>2</sup> In what respects he needed it, he himself shews, where he says, that without the protection of the Frankish prince, he could neither govern the people nor defend the clergy, the monks and nuns (who presided over the education of the young), nor hinder the practice of idolatry and heathen rites, from which the people were restrained only by the commands or by fear of the prince.<sup>3</sup> The following example will serve to shew how much he effected by the destruction of one of the popular sanctuaries, reverence for which had been transmitted from one generation to another, and had been cherished in the minds of men from childhood. Near Geismar, not far from Fritslar, in the division of Gudensberg, in Upper Hesse, stood a huge, ancient oak. It was consecrated to Thor, the god of thunder ; was contemplated with shuddering awe by the multitude, and formed the gathering point of their popular assemblies.<sup>4</sup> In vain had Boniface proclaimed the nothingness of the idol. The impression made by the ancient object of idolatrous reverence rendered his exhortations powerless ; and the newly-converted were thereby thrown back into heathenism. Boniface resolved to vanquish one sensible impression by another.<sup>5</sup> Accompanied by his followers, he proceeded,

1 Ep. xlvi. Tuo conamine et Caroli principis.

2 Ep. xii. To bishop Daniel.

3 Sine patrocinio principis Francorum nec populum regere, nec presbyteros vel diaconos, monachos vel ancillas Dei defendere possum, vel ipsos paganorum ritus et sacrilegia idolorum in Germania sine illius mandato et timore prohibere valeo.

4 In the district of the ancient Mattium.

5 An interesting comparison may be instituted between the occurrence here described, and one which took place in the province of Madura, in the East Indies, in August 1831.

armed with a heavy axe, to the spot where the oak grew. The heathen people stood around it, filled with rage against the enemy of their gods. Nothing was expected but that those who should venture to touch the sanctuary would instantly fall victims to the vengeance of the deities. When, however, they beheld the huge tree split into four quarters before their eyes, their faith in the power of the idols vanished. Boniface successfully employed the impression thus created, and, in order to render it permanent, he immediately directed that a church should be built of the wood of the oak. This he dedicated to the apostle Peter, it being his anxious wish to promote the honour of that apostle and his church.

But though he thus endeavoured to work upon the outward and sensual feelings of the people, it is equally evident, from many circumstances, that he by no means neglected their religious instruction, or undervalued its importance. His old friend, Daniel, bishop of Winchester, who was then blind, gave him this admonition in regard to the mode of instruction ;<sup>1</sup> that is, he was not immediately to commence with directly controverting the notions of the heathen, but should question them, and so, while he proved his own perfect acquaintance with the subject, guide them to the discovery of the contradictions involved in such notions, and of the wretched consequences to which they must lead ; and all this he was to do without any expression of contempt or wrath, but with gentleness and moderation ;<sup>2</sup> and with the fervent application of Christian doctrine, the comparison of which with their own superstition, might incite the heathen to shame rather than anger.

That Boniface was in the habit of preaching, and of using the

There was an old tree of vast growth, known to have existed for a hundred and twenty years, and held in great reverence by the people of the neighbourhood for many generations, as the seat of the tutelary deity of the province. Numerous offerings were yearly brought to the spot on which it grew. At first, several branches of the tree were cut off for the purpose of erecting a school-room. But when the overseer of the village, a Christian convert, fell sick, the heathen people regarded this as a proof that the anger of the deity was hanging over him. To convince them of their error, the overseer resolved to cut the whole tree down. When it fell, hundreds of people, filled with astonishment, assembled on the spot, and passed the whole week in walking about it, regarding it as a wonder, and threatening the newly-converted with the vengeance of their god. *Missionary Register for 1832, p. 399.*

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Non quasi insultando vel irritando eos, sed placide ac magna objicere moderatione debes.

Scriptures in his sermons, appears from a remarkable charge which he gave to his old friend, the abbess Eadburga, who was accustomed to send him clothes and books from England.<sup>1</sup> He desired her to have a copy of the epistles of the Apostle Peter made for him, in gilded letters, and which he might use in preaching, thereby inciting in the minds of his sensual hearers reverence for the Holy Scriptures, and especially for the Apostle Peter, whose ambassador he represented, and believed, himself to be.<sup>2</sup> His diligence in the study of the Scriptures appears also from the fact, that he often sent to England for copies of them, "written in clear characters, such as were good for his weak eyes," and for commentaries on the same. Thus, for example, a copy of the prophets was written by his scholar, the abbot Wimbert, without abbreviations, and in letters distinctly separate from each other.<sup>3</sup>

Some fragments of the sermons of Boniface still exist. They are parts of those which he probably translated into the language of the country. One of them contains an admonition to chastity, as a necessary condition for the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper, then about to be celebrated. "We speak to you," he says, "not as the messengers of one, from obedience to whom you can free yourselves by gold ;<sup>4</sup> but as coming from him who bought you with his blood. My beloved ! we are men full of the defilements of sin ; and yet would we not suffer ourselves to be touched by those who are defiled. Can we believe, then, that the only begotten Son of God will willingly endure the defilement of our sins upon his body ? See, my brethren, our King, who has deigned to send his messengers among us, now comes himself. Let us prepare a clean house for his reception, if we would indeed have him abide in us."

In the other sermon, he answers the objection, founded on the inquiry, why the message of salvation was brought at such a late period, and after so many had perished. In reference to this sub-

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Et quia dicta ejus, qui me in hoc iter direxit, maxime semper in presentia cupiam habere.

<sup>3</sup> Quia librum prophetarum talem, qualem desidero, acquirere non possum, et caligantibus oculis minutas ac connexas litteras discere non possum.

<sup>4</sup> This was probably said in allusion to the mischievous *compositions* known among the Germans, and from a certain adaptation of which indulgences arose ; a result which Boniface seems to have feared.

ject, he says: "You might have some right to complain respecting the late arrival of the Physician if you had, since he is at present here for your good, made the best use of his help." Instead of uttering complaints that aid came so late, they ought to have hastened so much the more to apply it when it arrived. The entire proceeding of Boniface in founding the new church, tends to prove how important he felt it was for him to effect, by Christian means, the spiritual enlightenment of the people. Hence he instituted monasteries, as centres of union, and from which the instruction of the surrounding inhabitants and the cultivation of the land might be successfully begun. To these institutions he invited monks and nuns from England.<sup>1</sup> They brought with them various arts, various kinds of knowledge,<sup>2</sup> and books for the instruction of the young.<sup>3</sup> From them missionaries were chosen<sup>4</sup> to be sent among the people; and, connected with the improvement thus effected, were the ecclesiastical rules, whereby it was ordered that no man or woman should act as sponsor without being able to repeat the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer in the vulgar tongue; and that no one should be ordained priest who could not repeat the questions in the formulary of renunciation in the baptismal service, and the confession of sins, in the language of the people.<sup>5</sup>

Boniface, in the course of his labours, had to contend with numerous opponents, but of these we can gain no certain information from his not unprejudiced and partial statements. They consisted partly of the liberal-minded British and Irish clergy, and particularly of those who would not subject themselves to the rule of celibacy which the Roman Church had instituted for the priests.<sup>6</sup> The married life of these men Boniface naturally re-

<sup>1</sup> The monks were denominated *magistri infantium*. Ep. lxxix.

<sup>2</sup> Willibald says, § 23, *e Britannia partibus servorum Dei plurima ad eum tam lectorum quam etiam Scriptorum* (those who employed themselves in copying books), *aliorumque artium eruditorum virorum congregationis convenerat multitudo*.

<sup>3</sup> He had also books sent from Rome.

<sup>4</sup> Boniface went a long way towards these strangers. See ep. lxxx. They wrote to England respecting their labours among the heathen. *Deus per misericordiam suam sufficientiam operis nostri bonam perficit; licet valde sit periculosum ac laboriosum pæne in omni re, in fame et siti, in algore et incursione paganorum inter se degere*.

<sup>5</sup> See epp. ed. Würdtwein. f. 142.

<sup>6</sup> It had been ordered by an Irish synod, held in the year 456, can. vi., that the wives of the clergy, from the wife of the porter to the wife of the priest, should only go out veiled.

garded, from the point of view which he took, as an unlawful union. But another part of his opponents consisted of those rude and ignorant men who led a life altogether unspiritual, employing themselves in hunting and war; making a cloak of the priestly office, and diffusing among the barbarous people notions of Christianity which were equally prejudicial to religion and to morality.<sup>1</sup> A third part was formed of those of the clergy, or monks, who, whether from right or wrong motives, refused to be dependent on Boniface, and who, by the veneration which their severe, ascetic life inspired, gained for themselves great influence among the people.<sup>2</sup> The divisions created by such men, however well disposed, could not fail to be prejudicial to the extension of the church in an uncivilized country. It is probable also that they might find a favourable reception at the court of the warlike Charles Martell, with whose interests and inclinations much which they wished and asserted was more likely to agree than the severe ecclesiastical rule of Boniface. At all events, he could never succeed, during the life of Charles Martell, in establishing his authority as Papal legate against these opponents. He had sworn, as we have seen, to withdraw from the communion of all who opposed the system of the Romish church. Thus it greatly oppressed his conscience, when he visited the court of Charles Martell, that he could not avoid all intercourse with the people of which we have spoken, while his not doing so would be a violation of the principles of his church. It consoled him, however, to re-

See Wilkin's Concil. Aug. T. i. p. 2; but it hence appears that the marriage of such of the clergy was considered lawful.

1 There were even those who, from ignorance, and a desire to please the barbarous people, made up of heathens and Christians, with whom they conversed, actually brought offerings to the idols. According to the account sent by Boniface to Pope Zacharias: "Qui tauros, hircos, diis paganorum immolabant."

2 Boniface says, ep. xiii.: *Quidam abstinentes a cibis, quos Deus ad percipiendum creavit. Quidam melle et lacte proprie pascentes se, panem et cæteros abjiciunt cibos.* Thus he seems to point these persons out as false teachers. We might, therefore, suspect some connection between such instances of abstinence and heretical errors, perhaps those of the Gnostics. But, had Boniface known anything of this kind, regarding as he did the slightest deviation from the established doctrines as a dangerous heresy, he would certainly have used a severer language. It is possible, indeed, that these people, without any error in doctrine, only lived with extraordinary strictness. An ascetic severity would probably have appeared praiseworthy in the eyes of Boniface; but he viewed it in another light in respect to these people. They employed the veneration which they thereby gained to render themselves independent, and to resist his rules.



flect, that he sufficiently fulfilled his oath, if he refrained from any willing intercourse or church communion with those people. His prudent friend, Bishop Daniel, confirmed him in this opinion. He had stated his perplexities to the aged prelate, and the latter had counselled him to consider well the circumstances in which he was placed, and to employ a certain degree of dissimulation when it would serve the important ends he had in view.<sup>1</sup> But Boniface could not quite satisfy himself in this respect, till he had made his feelings known to the Pope, who had placed him under his present obligations, and whose authentic interpretation of the oath could alone remove his doubts. The Pope replied to him, that the clergy, whose mode of life disgraced their calling, should be admonished in the name of the papal authority. But should they refuse to hear the reproof, he was not to avoid all discourse or communion with them at table, since it often happened, that men were more easily led by hospitable entertainment and friendly discourse into the right way, than by severity and reproof.<sup>2</sup>

In the space of fifteen years, Boniface had laid the foundation of the Christian religion among a hundred thousand Germans, and had raised churches and monasteries in the midst of the wilderness. Having accomplished this work, he travelled for the third time to Rome (A. D. 738), in order to communicate with the lately elected Pope Gregory III., and to receive from him a new commission. The pontiff gave him directions to visit, as his ambassador, the Bavarian church; on the one side, not yet firmly established; and, on the other, partially shattered, and always standing open to the British and Irish missionaries, so suspected in Rome.<sup>3</sup> He was also invited thither by the Bavarian Duke Odilo. On his return, therefore, from Rome, in the year 739, he proceeded to Bavaria. He remained there a considerable period; and founded under papal authority the four great bishoprics of

1 The principle of the officiosum mendacium, quod utilis simulatio assumenda sit in tempore, which, as had been the custom in still earlier times, he defended by an appeal to the example of Peter and Paul. Ep. xiii.

2 Ep. xxiv. Plerumque enim contingit, ut quos correctio disciplinæ tardos faciat ad percipiendam veritatis normam, conviviatorum sedulitas et admonitio disciplinæ ad viam perducatur justitiæ.

3 These missionaries may yet have shown themselves not altogether disinclined to submit to the authority of the Romish church; as we see by the example of Virgilius.

Saltzburg, Ratisbone, Freisingen, and Passau. Soon after his return to the scene of his early labours, the death of Charles Martell, which occurred in 741, produced political changes, highly favourable to his designs. Although that prince had acknowledged him in the character of papal ambassador, and generally favoured his mission, he could not be induced to let him acquire such a decided superiority as might enable him to subdue all his opponents, and subject them to Roman inspection. But when the rude warrior indulged the clergy in assuming a military character, and he pillaged churches and monasteries to supply himself with money,<sup>1</sup> his hostility to the new institution could no longer be doubted, and the resentment of Boniface was excited accordingly.

Boniface exercised a far greater influence over the sons of this prince, Carloman and Pepin. So strongly was the former governed by religious sentiment, that he was induced to change his regal state for a cowl. The latter was prepared to enter much more extensively than his predecessor into the designs of Boniface, for the Christian edification of the Germans; and was ready to form a close alliance with the papacy, as likely to promote his own political advantage.

By these means, Boniface was enabled to accomplish two important things for the firmer organization of the new church; the foundation, that is, of several bishoprics, and the establishment of synods. Thus, in the year 742, he formed, with the authority of the Pope, the three dioceses of Würzburg, Erfurt,<sup>2</sup> and Burburg, not far from Fritslar. By the introduction of a regular system of provincial synods, provision was made for the entire oversight of the religious and moral condition of the people; and for the addition of laws proper to the necessities of the church. In that of the Franks, regular synods had fallen altogether into forgetfulness. No assembly of the kind had been held for eighty years; and Carloman himself requested Boniface to summon one, and thereby provide some remedy for the abuses which had entered into the government of the church.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Mabillon *Annal. Ord. Benedict.*, t. ii., f. 114.

<sup>2</sup> Some difficulty exists in relation to this bishopric; no trace of such a diocese exists at a later period. It may be, either that, in the course of time, some change was made in this order, through particular circumstances, or that a false reading has crept in.

<sup>3</sup> See ep. li. Carolomannus me accersitum ad se rogavit, ut in parte regni Francorum,

In these synods, Boniface occupied the first place, as the representative of the Pope. This extended his influence over the whole Frankish church, now greatly in need of improvement; and pope Zacharias invested him with full power to execute, in his name, whatever was necessary to effect the desired reform.<sup>1</sup> He held altogether five of these synods. By their means laws were passed, which obliged the clergy to lead a life more answerable to their calling, and to cease, on pain of deposition, from taking part either in war or in the chase. Regulations also were established in support of a general religious education; and superstitious customs,<sup>2</sup> predictions, magical rites, amulets, even though consisting of words derived from Scripture,<sup>3</sup> and all such things, the fruit of heathenism, or founded in heathen notions, but now mixed up with the profession of Christianity, were strictly forbidden. At one of these synods, held in 744, inquiry was made into the supposed existence of several heresies. Boniface had expressed his anxiety on this subject some time before; but had not sufficient authority, under Charles Martell, to effect his purpose.

One of the suspected heretics was a Frank, named Adelbert.<sup>4</sup>

*quae in sua est potestate, synodum facerem congregari, et promisit, se de ecclesiastica religione, quae jam longo tempore id est non minus quam per sexaginta vel septuaginta annos calcata et dissipata fuit, aliquid corrigere et emendare velle.*

<sup>1</sup> The words of Pope Zacharias ep. lx. are, Nos omnia quae tibi largitus est decessor noster, non minuiimus, sed augemus. Nam non solum Bojoariam, sed etiam omnem Galliarum provinciam nostra vice per praedicationem tibi injungimus, ut quae repperis contra Christianam religionem vel canonum instituta ibidem detineri, ad normam rectitudinis studeas reformare.

<sup>2</sup> For example: Hostias immolantias, quas stulti homines juxta ecclesias ritu pagano faciunt, sub nomine sanctorum martyrum vel confessorum. The German synods of the year 742, see p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> Si quis clericus auguria vel divinationes, aut somnia sive sortes, seu phylacteria, id est scripturas observaverit, p. 99. The Chrisma also was not to be used as a means of cure in cases of sickness, p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> The Mayence priest, whose short account of the life of Boniface is given by the Bollandists (June v.) relates, that Adelbert gave money to the people to pretend that they were afflicted with various bodily disorders, and were then healed by his prayers. See Pertz t. ii. p. 354. But this, as the assertion of a passionate opponent, is not worthy of credit. As soon as a man was regarded as a heretic, nothing remained but to declare that the supposed miracles ascribed to him were either performed by the help of the evil spirit and magic, or were altogether deceptions. It was also a thing by no means rare in the Frankish church, for fanatics and impostors to appear, who knew how to gain veneration, and extraordinary influence as workers of miracles. Thus Gregory of Tours (l. ix. c. 6,) gives an example of one Desiderius, who went about in a cowl and shirt of goat's hair, and led a life of great severity, describing himself as

His origin was obscure ; and he was probably one of those whom Boniface had pointed out as gaining popular admiration by his asceticism, and using the influence which he so gained against the Catholics. He was, in fact, honoured among the people as a saint, and a worker of miracles. Nor did he fail to meet with ignorant bishops ready to afford him episcopal ordination. It appears, however, that Adelbert, with many fanatical notions, connected much which proceeded from a pure and evangelical source, and which he opposed to the dominant opinions, or dominant worship, of the church. Boniface reports of him,<sup>1</sup> that he had indulged his pride to such a degree, that he compared himself to the apostles ; and that he had not deemed these holy men, or the martyrs, worthy of having churches dedicated to their name ; but had, notwithstanding, insanely consecrated houses of prayer to his own. If, however, this pretension to a dignity, like that of the apostles, was the reason why Adelbert would erect no churches in their name, he might fairly answer, that it was just as lawful to designate them by his own name, as by theirs. There would have been no essential absurdity in such a proceeding, as Boniface, it appears, wished to prove. But it may almost be deduced, from the very words of the latter,<sup>2</sup> that he allowed himself to pervert the statements of his opponent. Adelbert, it is probable, merely

holding especial intercourse with the apostles Peter and Paul. Vast numbers of the people allowed themselves to be deceived by him ; and many sick were brought to him to be healed. In the case of those who were lame, he ordered them, with all authority, to stretch out their limbs. These experiments had sometimes good and sometimes bad success. *Ut quos virtutis divinae largitione derigere (to make their limbs straight again) non poterat, quasi per industriam (by help of human art) restauraret. Denique apprehendebant pueri ejus manus hominum. alii vero pedes, tractosque diversas in partes, ita ut nervi putarentur abrumpi, cum non sanarentur, dimittebantur exanimis.* In another place, (l. x. c. 25,) Gregory cites the example of a man, who (at first, perhaps, in a fit of insanity,) gave himself out to be Christ, and the woman whom he led about with him, for Mary. The people flocked to him, and brought their sick to be healed by his touch. He also pretended to prophecy. More than three thousand persons were baptised by him, and even some priests were among them. Gregory says, that in France many such impostors had appeared, and that, being joined by women whom they represented as saints, they found acceptance with the people.

<sup>1</sup> Boniface says, that contrary to the laws of the church, an ordination, not confined to a particular diocese, an *ordinatio absoluta*, had been conferred upon him. This was altogether in opposition to the laws of the church, but it could not be otherwise in the case of missionaries. It had been done in that of Boniface himself, and Adelbert, probably, wished to labour as a missionary, following the example of so many ignorant and fanatical men in these times, who believed that they had received a call.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxii.

said, that no church ought to be dedicated in the name of a man, and, therefore, not in that of an apostle even.<sup>1</sup> If he said this, he would plainly have contradicted himself very grossly, had he given his own name to any house of prayer. It is not likely that an enthusiast would have so violated his principles. The case may have been very different. Boniface, it is possible, exercised the art of framing conclusions, and so placed the conduct of Adelbert in a false light. This supposition is borne out by the circumstance, that Adelbert accused the people of suffering themselves to be persuaded to seek the *limina apostolorum* at Rome, instead of seeking help from God or Christ, who is everywhere present. The consequences, so injurious to morality, which followed the pilgrimages to Rome, as Boniface himself was obliged to acknowledge,<sup>2</sup> could not fail to increase the prejudice against them. But Adelbert had crosses erected in the fields, around which the people were to assemble, and little oratories, or places for prayer, in the meadows, and by the side of fountains. This may have led to the accusation of Boniface, that they were dedicated to his name; a hasty conclusion, drawn probably from the circumstance that the people called them Adelbert's oratories. Multitudes appear to have left the public churches, and the bishops, to assemble in these places, believing, as they said, that the merits of the holy Adelbert could help them. These expressions of excessive veneration, not so surprising considering the times in which Adelbert lived, may confirm what Boniface relates, supposing the rest to be true, respecting the conduct of Adelbert's followers, who carried about pieces of his hair and nails as relics. Adelbert himself may not, perhaps, have sought this honour; but he may not have done what he could to avoid it; and hence the growth of a party. When the people came to him to confess their sins, he is reported to have said, that he knew all their sins, for that all that was hidden was known to him: that they need not confess to him: their sins were forgiven; and they

1 This seems to be indicated from the words: *Dedignabatur consecrare.*

2 Boniface endeavoured, by means of a synod, and by a law passed in England by its princes, to prohibit married women and nuns from making pilgrimages to Rome, a practice which had been attended by a great corruption of manners. *Quia magna ex parte pereunt, paucis remanentibus integris. Perpaucæ enim sunt civitates in Longobardia, vel in Francia, aut in Gallia, in qua non sit adultera vel meretrix generis Anglorum.* See ep. lxxiii. to Cudberth, Archbishop of Canterbury. Ed. Würdtwein p. 201.

might depart in peace to their homes. It is possible, indeed, that Adelbert, forming a fanatical notion of himself, might actually utter expressions of this kind; but we must here again view with suspicion the statement of Boniface, so inclined to suspect the existence of heresy, and to blacken every thing where it was supposed to be found. Adelbert was, perhaps, only an opposer of church confession and absolution: as such he might say to the people that they need only confess their sins to God, and that, doing so, they might go away comforted, trusting in the remission of sins obtained through Christ. We have a fragment of a prayer composed by him.<sup>1</sup> It contains no mark of the fanatical self-exaltation of which he is accused, but proofs rather of a humble, Christian feeling. "Lord, Almighty God! Father of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ! Thou, the Alpha and Omega, who sittest above the seventh heaven, above Cherubim and Seraphim. Thou mighty love, Thou fountain of delights, upon Thee do I call, Thee do I invite to come unto me, most wretched as I am, for thou hast deigned to say, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name shall be given unto you;' therefore I ask thee for Thyself."<sup>2</sup> In another passage from this prayer, expressions occur which do not agree so well as those quoted above with a pure Christian spirit. But even the appeal to angels, the names of many of whom were not known,<sup>3</sup> might, under the influence of a fanatical mysticism, be regarded as not inconsistent with evangelical feeling. In the proceedings of the Romish Council, a supposed letter of Christ,<sup>4</sup> feigned to have fallen in Jerusalem from heaven, was brought forward, as circulated by Adelbert. The superscription of this letter was of a very adventurous character; and in the letter itself the Romish Church was recognized as that

<sup>1</sup> In the report of the Romish Council, which was held on occasion of the report transmitted to it by Boniface, ep. clxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> According to another reading: To thee I direct my prayer.

<sup>3</sup> In the Romish council these unknown angels' names were declared to be those of wicked spirits, which Adelbert called to his aid; and this was especially laid to his charge as one of his crimes.

<sup>4</sup> Many things of the same kind were circulated at this time. In one of the capitularies of the Emperor Charles, in the year 789, it is said: *Pseudographiæ et dubiæ narrationes, vel quæ omnino contra fidem Catholicam sunt, ut epistola pessima et falsissima, quam transacto anno dicebant aliqui errantes et in errorem alios mittentes, quod de celo cecidisset, nec credantur nec legantur; sed comburantur.* Mansi Concil. t. xiii. p. 174 Appendix.

in which were deposited the keys of the kingdom of heaven. From this it would appear that Adelbert, whatever traces may exist to the contrary, could not be fairly charged with a mysticism opposed to the hierarchical system. According to the further statement of Boniface, he gained great veneration for himself by the display of certain relics, to which he ascribed especial miraculous virtue, asserting that they had been brought to him from the uttermost bounds of the world, by an angel in human form.<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of remark, however, that Boniface says that he came forward with these pretexts in his younger days,<sup>2</sup> whence it might be concluded that he did not always uphold the same views and notions. Supposing this to be the case, the inconsistencies which are met with in the principles ascribed to him, ought not, perhaps, to be attributed to the existence of contradictory principles in his own mind, but rather to the confusion arising from the mixture of two different periods of his religious and mental development, the earlier and later, in the accounts given of his conduct. We may imagine that the element of mysticism, as it existed in him at the beginning, was clad in the form of a sensual fanaticism, closely connected with the religious character of the church, but that it was perpetually struggling to divest itself of this sensual form. But the vague and uncertain accounts which we possess will not allow us to speak confidently on this subject. It is plain that Adelbert must have enjoyed considerable respect, even among those who did not belong to the ignorant multitude. A memoir of him was published while he was still living, an honour not usually paid by scholars to their venerated master till after his death. In this memoir Adelbert is styled “*sanctus et beatus Dei famulus.*”<sup>3</sup> But if he had many followers, much of that which is unjustly laid to his charge may be attributed to the errors or excesses of these his scholars.

When Boniface had compelled Adelbert to cease from preach-

1 The people of these times were often deceived by such pretexts. See Gregor. Turon. l. ix. c. 6.

2 In *primaeva aetate*.

3 The introduction to this memoir is only known to us through the quotation made from it in the Acts of the Roman Council. It is here said, that the grace of God filled him from his birth, in a manner answerable to the account which we have of the birth of John the Baptist. This kind of expression was regarded as blasphemous in the Roman Council, but many things similar to it are found in other *actis sanctorum* of this age.

ing, which was probably done even before the Pope was consulted on the subject, and had committed him to prison by the authority of the mayor of the palace, his numerous followers complained that their holy apostle, their intercessor, their miracle-worker, was taken from them. The man who stood in a position to work miracles possessed far greater power among the multitude than Boniface, distinguished only by zeal, accompanied by Christian prudence and thoughtfulness; and with whom, far from wishing to appear as a worker of miracles, the element of Christian intelligence availed much more than that of a rapturous inspiration. It is a circumstance, indeed, which remarkably distinguishes Boniface from the other active missionaries of his time, that none of his scholars had any account to give of miracles wrought by his power.<sup>1</sup>

The second of those opponents of Boniface to whom we have alluded, was a man of a very different disposition, a native of Ireland, named Clemens. By means of his education in that country, he was, without doubt, superior to Boniface in evangelical freedom of mind and Christian knowledge. He was also wholly free from the fanaticism imputed to Adelbert. We discover in this man one of the first instances of the reaction of Christian consciousness, holding fast the original truth, against the hierarchical, or Old Testament-theocratical principle of the middle ages. He would allow no absolute authority, in matters of faith, to the

1 The priest of St Martin's Church at Utrecht, who composed a brief memoir of Boniface in the ninth century (given by the Bollandists under the 5th of June), thought it necessary to defend himself against the accusation, that he had described no miracles of Boniface. What he says on this point is remarkable, as an expression of the Christian's consciousness of truth in all centuries. All, he says, must be referred at last to the operation of God, which acts upon the inner being of man; making the visible miracle testify of the invisible, and, by means of the miracle, again exciting the inward susceptibility, *intus qui moderabatur, quique idololatrias et incredulos trahebat ad fidem*. The same Spirit has imparted his gifts in manifold ways. *Uni dabat fidem ut Petro; alteri facundiam prædicationis ut Paulo; and Boniface proved himself an organ of the same Spirit. Faciebat autem signa et prodigia magna in populo, utpote qui ab aegrotis mentibus morbos invisibiles propellebat*. Having further expressed himself on this subject, he adds: *Quod si ad solam corporum salutem attenditis, et eos angelis æquiparatis; qui membrorum debilitates jejuniis et orationibus integritati restituunt; magnum quidem est quod dicitis, sed hoc sanctis quodammodo et medicis commune esse crebris remediorum manifestatur eventibus. Sed et quemlibet in his talibus miraculis sublimem oportet magna seipsum circumspeditione munire; ut nec jactantia emergat, nec appetitus laudis surripiat, ne forte, quum alios coöperante sibi virtute sanaverit, ipse suo vitio vulneratus intereat.*



writings of the fathers, or to the canons of councils.<sup>1</sup> Hence it is evident that he ascribed this authority to the holy Scriptures alone, and that he recognized them as the sole fountain and rule of Christian belief. The application of this principle must naturally have led him to differ, in many remarkable instances, from the dominant doctrines of the church. Of this, however, we have no express information. Boniface lays it mainly to his charge, that, though he had two sons by an unlawful union, he yet ventured to remain in the state of a Christian bishop. There is no doubt that Boniface here allowed himself to speak of the marriage of Clemens as an adulterous connection, because, according to the views which he entertained, he could regard the marriage of a bishop in no other light. But Clemens defended it with the greatest appearance of right, and by arguments derived from Scripture. Boniface accused him still further of favouring Judaism, because he argued that it was allowable to marry the widow of a deceased brother. But the accusation, that he spoke of the Mosaic law as still binding upon Christians, could only have been justified on the supposition, that he asserted it to be the bounden duty of a Christian to marry his brother's widow, according to Deut. xxv. the deceased having left no children. Had he done this, he must then have prohibited such marriages in every other case, they being strictly forbidden by the Mosaic law, with the single exception above mentioned. He may, therefore, have merely described the then existing rules of the church as capricious in regard to the prohibition of marriages within certain degrees; and may have quoted the Mosaic law referred to only as an illustration of his meaning, that the command was not founded in a divine principle, for that, if it had been so, Moses would have allowed no exception to its application. The example of Kilian, as we have seen, teaches us how important such disputes on questions of ecclesiastical discipline might become for the missionaries. It is also worthy of remark, that, on another similar point, the Christian consciousness of Boniface himself was at variance with the principles of church authority. While he found, both in the Romish church and in that of the Franks, the dominant rule that, by the so-called spiritual relationship arising out of the connection

<sup>1</sup> Boniface expressly mentions only Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, because they were regarded with particular reverence in the Western church.

established through god-fathers and god-mothers, a hindrance to certain marriages was created, he could never be induced to own the validity of such a prohibition. It seemed to him to have no foundation, either in Scripture, or in the nature of Christianity, baptism itself establishing a spiritual relationship among all Christians.<sup>1</sup>

But, lastly, Clemens, as Boniface asserted, taught that Christ, when he descended into Hades, delivered not only believers, but unbelievers and idolaters therefrom. We can only understand this, however, as intimating that Clemens opposed the common doctrine of the "*Descensus Christi ad inferos*," according to which Christ by this descent benefitted the Jewish saints alone. Confining himself to the Holy Scriptures, he saw in this doctrine an endeavour to introduce the notion, that those who, during their earthly life, had not received the announcements of the gospel, might, after death, be brought to know Jesus, and to enjoy communion with him as their Saviour. A thoughtful missionary among the heathen must easily have been led to question the doctrine of the unconditional condemnation of these people.<sup>2</sup> Such a doctrine could not fail greatly to offend the natural, human feeling of those to whom the gospel was preached, and to create doubts of its origin. But he who was led by inquiry to shrink from adopting this opinion, would easily be induced to go farther, and to reject the doctrine of predestination, as hitherto received; and of this Boniface did actually accuse Clemens, stating that he had taught many things respecting divine predestination,<sup>3</sup> which were contrary to the catholic faith. But we have no means of certainly determining whether Clemens proceeded so far as to assert a general restoration.<sup>4</sup> All that we know is, that

1 Quia nullatenus intelligere possum, quare in uno loco spiritualis propinquitas in conjunctione carnalis copulae tam grande peccatum sit, quando omnes in sacro baptis- mate Christi et ecclesiae filii et filiae, fratres et sorores esse comprobemus. Ep. xxxix. xl. et xli.

2 We learn from Gregory, l. vii. ep. xv. that two ecclesiastics of Constantinople had come to the conviction, that Christum ad inferos descendentem omnes qui illic confiterentur eum salvasse atque a poenis debitis liberasse: Which appeared to Gregory, viewing it from the standing-place of the received doctrine of the church, as something very heretical.

3 Multa alia horribilia de praedestinatione Dei.

4 It is well worthy of remark, that Scotus Erigena, in whose writings we find similar doctrines, came from Ireland.

the peculiar tendency of his mind and doctrine was not calculated to procure for him in this rude age the popularity enjoyed by the fanatical Adelbert.<sup>1</sup>

Boniface having accused these two men to Pope Zacharias, insisted that, in order to prevent their doing farther harm, they should be committed to prison for the remainder of their lives. The Pope, in his answer to Boniface in the year 745, agreed to his memorial on the subject of their condemnation, but without directing anything respecting their personal punishment, except that they should be deprived of their spiritual office. But it deserves notice, that the just and mild Zacharias seems to have been rendered doubtful as to the equity of the proceedings against these preachers. The suspicion thus entertained was awakened by intelligence which he received from Germany; and in the year 747,<sup>2</sup> he directed that a strict inquiry should be instituted into the affair of the two deposed bishops.<sup>3</sup> “And if they should be convinced that they had erred from the right way, and manifested an inclination to return, then proceedings should be adopted in their case which appeared agreeable to the laws of the church. But if they persevered in asserting their innocency, they should be sent, with two or three of the most prudent of the clergy, to Rome, that their cause might be tried before the apostolic chair, and judgment given according to their desert.” Thus important did it seem to the Pope, to guard against the possibility of any unjust, or too severe a proceeding being instituted against these men, for whom he could even feel a personal interest; and equally strict was he in not employing the influence of his high dignity in sacrificing them to the man who had deserved so well of the papacy, and still continued to be one of its most powerful organs. Had the interest of the papacy been the most important object in the mind of the Pope, he would not have hesitated a moment to follow the advice of Boniface. The latter, however, possessed at

<sup>1</sup> The present which Boniface sent to the deacon Gemmulus, whom he charged with this business to the Pope (a silver goblet and cloth), might lead us to view him with some suspicion, did it not appear from the letters of Boniface, that it was usual, in those days, to accompany letters from a distance with presents. Thus Boniface sent a cloth for wiping the hands or feet to a pope (*villosa*) and a little gold and silver.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxxiv.

<sup>3</sup> Some one named Godalsacius is here mentioned with Adelbert; he was probably one of his associates.

that time as he was of extensive influence, seems to have discovered the means of hindering the fulfilment of the Pope's charitable wishes.

Of the fate of Clemens we have no certain information, but it is certain, from the nature of his doctrine, that he could expect no favourable result to the examination of his case at Rome. Of Adelbert we know, that he was sentenced, according to the judgment of Boniface, to perpetual imprisonment, and that having succeeded in effecting his escape, he came to a miserable end.<sup>1</sup>

Zacharias also shewed, in other respects, that he was not always ready to be guided by the judgment of Boniface, so inclined, from the slightest circumstance, to convict men of heresy. He was, on the contrary, ready to hear his opponents. Virgilius, another Irish priest in Bavaria, had fallen into a dispute with Boniface on account of some baptism, at which the Latin formula was imperfectly pronounced.<sup>2</sup> Boniface insisted that the baptism was invalid, and must be repeated. Virgilius protested against this decision. He even ventured, in conjunction with another priest, Sidonius, to appeal to the Pope. The latter decided in their favour.<sup>3</sup> The same Virgilius, who appears to have acquired considerable influence with Duke Odilo, subsequently applied for one of the bishoprics, founded by Boniface. But Boniface used his endeavours to hinder his success; and accused him of asserting the heretical opinion, that there is another world, with other men, under the earth. This was probably a mere perversion of the belief that there are antipodes. The Pope, indeed, regarded this notion as a scandal, because it might follow as a consequence, that the whole human race was not descended from Adam; that all men were not infected with original sin; that all do not need a Redeemer. In the declaration, therefore, that the information given by Boniface was according to truth, he ordered that Virgilius should be deposed from the priesthood. He also wrote an angry letter to Virgilius and Sidonius, and testified of

<sup>1</sup> The Presbyter of Maynz relates, see *Monumenta* ed. Pertz ii., p. 355, that he was imprisoned in the monastery of Fulda, and that he contrived to escape, carrying a boot filled with nuts, which were to furnish him nourishment on his way. He was attacked, however, by herdsmen, who plundered and murdered him.

<sup>2</sup> *In nomine patria et filia.*

<sup>3</sup> See Ep. lxii.

Boniface, that he believed him rather than his two opponents. But still he cited them to Rome, that the subject might be more strictly examined there, and a final decision given according to the evidence. The result shows us, that Virgilius must have been able to justify himself before the Pope, for he was made bishop of Saltzburg, and was subsequently honoured as a saint.<sup>1</sup>

Although Boniface constantly acted in dependence upon the popes, and exhibited the profoundest reverence towards them, yet he did not shrink from saying to a pope that which could scarcely be agreeable to his ears, whenever his duty required it of him. Thus he dared to object to Zacharias, that the Romish church, by demanding a fee for granting the pallium, was guilty of simony.<sup>2</sup> He also complains in a letter to the same pope, that the rude and ignorant Germans received a pernicious example at Rome. Thus he instances, that, on the first of January, various superstitions were practised in that city; that the women covered their arms and ankles with amulets; and that these amulets were offered publicly for sale. The Germans now appealed to the fact, that such things had taken place at Rome before their own eyes; and Boniface complains that the good effects of his labour were thereby greatly hindered.<sup>3</sup> He adduces the authority of the apostle Paul and of Augustine in reprobation of these practices, and he earnestly requires the Pope to suppress them.<sup>4</sup>

The re-establishment of a well-constructed system of ecclesiastical organism, of which the Pope should be the supreme controller, was, according to the plan of Boniface, the main thing needed for a reformation of the church. The bishops were to be subject

1 See the Epigram of Alcuin on Virgilius. Boniface was chiefly engaged in controversy with the educated Irish, so anxious for independence; but there was one among them, a priest named Samson, who, according to Boniface, ep. lxxxii., asserted that a person might be made a Christian without baptism, by the laying on of the hands of the bishop. That he should have said this; that a priest should have so over-estimated the importance of the laying on of the hands of the bishop, can scarcely be credited; and we must suspect that Boniface did not correctly state the meaning of his opponent.

2 Zacharias himself says, ep. lx., p. 148, of the letter containing this complaint: *Lit-teræ tuæ nimis animos nostros conturbaverunt.* He denies the whole: The officers of the papal court may, perhaps, have acted without his consent or knowledge.

3 Ep. li. *Quæ omnia eo, quod ibi a carnalibus et insipientibus videntur, nobis hic et improprium et impedimentum prædicationis et doctrinæ perficiunt.*

4 The Pope did not deny that such abuses had crept into Rome; but added, that he had suppressed them all since his accession.

to the metropolitans, as the latter to the Pope. As the bishops, when they found themselves unable to correct abuses in their dioceses, were to satisfy their consciences by laying the affair before the metropolitan, or archbishop, and render him responsible for the correction of the evil, so were the metropolitans and archbishops to conduct themselves in regard to the pontiff.<sup>1</sup> Such an organized system of superintendence over the whole church might have been especially useful in this age of barbarism, and when there was so much to oppose ecclesiastical discipline. But the constitution of metropolitans was not so well in accordance with the relations of the Frankish kingdom, as with those of the old Roman empire; and the independent spirit of the Frankish bishops was not disposed to submit itself to such a form. Boniface had, therefore, many difficulties with which to contend in this respect. When he received his commission from the Pope, to order the constitution of the Frankish church, he established three metropolitans, and to these the pallium was sent.<sup>2</sup> But he could not so easily give effect to this arrangement.<sup>3</sup> The new German church remained for a considerable time without a metropolitan. Gregory III. indeed endowed Boniface with the rank of archbishop in 732, and sent him the pallium, but without designating a metropolis.<sup>4</sup> The death of Raginfred, bishop of Cologne, in 744, induced Boniface to take measures for having that see raised to the rank of an archbishopric, and procuring it for himself.<sup>5</sup> This was

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxxiii. Addressed to the English metropolitan Cudbert, to whom he gave information respecting what he had hitherto done in the performance of his duties. *Sic omnes episcopi debent metropolitano et ipse Romano pontifici; si quid de corrigendis populis apud eos impossibile est, notum facere et sic alieni fient a sanguine animarum perditarum.*

<sup>2</sup> See ep. lix. of Pope Zacharias.

<sup>3</sup> The Pope was very surprised that Boniface afterwards asked for only one pallium; and he enquired of him, *Cur tantae rei facta sic permutatio?* Ep. lx. At the Council of Soissons, in the year 744, it fell to him to complete the nomination of two metropolitans. At a later period, he wrote an apology to the Pope, ep. lxxxvi., *De eo autem, quod jam praeterito tempore, de archiepiscopis et de palliis a Romana ecclesia petendis juxta promissa Francorum sanctitati vestrae notum feci; indulgentiam Apostolicae sedis flagito, quia, quod promiserunt, tardantes non impleverunt, et adhuc differtur et ventilatur, quid inde perficere voluerint, ignoratur, sed mea voluntate impleta esset promissio.*

<sup>4</sup> See ep. xxv.

<sup>5</sup> Boniface had, at an early period, fallen into a dispute with the Bishop of Cologne, who had endeavoured to extend his diocese to within the circle appointed to Boniface as the scene of his labours. The bishop had done nothing towards promoting Christianity

in accordance with his favourite plan. He was anxious to resume the personal management of the mission among the Frisians, which had not been so actively carried on since the death of Willibrord in 739. When that event took place, he regarded the conduct of the Frisian mission as belonging peculiarly to him in his capacity of papal legate, and as the mayor of the palace, Carloman had given him full authority for this purpose,<sup>1</sup> he ordained one of his countrymen and scholars, the priest Eoban, bishop of Utrecht. But he might easily extend his own inspection of the missionary operations in Friesland from Cologne.<sup>2</sup> The Frankish nobles were altogether contented with this arrangement, and the Pope confirmed it. A part, however, of the clergy, those especially who generally opposed Boniface, objected, as he states in his letter to the Pope, to the proposed measure.<sup>3</sup> The Pope believed that he should be able to overcome this resistance; but it was more obstinate than he supposed. Another circumstance also occurred which gave a new direction to the choice of the German metropolis.

In the army which came to assist the Thuringians in 744 against the Saxons, was Gerold, bishop of Maynz.<sup>4</sup> He fell by the hand of a Saxon; and Carloman appointed his son, Gewillieb, to be his successor in the bishopric. This young man, although perhaps unblameable in his moral character, was entirely wanting in the knowledge and qualities proper for a spiritual office, and, as

among the heathen living in his neighbourhood. Gregory II., who decided against him, describes him as the *Episcopum, qui nuncusque desidia quadam in eadem gente praedicationis verbum disseminare neglexerat, et nunc sibi partem quasi in parochiam defendit.*

<sup>1</sup> See ep. cv.

<sup>2</sup> Boniface had himself stated the reasons which recommended the establishment of a metropolis at Cologne, and which made such a design peculiarly acceptable in his own case; as the Pope says, *Ep. lxx. Civitatem pertinentem usque ad paganorum fines et in partes Germanicarum gentium, ubi antea praedicasti.* That Cologne, and not Maynz, was meant here, as the superscription of the letter would intimate, appears, as Pagi also remarks, both from the allusions, and also from what the Pope expressly says in the letter: *De civitate, quae nuper Agrippina vocabatur, nunc vero Colonia juxta petitionem Francorum per nostrae auctoritatis praeceptum nomini tuo metropolin confirmavimus.*

<sup>3</sup> *Quidam falsi sacerdotes et schismatici hoc impedire conati sunt.*

<sup>4</sup> We have to thank the presbyter of Maynz, to whose narrative we have before referred, for the circumstantial account of this affair. His statements cannot be wholly depended upon, and they are mixed up, in this case, with anachronisms, but in Maynz, where he wrote, he could gain minute information on the subject, and his narrative bears generally the character of truth.

his father seems to have been, was devoted to the sports of the field.<sup>1</sup> When the two armies afterwards came to battle, Gewillieb rushed from the ranks of the Saxons to take vengeance on the murderer of his father. According to the laws which he had succeeded in establishing, Boniface could not but insist that Gewillieb, who, though a bishop, still carried the sword, should be deposed from his office. This took place in a synod at which Boniface presided, in the year 745. There is so much the less reason to accuse Boniface of interested motives in this proceeding, as the removal of the metropolitan see to Maynz, could not but be adverse, according to what we have stated above, to his interests and designs. But it probably never entered his mind that the deposition of Gewillieb would have any consequence of this kind, engaged as he now was in establishing the metropolis at Cologne.

Gewillieb made a journey to Rome, in order to appeal to the Pope.<sup>2</sup> An inquiry was instituted into the affair; but it must have ended in the confirmation of the judgment pronounced in the German Synod. The deposition of Gewillieb, and the consequent vacancy of the bishopric of Maynz, enabled the party, who opposed the erection of Cologne into a metropolitan see, to accomplish their purpose. Maynz, it was remarked, had been already the seat of an archbishopric, and it would be proper, at such an opportunity, to restore it to its former dignity. Boniface, on communicating this decision of the Frankish states and princes to the Pope, intreated that he might be allowed, on account of his great age and bodily infirmities, to consecrate some one in his room to the office of archbishop. There was in this request of Boniface no deceit or hypocritical humility, from which his character was remarkably free. Nor have we so understood his expressions as to suppose, that he wished to spend his healthy, though advanced old age, in inactive repose. His object was rather to escape from the manifold cares involved in the duties of

<sup>1</sup> The presbyter of Maynz says of him: *Hic autem honestis moribus, ut ferunt, nisi tantum quod cum letodiis et canibus per semetipsum jocabatur.* If he be the same person as Boniface describes in his letter to the Pope, ep. lxx., *Adulterati clerici et homicidæ filius, in adulterio natus, et absque disciplina nutritus*; it must be recollected that Boniface thus spoke of him, because he viewed him in the light in which he regarded all bishops who were married or took part in war.

<sup>2</sup> He says in his letter to Boniface: *Dum advenerit, ut Domino placuerit, fiet.*



the German archbishopric, and to prevent any interruption to the labours of his office as papal legate, from which he had no intention of retiring. He only wished to avoid being confined to a definite metropolitan see; and especially one which seemed but ill-adapted to allow of his missionary wanderings. It was his earnest desire to spend freely all the strength which was left to him, in the instruction of the heathen, or newly converted people of the rude districts which he regarded as the peculiar sphere of his operations, and in which was included that of Frisia.

Boniface had already, some years before this,<sup>1</sup> besought Zacharias to allow him to proceed, in regard to the choice and ordination of a successor, in such a way as might seem to him, after seeking due counsel, most proper for existing circumstances. He appealed especially to the fact, that Gregory III. had commanded him, in the presence of Zacharias himself, at Rome, to appoint and consecrate a successor to his bishopric. Whether Boniface had actually, at that time, the intention of transferring the external government of the church to another, or of sharing it with another, that he might devote himself more freely to the work of religious teaching; or whether, considering the uncertainty of human life, and the dangers which always threatened him, on the side of the heathen, he wisely desired to provide against the confusion, which, in case of his death, would disturb the infant church, —which of these was the case may be matter of question. But it was plainly not consistent with the ancient laws of the church, that a bishop should nominate and ordain his own successor. Of this, it is probable, Boniface was ignorant. It was now, therefore, for the Pope to determine, when thus appealed to by Boniface, whether, under the extraordinary circumstances, he would depart, in some degree, from the severe rules of the church. The new and difficult relations which now existed seemed to render many such deviations necessary. But the Pope did not think so. He replied to Boniface,<sup>2</sup> that what he desired was altogether opposed to the laws of the church, and could not be allowed. But even if the Pope should grant the request, it was not in his power to fulfil it, for no one could tell which of two men was the nearer to the grave; and thus it might happen, that he who nominated a successor might himself be the survivor. It was added, however,

<sup>1</sup> See Ep. li.

<sup>2</sup> See ed. Würdtwein, p. 113.

that Boniface was at liberty to seek out a priest, whom he might employ as his especial support in the duties of his office, and who, performing well the charge thus committed to him, might render himself worthy of a higher degree. Boniface was exhorted always to pray, that God might grant him a right-minded successor; and it was said, that if the priest whom he selected remained with him to the end of his days, he might, on the approach of death, if it still seemed good to him, openly nominate him as his successor, and the priest so nominated might afterwards come to Rome to receive ordination. This was to be allowed to no other.

The Pope proceeded even a step farther than this, when, Boniface having petitioned him a second time to be allowed to resign his archbishopric, he was anxious to cheer him in the many and various struggles which, old as he was, he had still to encounter. Thus he wrote to him,<sup>1</sup> saying, that he must, on no account, resign the see of Maynz, since that by enduring unto the end, the word of the Lord would be fulfilled in him, namely, that he who continues unto the end shall be saved. Matt. xxiv. 13. But if the Lord should grant him a man altogether adapted to the office; one who would care for the salvation of souls, he might consecrate him bishop, as his vicar in the diocese, and place him, in the service of the church, above all his other assistants.

Having obtained this permission from the Pope, Boniface resolved<sup>2</sup> to prepare a retreat for himself in his favourite monastery of Fulda. There he hoped to regain some degree of strength for his weary frame, bowed down as it was by long years of labour and old age. When he acquainted the Pope with his intention, he informed him, at the same time, that he had no idea of withdrawing from the duties of his calling; but that, as Zacharias had exhorted him, he would persevere unto the end, and would employ the best efforts of his remaining strength to proclaim from the monastery of Fulda the gospel to the surrounding neighbourhood. "As the four people to whom, by the grace of God, we have made known the word of Christ, dwell in the circuit of this place, so, as long as I live, will I endeavour to be useful to them; for

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxxxii.

<sup>2</sup> As he stated to the Pope some years later, in the letter in which he prayed him to confirm what he had done in founding the monastery at Fulda. Ep. lxxxvi.

I desire to continue in the service of the Romish Church among the German people, and to obey your command."<sup>1</sup>

Closely connected with the last public proceedings of Boniface in Germany, was the part which he took in a political revolution, which was not without its importance in relation to the firm establishment of the new ecclesiastical institutions. Pepin, the mayor of the palace, after having long exercised the royal power, at length assumed the titles of sovereignty, and robbed the last descendant of the old legitimate dynasty, Childeric III., who was only king in name, even of that badge of royalty. That he could regard this illegal transaction as sanctified in the sight of his conscience, and of his people, by the authority of the Pope, was no doubt a consequence of the influence practised by Boniface on men's religious feeling; a result of the new point of view, by which the people were led to regard the church as a theocratic institution, and the Pope as a theocratic chief. To Boniface himself it must have appeared important for the interest of his particular circle, that Pepin, by assuming the titles of royalty, increased his authority, and was the better able to oppose a counterbalancing influence to the several dukes, whose arbitrary power continually threatened destruction both to civil and ecclesiastical order.<sup>2</sup> By means of the dignity thus invested in Pepin, and by the relations of the church to society, and of the Pope to the church, a course of action might be instituted which the decisions of the Pope, as the highest organ of Christ in the conduct of believers, would render legitimate, and which, at the same time, might prove equally beneficial to the well-being of both church and state. From the strict union between Boniface and the Pope, and from the position occupied by the former as mediator between the pontiff and the Frankish church, it may be concluded, that the discussion of this weighty subject was not carried on without occasional colli-

<sup>1</sup> *In quo loco proposui aliquantulum vel paucis diebus fessum senectute corpus requiescendo recuperare, et post mortem jacere. Quatuor enim populi, quibus verbum Christi per gratiam Dei diximus, in circuitu loci hujus habitare dinoscuntur. Quibus cum vestra intercessione, quandiu vivo vel sapio, utilis esse possum. Cupio enim vestris orationibus, comitante gratia Dei in familiaritate Romanæ ecclesiæ et vestro servitio inter Germanicas gentes, ad quas missus fui, perseverare et præcepto vestro obedire.*

<sup>2</sup> As Willibald, in the *Life of Boniface*, shows (§ 23) that the revival of heathenism in Thuringia was greatly promoted by the tyranny of the dukes.

sions. We have no certain information in this respect ; but that which the presbyter Lull, who was sent, at this time, as messenger from Boniface to the Pope, was to communicate by word of mouth to the latter,<sup>1</sup> had some relation to the business. It was certainly Boniface who, in the year 752, by the Pope's commission, anointed Pepin at Soissons. But, wide as was the sphere of labour in which Boniface was engaged, it did not make him forget his native land. Although his duty constrained him to deny himself the gratification of the wish which he entertained to return to England, he ever took an especial interest in its affairs.<sup>2</sup> He kept up a constant correspondence with the bishops, nuns, and princes of that country ; and as it gave him particular delight, according to his own words,<sup>3</sup> to hear of its prosperity, so was he proportionally troubled at the contrary. Thus it greatly afflicted him to learn that one of the princes of his country, the king of Mercia, was leading an unholy life, squandering the goods of the church, and demoralizing the people by his example. He considered himself bound, by the commission which he had received from the Pope, to pass the narrow bounds prescribed to his personal labours, and to assail the unchristian spirit which he thus learnt was prevailing among his countrymen.<sup>4</sup> Constrained, therefore, by a sense of duty, he caused a very impressive admonitory letter, written in the name of a little synod, to be addressed to the king.<sup>5</sup> In this epistle he described to him the disgrace incurred by the English people, and the fearful punishment to which they were exposed, by the corruption of chastity in the heathen mother-land of the Anglo-Saxons. They thereby violated the law of God written in their hearts ; and the synod warned the king of the divine vengeance impending over a reprobate people. In

1 See ep. lxxxvi. respecting Lull. *Habet secreta quædam mea, quæ soli pietati vestræ profiteri debet.*

2 In his letter to a priest of his native country, to whom he sent the admonitory epistle to the King of Mercia, for him to deliver, he says : *Haec verba admonitionis nostræ ad illum regem propter nihil aliud direximus, nisi propter puram caritatis amicitiam et quod de eadem gente Anglorum nati et enutriti hic peregrinamur.* Ep. lxxi.

3 Thus in the above-cited letter : *Bonis et laudibus gentis nostræ lætamur ; peccatis et vituperationibus contristamur.*

4 See ep. liv. As the, *Præceptum Romani pontificis, si alicubi viderem inter Christianos pergens populos erroneos vel ecclesiasticas regulas depravatas vel homines a Catholica fide abductos, ad viam salutis invitare et revocare totis viribus niterer.*

5 Ep. lxxii.

order, however, to render him more inclined to accept this reproof, Boniface addressed him in a shorter epistle, accompanied with a present, consisting of a goshawk, two falcons, two shields, and two lances.<sup>1</sup> He at the same time exhorted the primate of the English church, Cudberth, archbishop of Canterbury,<sup>2</sup> to take measures for its reform. With this exhortation, he sent a copy of the rules established for the government of the Frankish and German churches; and it is probable that, through the influence which Boniface thus exercised in England, the reforming Synod was held in the year 747, at Cloveshove (Cliff), under the presidency of the same archbishop.

Boniface, according to the permission granted him by the Pope, had nominated as his successor, and ordained as bishop, his countryman Lull, who had been for twenty years his scholar, and his support in his various labours. All that was now needed was the recognition of this appointment by royal authority, which being granted, Lull was admitted to the exercise of all the rights connected with his office. Impressed with the feeling that the infirmities of old age indicated the speedy approach of death,<sup>3</sup> Boniface busied himself in arranging the affairs of his religious institutions, the speedy dissolution or perversion of which he had so much reason to fear, unless he appointed them a firm head, such a one as he knew they would have in the person of Lull. The letter in which he requested Fulrad, chaplain at the Frankish court, to represent this matter to King Pepin, expresses in a striking manner the fatherly anxiety which Boniface felt for those whom God had entrusted to his pastoral care. "Almost all my scholars," he writes, "are strangers; some being priests, appointed to various places in the service of the church and people; and some monks, who are divided among the various monasteries, where they are employed in teaching children to read; and many of them are now aged, having lived with me a long time, sharing and supporting me in my labours. I am anxious for all these, lest that, after my death, they should be dispersed abroad; and I would fain,

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lv.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. xc. to the Frankish court-chaplain Fulrad: Quod mihi et amicis meis similiter videtur, ut vitam istam temporalem et cursum dierum meorum per istas infirmitates cito debeam finire.

therefore, entreat your protection for them that they may not be scattered as sheep having no shepherd, and that the people on the borders of the heathen may not lose the law of Christ. Thus I earnestly beseech you, in the name of God, to let my son and fellow bishop Lull be appointed to this office, as minister and teacher of priests and people. And I hope, if God so will, that in him the priests may find a leader, the monks an instructor in their rules, and the Christian people a true preacher and shepherd. I especially entreat this, because my priests lead but a wretched life on the borders of the heathen. Bread to eat they can earn for themselves; but clothes they cannot find there, unless they have advice and assistance afforded them from without, as I have supported them, that they might be able to continue in those places for the service of the people.”

When Boniface had accomplished what he wished in these respects, and had rendered the safety of the German church independent of his personal support, he resolved, contrary to his original intention, not to end his days in the monastery of Fulda, but to consecrate them to the work on which he had first employed his missionary labours. It was no doubt in order to be able to give his personal superintendence to the mission in Friesland, that he had wished to make Cologne the seat of his archbishopric. But a dispute now arose between him and Hildegard, the newly-appointed bishop of Cologne, who urged certain obsolete pretensions, by which he sought to render the diocese of Utrecht dependent on his authority. But he had taken no part in the efforts made to establish the gospel in that district; and Boniface opposed his claims with the remark, that the bishops of Cologne who had not troubled themselves with the mission in Friesland, had also never pretended that it should be submitted to their rule: that the church at Utrecht had been constituted by Pope Sergius, as a metropolitan see, subject only to the Pope, and established especially to promote the conversion of the heathen.<sup>1</sup> From all this it followed, that that church was now under his sole control as legate of the Pope, who had given him the oversight of all the churches instituted among the heathen tribes.

It is much more reasonable to refer this controversy between

<sup>1</sup> See ep. cl. to Pope Stephen II.

Boniface and the Bishop of Cologne, to the desire of the former to place himself again at the head of the mission in Friesland, than perversely to ascribe the plan of his journey into that country to motives of ambition, or to his mere desire to exercise his legantine powers there against the Bishop of Cologne. How could he have been induced, aged as he was, to seek for the short remainder of his life, through toil and perils, the enjoyment of an honour, which he could so easily, and without danger, have secured to himself by means of the Pope and the Frankish king ?<sup>1</sup>

Boniface set out on his journey to Friesland at the beginning of the year 755, and with the consciousness that he should not return. With this feeling he took leave of his scholar Lull ; enjoined him to uphold and continue the work which he had begun, and especially to complete the building of the church at Fulda, in which he desired his remains to be deposited. He packed up in the book-chest, which he always carried with him in his journeys,<sup>2</sup> that he might have spiritual books out of which to read or sing by the way, a shroud in which his body was to be placed, and sent to the monastery at Fulda. With a little company of followers, some priests and some monks, and others servants, he proceeded along the banks of the Rhine, and landed on the shore of the Zuydersee, being joined, in Friesland, by his scholar, Bishop Eoban. They traversed the district ; and in many cases, found a favourable reception, baptizing thousands of converts, and building new churches. Boniface sent many of those whom he had instructed and baptized back to their homes, with the injunction, that they should meet him again on a certain day, to receive confirmation. In the meantime he pitched his tents, and encamped with his companions on the banks of the river Burda, not far from Dockingen.<sup>3</sup> It was on the fifth of June, in the year 755, that he expected the return of his spiritual children. Early in the morning he heard the distant sound of the approaching multitudes.

<sup>1</sup> It is singular that the Bishop of Cologne should have entered upon this dispute, in opposition to the papal arrangements for the founding of the metropolis at Mainz (see Würdtwein ep. lxxxiii.) by means of which both Utrecht and Cologne were subject to it ; and that Boniface, in his address to Pope Stephen II., did not appeal to the authority of his predecessor in this case. We should conclude therefrom, supposing the text to be correct, that the document in this form had, from the beginning, no legal force.

<sup>2</sup> The priest of Utrecht says of him, § 18, Quocunque ibat, semper libros secum gestabat. Iter agendo vero vel scripturas lectitabat, vel psalmos hymnosve canebat.

<sup>3</sup> Dockum : between Franeker and Gröningen.

Full of joy, he hastened to the door of his tent. But he soon found that he was grievously deceived. The clang of weapons indicated that the crowd was rushing on with a far other than friendly disposition. Many of the heathens, in fact, enraged at the success of Boniface in turning their countrymen from the worship of idols, conspired to consecrate this day, on which so many were to be received into the bosom of the Christian church, as a day of vengeance to their gods. The lay-attendants on Boniface wished to defend him with their weapons; but he forbade them. Bearing relics in his hand, he quietly awaited what might happen. In this attitude he exhorted his companions not to fear those who could hurt the body only, and were unable to harm the soul, but rather to think upon the unerring promises of their Lord, and to trust in him who would soon enrich their souls with the reward of eternal glory. Thus he died a martyr's death<sup>1</sup> in the seventy-fifth year of his age; and with him fell many of his followers, among whom was Bishop Eoban.

Boniface left behind him numerous scholars, who were ready to work in his spirit. Of these some were bishops, and some priests and abbots, but all were anxious to labour for the instruction of the young, or in the improvement of the country. The most conspicuous among them was the abbot Gregory, who was so devoted to the work in Friesland. A remarkable example of the power with which Boniface wrought on the mind of youth, appears from the manner in which Gregory, while young, was led to attach himself to his party.

Boniface, in the course of his second journey from Friesland to Thuringia and Hesse, arrived in the district of Treves. In the monastery near that city he found the abbess Addula, a lady of noble descent, but who had left the world to spend the remainder of her days within the walls of a cloister. She gave Boniface a hospitable reception. During the repast, Addula's grandson, named Gregory, a lad fourteen years of age, who had just returned from school, was directed to read a portion of Scripture before the

<sup>1</sup> The presbyter of Utrecht relates, that in the district where this happened, an old woman was still living, who states, as an eye-witness, that Boniface, when he saw that he was mortally wounded, took a book of the gospels, and made it a pillow for his head.

<sup>2</sup> According to the account given by the ecclesiastic of Münster, the number of those who fell was fifty-two.



company. Boniface applauded his good reading ; but asked him to explain, in German, the meaning of what he had read. The youth confessed his inability to do this ; and Boniface proceeded to translate and expound the words of the passage, upon which he afterwards delivered a discourse which sank deeply into Gregory's mind. So powerfully, indeed, did the lad feel himself drawn towards Boniface, that he declared his resolution to attach himself to his company, and never to leave him again, that he might learn from his lips to understand the Holy Scriptures. But his grandmother, to whom Boniface was at that time altogether unknown, did all in her power to dissuade him from his resolution. It was in vain. He told her, that if she refused to give him a horse, he would follow Boniface on foot, whithersoever he might go. She at length acceded to his wishes ; and gave him both horses and servants for the journey.<sup>1</sup> Gregory accordingly accompanied Boniface in all his toils and wanderings, and was with him in his last expedition to Friesland.<sup>2</sup>

Bishop Eoban, as has been stated, shared the martyrdom of his master. Thus the see of Utrecht was left vacant ; and Gregory took upon himself the entire management of the mission in Friesland, an office in which he was confirmed both by the Pope, Stephen II., and King Pepin. He did not assume indeed the rank of bishop, but remained a priest. This may be ascribed either to his humility, which prevented him from seeking a higher dignity, or to the circumstance that the duties of the episcopal office could not be properly combined with that to which he felt himself more particularly called ; or it might be, that there were peculiar reasons at the time for not re-establishing the vacant see. But when the abbot of a monastery at Utrecht, to whom various youths of English, Frankish, Bavarian, Swedish, Frisian and Saxon descent, had been entrusted for their education, found himself burdened with labour, Gregory undertook the in-

<sup>1</sup> Liudger, the scholar and biographer of Gregory, who no doubt had received this account from his own lips, says thereon : *Idem Spiritus videtur mihi in hoc tunc operari puero, qui apostolos Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei ad illud inflamavit, ut ad unam vocem Domini relictis retibus et patre sequerentur Redemptorem. Hoc fecit artifex summus, unus atque idem Spiritus Dei, qui omnia operatur in omnibus, dividens singulis prout vult.*

<sup>2</sup> If Boniface had not already, perhaps, assigned to Gregory, who was a native of the neighbouring district, his sphere of labour among the Frisians, who remained to the last the objects of his particular care.

struction of both Christians and heathens, and established a missionary school, from which missionaries were afterwards sent to all parts of the country. To supply the want of a bishop he despatched Alubert, an English ecclesiastic who had attached himself to his party, to obtain episcopal ordination in England. He lived to above seventy years of age, and laboured as a faithful teacher to the end. Three years before his death, which occurred in the year 781, he was afflicted with a stroke of paralysis on the right side. But he did not cease to labour for the instruction and spiritual edification of his people, till his sickness increased to such a degree that he was obliged to be carried by his scholars to the place where his presence might be required. In his last days, they still continued to assemble around his sick-bed, to listen to his admonitions, and receive comfort from the assurance of his faith. "He will not die to-day," they once said to each other; but he turned himself round to them, and making a last effort, replied, "Yes! to-day I shall have leave to depart." He expired, after praying and receiving the sacrament, with his eyes still directed to the altar.

The abbot Sturm<sup>1</sup> was another of the scholars of Boniface, to whom the German church and the cause of education were most deeply indebted. He was descended from a noble and Christian family in Bavaria. When Boniface was engaged in organizing the church in that country, Sturm was intrusted to him by his parents; and he was intreated to watch over him and prepare him for the ministry. He committed him to the monastery of Fritsler, one of his earliest institutions, and at the head of which he had placed the companion of his missionary labours, the abbot Wigbert. Him he charged with Sturm's education. When this was completed, Sturm having received priest's orders, supported Boniface as a fellow-labourer in his missionary work. Three years being thus passed under the guidance of his master, he was seized with the desire of following the example of those who had retired into the wilderness, there to habituate themselves in a conflict with untamed nature, and by constant self-denial, to the severest form of monastic life. Boniface consented to the wish of his scholar. He hoped to be able to render him useful in changing the vast extent of wild country, then known under the name

1 Sturm or Stirme.

of the Beech-Wood (Buchonia), and which formed a great part of Hesse, into a cultivated district. He granted Sturm two companions in his wanderings, and sent them with a blessing to seek their dwelling in the wilderness. When they had traversed the wood three days, travelling on asses, they came at length to a spot, Heroldesfeld (Hersfeld), which seemed peculiarly adapted for cultivation. Having built themselves huts, they spent some time there in devotion; and thus the foundation was laid in 736 of the monastery of Hersfeld. Sturm now returned to his beloved master, in order to inform him exactly, cautious and thoughtful as he was in all things, of the situation of the place; of the capabilities of the soil, and of the water-courses. Boniface was well contented with all, except that the spot seemed too exposed to the incursions of the Saxons. They long sought in vain for such a retreat as Boniface desired. He encouraged them anew; exhorted them to patience, and, full of confidence himself, told them that God would not fail to make known to his servants a place prepared for them in the wilderness. Sturm continued to wander for several days altogether alone through the wood, which he traversed in every direction. As he went along, he strengthened his faith, and comforted himself by singing psalms, and, full as the forest was of wild beasts, he felt no fear. Resting only at night, he then made a fence of hewn wood about himself and the ass on which he travelled, as a protection against the savage animals, and when he had done this, and commended himself to the Lord, making the sign of the cross upon his forehead, he lay down happy to sleep.

At last he discovered a spot for a settlement, to which Boniface could find no objection; and here, in the year 744, was laid the foundation of the monastery of Fulda. This was, of all others, the favourite institution of Boniface. Through his influence great privileges were obtained for it from Rome. It was made independent of the spiritual power of the bishop, and was subject only to the Pope;<sup>1</sup> and Boniface increased still further the reverence with which it was regarded, by desiring that his remains should

<sup>1</sup> This exemption, however, tended to promote the disunion between the successor of Boniface, the archbishop Lull, and the abbot Sturm; and the influence of the former, occasioned, among many other consequences, the long disgrace of Sturm with king Pepin, and his banishment.

be deposited within its walls. Soon after its foundation, he directed the abbot Sturm to make a journey into Italy, that he might there inspect the several monastic houses, especially that of the Benedictines, on Mount Cassino, and having become master of their rules, might employ them in the management of his own monastery at Fulda. After his return, Sturm conducted for a long series of years the labours of four thousand monks, through whose severe exertions the wilderness was gradually rendered fertile. His efforts were subsequently interrupted by the incursions of the Saxons. Their furious threats compelled him, in his extreme old age, to seek safety by flight. When he returned from one of these compulsory journeys, which he had begun in a state of sickness, to the restored security of his monastery,<sup>1</sup> he felt that death was near at hand. He accordingly directed all the bells to be tolled, that the whole convent might be assembled to hear the announcement of his approaching end, and join for him in prayer. A part of the monks being gathered round his bed, he begged them to pardon him, if, through the influence of sin, which cleaves to all, he had been guilty of any injustice towards them ; adding, that he, on his part, heartily forgave whatever offences he had received, and especially those which had been heaped upon him by his constant opponent Archbishop Lull. On the day of his death, one of his monks said to him, that as he was now assuredly going to the Lord, he hoped he would think of his scholars, and pray for them in heaven. Looking at the monk, he said, " Let your conversation be such, that, comforted thereby, I may be able to pray for you. Then I will do what you desire."<sup>2</sup> Thus the foundation was here laid for a nursery of Christian culture, which, in the course of time, proved of important service to the Church in Germany.

The longest and fiercest opposition which Christianity encountered in that country, was that excited against it in the northern provinces by the powerful Saxons. This was partly occasioned by the means employed in planting the church. It required the exercise of especial wisdom to establish Christianity among a

<sup>1</sup> The emperor had sent him his own private physician Wintar ; but the medicine which he gave him rather increased than lessened his malady.

<sup>2</sup> See his biography by his scholar and successor, the abbot Eigel, republished in Pertz. Monumentis t. ii.

people of such a warlike character, and whose old idolatry was so closely blended with all their feelings and institutions. But instead of this, everything was done which tended to excite their prejudices against the new religion. With Christianity the whole hierarchical system was at the same time to be introduced, and from this the free spirit of the Saxons naturally revolted. The payment of tithes, strenuously insisted upon, seemed to them as a badge of shameful servitude, and contributed greatly to render the religion which had such an accompaniment still more odious in their eyes. To this may be added, that the Christian Church and the Frankish government always appeared to them in strict alliance, and thus their zeal for their ancient freedom and independence led them to regard Christianity as a means employed to make them subject to the Franks. The armies of the emperor Charles were attended by priests and monks, who baptized the conquered, and those who, trembling at the power of the invader, were inclined to purchase peace for the moment by adopting the Christian faith, and allowing churches and monasteries to be erected on their lands.<sup>1</sup> It was natural that the doctrines of Christianity, coming to them in such a guise, should not easily win their confidence. Vast multitudes allowed themselves to be baptized only in pretence, and while they yielded in appearance to the authority of the church, resolved, on the first favourable opportunity, to cast off the cloak which they had been thus forced to assume. This they did when they again took arms against the Frankish kingdom.

The monastery of Fulda, whose abbot, Sturm, had laboured with devoted diligence in planting Christianity among the conquered Saxons, was thus rendered a particular mark for their vengeance.<sup>2</sup> The pious and single-minded abbot Alcuin, saw most clearly how the founding of the Christian church had been mainly

<sup>1</sup> See the *Life of Sturm*, l. c. c. 22, where it is said, in reference to the warlike proceedings of the emperor in the years 772 and 776: *Partim bellis, partim suasuribus, partim etiam muneribus maxima ex parte gentem illam ad fidem Christi convertit*; and the abbot Alcuin writes in the year 790 to a Scottish abbot, ep. iii., *Antiqui Saxones et omnes Frisonum populi instante rege Carolo alios præmiis et alios minis sollicitante ad fidem Christi conversi sunt.*

<sup>2</sup> When the Saxons in the year 778 had begun a new war, Sturm was obliged to flee, for he heard that they were hastening full of wrath to the monastery, which they had determined to burn with everything in it, and, at the same time, to murder all the monks.

hindered in this case. He gave admirable advice in regard to the mission, both to the emperor himself, and to the bishops and courtiers, but it was little regarded. Thus he wrote to the chamberlain and treasurer, Magenfrid,<sup>1</sup> and while he appealed to the words of Christ (Matt. xxviii. 19), remarked that "three things must be combined in missionary undertakings, namely, the statement of doctrine, the administration of baptism, and an exposition of the commandments of the Lord. Without the union of these three particulars, the hearers could not be brought to a state of salvation. Faith moreover must be voluntary. There must be nothing compulsory in it. Men may be led, they cannot be forced to believe. A person may be compelled to submit to baptism, but this can be of no use in the work of faith.<sup>2</sup> Those of mature years were to answer for themselves, and to state what they believed or desired; if they gave but a hypocritical account of their faith it might be concluded that they had no real wish for salvation. Preachers among the heathen, therefore, must instruct the people kindly and prudently.<sup>3</sup> The Lord knows his own, and will open their hearts, according to his good pleasure, that they may be able to understand the truth.<sup>4</sup> But after a profession of faith and baptism, respect must be had to the necessities of weak minds, in the exposition of the divine commandments. Too much must not be demanded of them at first; but according to the precept of the apostle Paul, they must be fed for a time with milk, and not with strong meat.<sup>5</sup> Thus the apostles (Acts xv.) did not im-

1 Ep. xxxvii.

2 *Attrahi poterit homo ad fidem, non cogi. Cogi poteris ad baptismum, sed non proficit fidei.*

3 *Unde et prae dicatores paganorum populum pacificis verbis et prudentibus fidem docere debent.*

4 The Augustine doctrine, however, had the prejudicial consequence, that when such a work failed, people looked for the reason of this failure not to the want of sound instruction, or the use of improper means, but to the absence of all powerful grace, and predestination. Thus Alcuin himself, in the 28th epistle to the emperor, perhaps, indeed, to avoid throwing all the blame upon the monarch, says: *Ecce quanta devotione et benignitate pro dilatione nominis Christi duritiam infelicis populi Saxonum per verae salutis consilium emollire laborasti. Sed quia electio necdum in illis divina fuisse videtur, remanent hucusque multi ex illis cum diabolo damnandi in sordibus consuetudinis pessimae.*

5 Alcuin here by no means intended to say that an illusive morality might be preached at first, to avoid offending the weak. He alluded to the positive church ordinance; to the demands made upon the people in relation to imposts and the payment of tithes.

pose the burden of the law on the newly-converted heathen. And further, Paul boasted that he lived by the labour of his own hands (Acts xx. 34, 2 Thess. iii. 8, 1 Cor. ix. 15, 18.) The great and especially chosen preacher to the heathen, acted thus in order to take away all excuses for avarice from ministers; that no one should preach the Word of God from a desire of gain, but as strengthened by love of Christ, even as the Lord himself commanded his disciples, "Freely ye have received; freely give." "If then," he continues, "it be proposed to make known to the stiff-necked people of Saxony the easy yoke and light burden of Christ, let care be taken not to compel them to the payment of tithes, or to suffer punishment for every little transgression; if this be done, they may not, perhaps, have such a horror of baptism. Would that, moreover, the teachers of the faith would conform themselves better to the example of the Apostles;<sup>1</sup> would that they would confide more in the loving care of Him who says, 'Take neither scrip nor purse,' and of whom the prophet says, 'Who hope on Him He saveth.'<sup>2</sup> "This have I written to you," he says, after giving the above advice, "that your admonitions may be of advantage to those who seek your counsel."<sup>3</sup>

Alcuin speaks with remarkable candour and severity against the laws issued by the emperor, and that in a letter addressed to the monarch himself.<sup>4</sup> He exhorted him, by all means, to conclude a peace with that terrible people, the Saxons. "It would be right to cease a while from uttering threats, that they might not be altogether hardened in their hostile feeling against the Frankish kingdom and the Christian church, and so be made afraid of entering into any kind of treaty;<sup>5</sup> on the contrary, they were to be led on by hope till they could be induced, by wholesome counsel, to cultivate peace." As the insurrections of the embittered Saxons were followed, as a natural consequence, by their irrup-

<sup>1</sup> Sint praedicatores, non praedatores.

<sup>2</sup> History of Susanna, as ascribed to Daniel.

<sup>3</sup> In his letter to Arno, Archbishop of Saltzburg (ep. lxxii.) Alcuin says, *Decimae, ut dicitur, Saxonum subverterunt fidem. Quid injungendum est jugum cervicibus idiotarum, quod neque nos neque fratres nostri ferre potuerunt? Igitur in fide Christi salvari animas credentium confidimus.*

<sup>4</sup> Ep. lxxx. As to the meaning of which I agree rather with Frobein than Pagi, but not altogether even with the former.

<sup>5</sup> Ne obdurati fugiant.

tion into the neighbouring provinces, now belonging to the Franks, and to the restoration of heathenism in those districts, Alcuin therefore warns the emperor not to allow his anxiety to win a little additional territory for the Christian church, to induce him to take a course whereby he would expose a larger portion of that church, in lands where it was already established, to imminent peril.<sup>1</sup> He greatly disapproved of the ordinance for the removal of many of the Saxons into the Frankish territory. These exiles would have been better Christians themselves, and might have assisted as a Christian element, in the conversion of their countrymen, now altogether consigned to heathenism, had they been left in their own land.<sup>2</sup>

It was not till after a succession of wars, continued through thirty years, that the emperor Charles gained a final victory over the Saxons, whose attacks had been perpetually renewed against the Christian church as well as against the dominions of the Franks. By the peace concluded at Selz in the year 804, the authority of both powers was recognized by the Saxons; and all other kinds of tribute were remitted them, on their promising to pay the ecclesiastical tithes.

As the Christian church was thus established by force, so also were individuals compelled to join it by violence. Those who refused to be baptized, or who were detected in secretly endeavouring to restore idolatry, were threatened with death. It was natural, however, that many of those who suffered themselves to be baptized, should submit only in appearance, and that they should despise the laws of the Christian church, as far as they could do so without danger, and still continue in secret the observance of their heathen rites. The severest laws were published against such offenders. To burn churches, to neglect the fasts, or to eat meat at those times, if out of contempt to Christianity, were capital crimes. The punishment of death was also denounced against him who should burn a dead body according to the cus-

<sup>1</sup> Turendum est, quod habetur, ne propter acquisitionem minoris, quod majus est, amittatur. Serretur ovile proprium, ne lupus rapax (the Saxons) devastet illud. Ita in alienis (among the heathen Saxons) sudetur, ut in propriis (the corporations already established both in the Frankish kingdom, and in the Christian church) damnum non patiatur.

<sup>2</sup> Qui foras recesserunt, optimi fuerunt Christiani, sicut in plurimis notum est, et qui remanserunt in patria in faecibus malitiae permanserunt.



tom of the heathen ; and against those guilty of offering human sacrifices. Fines only were imposed for the practice of other heathen observances.<sup>1</sup> In this manner, the introduction of many heathen usages into Christianity was promoted, and hence the birth of superstitions, which may be readily traced to the blending of the two systems. Of far greater worth than anything which could have been effected by laws like those alluded to, for the existing generation, was that which was done for the following age, in the provision made for Christian culture by the founding of churches and schools. In aid of this work, many men appeared whose energies were not confined to the mere suppression of idolatry and heathen usages, or even to the erection of churches, and providing for the necessities of outward worship ; but who also proved themselves able and zealous teachers of the faith. Of these, some came from the school of the abbot Gregory at Utrecht ; and others had come from England, induced by what they had heard of the great field of labour, and of the want of labourers among the Saxons. To all these, the Emperor Charles appointed a proper sphere of exertion.

One of the most distinguished of the body here spoken of was Liudger, a follower of the pious Wursing, who had so actively supported Archbishop Willibrord. Descended from a zealous Christian family, he had early received in his heart the seeds of piety, which were more and more developed under the influence of the abbot Gregory, in whose school he was educated. Indulging his passion for learning, which had distinguished him from childhood, Gregory subsequently sent him to England, that he might accumulate knowledge in the school of the great Alcuin at York. Well instructed, and supplied with books, he returned to his native country. After the death of Gregory, he gave his aid to Aldrich, Gregory's successor, who was consecrated bishop in Cologne, and with whom, as a presbyter, he laboured more particularly in what was still to be done, for the conversion of the heathen Frisians. The district in which Boniface met the death of a martyr, was that which formed the chosen scene of his labours as a teacher of Christianity. But his seven years' toil in this province was interrupted by the rising of the Saxon leader

<sup>1</sup> See the Capitulary for the Saxons in the year 789. Mansi Concil. t. xiii. Appendix fol. 181.

Wittekind, against the Frankish government in the year 782. The arms of the heathen Saxons prevailed: heathenism again won the victory. Churches were consumed by the flames; the clergy were driven into exile, and the idol-temples again rose from their ruins. Liudger took his departure for Rome, and for the abbey of Monte Cassino, in order to study within its cloisters the old monastic rule. On his return, after an absence of two years and a half, he found that Wittekind had yielded, and allowed himself to be baptised in the year 785 at Attigny; that his native land was thus restored to peace, and that the Emperor Charles had assigned him a sphere of labour around Gröningen and Norden. To him also it pertained to overthrow heathenism, and found the Christian church in the island of Heligoland (Fosite's land), where Willibrord had made, in former times, the vain attempt to accomplish that object. He baptized the son of the prince, named Landrich; gave him spiritual instruction, and consecrated him presbyter. This young man laboured for many years as a teacher of the Frisians. He also founded a monastery at Werden, then lying between the boundaries of Friesland and Saxony, and situated on a portion of land belonging to his family.

When the Saxons had been wholly subdued, the emperor despatched Liudger to the province of Münster; and a place called Mimigerneford was appointed the scene of his labour. Here a bishoprick was afterwards founded, which received the appellation of Münster from the canonical institution, or monastery, which he had erected in this neighbourhood. He travelled about the district with unwearied zeal, endeavouring to instruct the barbarous Saxons, building churches, and appointing priests to minister in them who had been educated under his own inspection. After having long exercised the office of a bishop without receiving the name, he was constrained by Hildebold, archbishop of Cologne, to allow himself to be consecrated. His zeal, however, for Christianity urged him to make a journey to the wild Normans, at that time a terror to Christians, and still more in after times; but the Emperor Charles would by no means suffer him to undertake the mission.

It could not be doubted that such a man would endeavour to make a powerful impression by his addresses on the minds of his hearers. To incite him to this, he had the examples and advice

of the men who regarded teaching as their peculiar office, a Gregory and an Alcuin, who had devoted themselves to this duty. In the sickness which attacked him, not long before his death, in the year 809, he overcame his bodily weakness, in order to avoid any interruption to his course of spiritual instructions. On the Sunday preceding the night of his death,<sup>1</sup> he preached twice, in two different parts of his diocese; that is, in the morning in the church at Kösfield, and in the afternoon, at three, in the church at Billerbeck, where he exerted the last remains of his strength to celebrate mass.<sup>2</sup>

Another of the men of whom we are here speaking was Willebad, a native of Northumberland. He also laboured, and with happy success, in the district of Dockum, where Boniface had shed his blood as a martyr. Many people were baptized by him; and many entrusted their children to him for education. But when he entered the district of Gröningen, throughout which idolatry still prevailed, his discourses so excited the wrath of the heathens, that they proposed to murder him. According, however, to the advice of the more moderate among them, it was resolved, in the first instance, to cast lots, and to seek the judgment of the gods respecting him. The supposed decision of the gods being in favour of preserving his life, he was sent away unharmed.

Willebad next directed his steps to the province of Drenthe. Here his discourses had already been favourably received, when some of his followers, inspired by intemperate zeal, and before the minds of the people were sufficiently prepared by inward conviction, began to destroy the temples of the idols. The heathen worshippers were enraged by this proceeding. They fell upon the missionaries, and Willebad was covered with blows. One of the heathen aimed at him with his sword, intending to slay him; but the stroke fell on a leathern-thong by which a bag, in which, according to the custom of the time, he carried relics, was fastened to his neck. Thus he was spared; and, as it was usual to reason in those days, the protecting power of the relics was regarded as sufficiently proved. The heathen, deeply affected by the incident, ceased at once from their attack on Willebad, and regarded him as defended by a superior power.

<sup>1</sup> He died March 26, 809.

<sup>2</sup> His life was written by his second successor Alfrid, and is published in t. ii. of Pertz, Monumenta.

When the emperor Charles, who knew so well how to gather around him men of ability, heard of Willebad's unshrinking zeal for the propagation of the faith ; and when, after his victory over the Saxons, in the year 779, he especially needed such men to establish the Christian church among that people, he summoned Willebad to his court. Having conferred with him, he appointed, as the sphere of his labour, the province of Wigmodia, which subsequently constituted the diocese of Bremen. He was, in the first instance, to preside over this district, to which was united a part of Saxony and Friesland, as priest. In this capacity, he was to fulfil all the duties of the pastoral office ; and to continue to labour in this way, till the Saxons might be sufficiently advanced to allow of the organization of bishops.

Willebad accomplished more by his preaching than could be effected by the stringent laws of the emperor. In the course of his two years' labour, he won many Frisians and Saxons to the faith ; founded communities and churches ; and appointed priests to superintend them. But his sphere of operations, promising as it thus appears to have been, was broken up by the consequences which followed the insurrection of Wittekind, in the year 782, and which extended themselves to this district. He had no fanatical desire to die a martyr's death. Instead, therefore, of exposing himself to the rage of the heathen, who denounced death against all Christian ministers, he regarded it as his duty, according to the commandment of the Lord (Matt. x. 23), to avoid the persecution, and so preserve his life for future labours in the gospel. He accordingly saved himself by flight ; but many of the clergy whom he had placed in different parts of the district died as martyrs.

The confusion created by the war, not permitting him to carry on his work, he employed the interval in a journey to Rome, and which he made while Liudger also was travelling to Italy. On his return, he found a quiet retreat in the monastery founded by Willebrord at Afternach (Epternach), the rendezvous of his dispersed scholars. There he lived for two years, passing much of his time in the exercise of devotion, and the rest in the study of the Scriptures and in writing.<sup>1</sup> Anxious, however, as he had

<sup>1</sup> He made for himself while here a copy of St Paul's epistles, and which was preserved by his successors, the bishops of Bremen, as a precious memorial.

always been to labour for the salvation of others, it was with great joy that he found himself able, after the victory over Wittekind, in 785, to return to the scene of duty appointed him by the emperor among the Saxons. Circumstances now for the first time rendered it possible to fulfil the design of founding a diocese in the country occupied by that people. In the year 787, the emperor published the ordinance by which the limits of the see of Bremen were distinctly marked out. Willebad was ordained bishop of the new diocese ;<sup>1</sup> and on Sunday the first of November, in the year 789, he consecrated the cathedral church of St Peter in Bremen, an edifice which he had raised with great magnificence. But he exercised the episcopal office only two years. On one of his visitations, which he frequently undertook to meet the necessities of his extensive diocese, filled with a people only lately converted, or satisfied with a seeming baptism, just as he reached Blexem,<sup>2</sup> on the Weser, not far from Wegesack, he was seized with a violent fever. One of his scholars who, assembled around his bed, were filled with anxiety for his life, said to him, " what will the new community, and the young clergy, whose head thou art, do without thee ? Thou must not leave us so soon : we shall be as sheep among wolves, and without a shepherd." Willebad answered : " O let me not have to wait any longer for the manifestation of my Lord ! I have no desire to live any longer ; and I fear not to die. I will only beseech my Lord, whom I have always loved with my whole heart, to give me such a reward for my labour as He, in his mercy, may see fit. But the sheep which he has intrusted to me, I commend to his own care. If I have myself done any good, it has been wrought only in his strength. Nor will his grace be wanting to you. The whole earth is full of his mercy." Thus he died, November 8th, 789.<sup>3</sup>

The victory which the emperor Charles obtained over the Avaren or Huns, the then inhabitants of Hungary, opened the way for an

1 Anselm in his *Memoir*, c. 9, says : *Quod tamen ob id tamdiu prolongatum fuerat, quia gens, credulitati divinæ resistens, quum presbyteros aliquoties secum manere vix compulsam sineret, episcopali auctoritate minime regi patiebatur. Hac itaque de causa, septem annis prius in eadem presbyter est demoratus parodua, vocatur tamen episcopus, et secundum quod poterat cuncta potestate præsentis ordinans.*

2 At that time, Pleccateshem.

3 His life, by Anselm, archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, has been republished in Pertz. *Mouumenta*, t. ii.

attempt to found a Christian Church among that people. One of their princes, Tudun, came in the year 796,<sup>1</sup> attended by a numerous train of followers, to the emperor, and desired to receive baptism. Charles resolved to establish a mission in Hungary, and he committed its conduct to Arno, archbishop of Saltzburg. While this undertaking was the subject of discourse, the abbot Alcuin gave the emperor excellent advice as to the manner in which he ought to proceed in order to secure success. He adduced, by way of example, the case of the Saxons.<sup>2</sup> For a people like the Huns, only lately converted, it would be necessary, he urged, to seek pious ministers, of good conversation, and such as were thoroughly well instructed in Christian doctrine and morals. To this he added exhortations similar to those which he addressed to the emperor on a former occasion.<sup>3</sup> The emperor was also called upon to consider whether the apostles, instructed by Christ himself, and sent forth to preach the gospel, had, in any case, demanded tithes, or instituted such a practice. Alcuin further admonished him to take care that the proper order was observed; that the conviction of the truth of the gospel preceded baptism, since the washing of the body without the confession of faith could avail nothing for the intelligent soul.<sup>4</sup> It was not till when a man had been well established in the belief of the main doctrines of Christianity, that he ought to be admitted to baptism.<sup>5</sup> So also, by the diligent exercise of the preacher's office, at the proper time, the commandments of the gospel were to be frequently impressed upon the mind of every one, till he became of mature age, and was fitted to be a worthy temple of the Holy Ghost.

1 See Ginhardi Annales : an. 796.

2 Ep. xxviii.

3 He skilfully referred here to the example of Christ, Matt. ix. 17. Unde et ipse Dominus fruat in evangelio respondet interrogantibus se, quare discipuli ejus non jejunarent: nemo mittit vinum novum in utres veteres, &c.

4 Ne nihil prosit sacri ablutio baptismi in corpore, si in anima utione utenti Catholice agnitio fidei non præcesserit.

5 He quotes the passage referring to religious instruction in this ordinance. Prius instruendus est homo de animae immortalitate, et de vita futura, et de retributione bonorum malorumque et de æternitate utriusque sortis. Postea pro quibus peccatis et sceleribus pœnas cum diabolo patiatur æternas et pro quibus bonis vel bene factis gloria cum Christo fruatur sempiterna. Deinde fides Sanctæ Trinitatis diligentissime docenda est; et adventus pro salute humani generis Filii Dei Domini nostri Jesu Christi in hunc mundum eponendus. Et de mysteris passionis illius et veritate resurrectionis et gloria adscensionis in cœlos, et futuro ejus adventer ad judicandas omnes gentes, et de resurrectione corporum, et de æternitate pœnarum et præmiorum.

When his friend, Archbishop Arno, begged Alcuin to give him a plan for the instruction of the heathen, he forwarded him in the first instance this writing, intended for the emperor.<sup>1</sup> He then sent him an epistle especially devoted to the subject.<sup>2</sup> In this he insisted, with particular exactness, on the important consideration, that all depended upon the preaching of the faith, and a corresponding conviction, without which baptism could be of no avail.<sup>3</sup> But how could a man be compelled to believe what he did not believe? Endowed with understanding, man must be instructed, and led to acknowledge the truth by the manifold aids of preaching. And further, especial prayer must be made in his behalf, for the grace of the Almighty; for in vain will the tongue of the teacher teach, if divine grace penetrate not the heart of the hearer.<sup>4</sup>

Alcuin next insists particularly on the necessity of proceeding gradually, instead of attempting to accomplish all at once that which relates to converts.<sup>5</sup> He who has been long strengthened in the faith may be expected to prove himself wiser than the novice. Peter, full of the Holy Ghost, bore a testimony before Nero, far different to that which he gave before the maid in the house of Caiaphas. And, imitating the gentleness with which Jesus reminded Peter of his fault, so should the good shepherd learn how he ought to conduct himself towards the erring of his flock.<sup>6</sup>

In another letter, Alcuin exhorts the bishop to be a teacher of the faith, not an exactor of tithes.<sup>7</sup> The undertaking in Hungary

1 Ep. xxx. He was thinking, perhaps, of the criminal failure of the mission to the Saxons, when he exclaimed: *Væ mundo a scandalis! Quid enim auri insana cupido non subvertit boni! Tamen potens est Deus recuperare quod cæptum est, et perficere quod factum non est.*

2 Ep. xxxi.

3 Idcirco misera Saxonum gens toties baptismi perdidit sacramentum, quid nunquam fidei fundamentum habuit in corde.

4 Quid otiosa est lingua docentis, si gratia divina cor auditoris non imbut. Quod enim visibiliter sacerdos per baptismum operatum in corpore per aquam, hoc Spiritus Sanctus invisibiliter operatus in anima per fidem.

5 Matt. ix. 17. Qui sunt utres veteres, nisi qui in gentilitatis erroribus obduraverunt? Quibus si in initio fidei novæ prædicationis præcepta tradideris, rumpuntur et ad veteres consuetudines perfidiæ revolvuntur.

6 Quatenus bonus pastor intelligeret, non semper delinquentes dura invertione castigare, sed sæpe piæ consolationis admonitione corrigere.

7 Ep. lxxii. Esto prædicator pietatis, non decimarum exactor.

appears to have been interrupted by a new war with its people in the year 798; but it was probably renewed after the entire conquest of the country. Alcuin complained that the same energy was not employed in the effort to plant Christianity among the Huns as had been used in the case of the Saxons, so obstinate in their opposition to the gospel; and he explained why so little had been effected by adducing the negligence which marked the execution of the plan.<sup>1</sup>

Both the Frankish government, and the Christian church, had still to endure violent resistance on the side of the numerous Slavonic tribes inhabiting the northern and eastern boundaries of Germany. The emperor Charles seems to have entertained the idea of instituting for their conversion, and for the diffusion of Christianity through the whole country, a northern metropolis in Hamburg. But the fulfilment of this design was left to be accomplished by his successor.

## 2. IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

While, in the manner above described, an entire new race, still barbarous, was gained for Christianity, and the germ of a new creation, springing also from Christianity, was planted therein, the church was continually threatened, in those very countries in which it had been originally established, with the narrowing of its limits, or with actual ruin. When the Persian king, Chosru-Parviz, at the beginning of the seventh century, rent several provinces from the Roman empire, and, in the year 614, took possession of Palestine, which conquest was succeeded in the two following years by the subjugation of Egypt, numerous Christians suffered death, were sold as slaves, or compelled to join the Nestorians. Many churches and monasteries were destroyed at this time.<sup>2</sup> But the storm was only of brief duration. During the period intervening between the years 622 and 628, the East-Roman em-

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xcii. Hunnorum vero, sicut dixisti, perditio, nostra est negligentia, laborantium in maledicta generatione Saxorum; Deoque desputa usque huc et eos negligentes, quos majore mercede apud Deum et gloria apud homines habere potuimus, ut videbatur.

<sup>2</sup> See Theopanes Chronograph. f. 199. Makriz. Historia Coptorum Christianor. p. 79, Renaudot Hist. Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 154.



peror Heraclius overcame the Persian kingdom, and recovered the conquered provinces. Soon afterwards, however, the Christian church was assailed by a hostile power, with which it had to carry on a far longer and severer struggle.

A Christianity, drained of its life by rigid formularies, ceremonies, and superstitions, was now to be exposed to the power of a new religion, extending itself on all sides with youthful energy ; endowed with qualities calculated to work most effectively on the imagination ; and having at its command the material instruments best suited to its purpose. This was the religion which Muhamed had lately established in Arabia. From the year 610 he had proclaimed himself as a prophet to those Arab tribes, among which, in the midst of the prevailing idolatry, and especially of Sabaism, and manifold superstitions connected with the use of amulets, a simple, original, Monotheistic religion had still retained its hold. Numerous Jews, and some few Christians, who, however, had but a very imperfect knowledge of their faith, were scattered among these people, and contributed to preserve the traces of their old religion. An influence of this kind might readily excite in a man of such quick intellect and fiery imagination as Muhamed, a religious consciousness reacting against the idolatry in which he had been brought up, and by which he was surrounded ; but which reaction would necessarily be disturbed by the prevailing sensual element peculiar to his race. Muhamed, however, felt himself urged on to shew his zeal for the honour of the one God, whom he had learnt to know and worship, from the traditions of an original religion, and from what he had been taught by Judaism and Christianity. The feeling of the supremacy of God above all creatures, of the immeasurable distance between Him and all things that are made ; the feeling of the perfect independence of the almighty and incomprehensible One, —this was the fundamental prevailing key-note of his religious convictions. But the other element necessary to the perfect development of divine consciousness, the feeling of relationship and communion with God, this was altogether defective in Muhamed. Thus he had but a one-sided comprehension of the divine attributes, the idea of omnipotence suppressing the idea of a holy love ; and hence omnipotence appeared to him as a limitless self-will ; and though he had occasionally a sense of God's love and

mercy, beaming through him in the way of religious consciousness, yet even this was in antagonism with that exclusive ground-tone of his system, and was necessarily marked thereby with a species of particularism. Hence the prevailing doctrine of fatalism, and the utter denial of moral freedom. As the ethical form given to the idea of God determines the character of the moral spirit to which a religion gives birth, so, consequently, although some isolated sublime moral sentiments, strangely contrasted with the ruling spirit of his religion, may be met with in the system of Muhamed, yet, taking it as a whole, it is singularly defective through this want of fundamental truth in the ethical comprehension of the idea of God. The God who is regarded but as an almighty self-will, may be worshipped by a mere unreserved subjection to that will, by a servile obedience, by the performance of various outward acts, as works of benevolence, which it may have pleased him to command, as signs of honour to his name; or homage may be rendered him, on the other hand, by the destruction of his enemies, as idolaters, by the enslaving of unbelievers, by the vain repetition of prayers, by fasts, lustrations, and pilgrimages. Through the contracted notion of the divine nature, Muhamed's system was also wanting, as to its moral character, in the all-pervasive and illuminating principle of a holy love. The ethical element being thus defective, no room is found for the feeling which points to the necessity of redemption. We read in the Koran of the original state of man, and of his eating of the forbidden fruit, but the tradition is given not as it exists in the Old or New Testament, but rather as it is found in the apocryphal-Jewish or Jewish Christian stories;<sup>1</sup> as something, indeed, peculiarly fictitious, and only as it agreed with the poetical disposition of Muhamed and his people, without any relation to its ethics, or connection with the substance of the religion; so that Muhamedanism, as far as its peculiar character is con-

<sup>1</sup> The account of the high dignity of Adam, to whom, it is said, the angels render honour, but to whom Satan, who envied him, would not give it, belongs to the Gnostic elements in the Koran. See my treatise on the development of the Gnostic system, p. 125, 265, and Church Hist. vol. ii. Geiger was right (see his learned work, "What did Muhamed derive from Judaism?" Bonn 1833, s. 100), not to deduce this system from the Old Testament Judaism; but he was not right in tracing it to Christianity. A Gnostic tradition, or an older oriental one, out of which Gnosticism derived it, is much more probably its source.

cerned, would lose nothing were this tradition entirely left out. This constitutes, in fact, the great distinction between Muhamedanism and Christianity, that the founder entirely denies the want of a redeemer and redemption.

Muhamed had no wish, at first, to establish a new and universal religion for mankind. His only object was to make known to his people, in their own language, and in an acceptable form, that same Theism of the primitive religion, which he recognized in Judaism and Christianity as something imparted by divine agency. He believed himself called, for this purpose, to be the national prophet of the Arabians.<sup>1</sup> At the beginning, he confined the exercise of his prophetic office to that people, and attacked idolaters only. But as the success of his undertakings, and the enthusiasm of his followers continued to give a new impulse to his imagination and vanity, and he was enraged by the opposition which he met with among Jews and Christians, he took a higher stand, and assailed these latter people, no less than idolaters. He now proclaimed that he had been sent by God to be the restorer of pure Theism ; that he was appointed to cleanse it of those strange elements with which it was found mixed in Judaism and Christianity. The earlier revelations of Moses, of the prophets, of Jesus himself, were not the objects of his attack. He ascribed to them the same reverence which he claimed for his own : the war which he waged was directed against the vain corruptions of those earlier revelations. Christianity, indeed, viewed under the form in which he beheld it, might fairly justify his accusing its professors of falsifying the original truth ; as when he assailed the idolatrous worship of Mary, the mother of God, and of sainted monks. Nor could the ecclesiastical exposition of the Trinity appear to any one who viewed it from without, from the standing-point of an abstract Monotheism, and not as a form to be comprehended by Christian consciousness, otherwise than as a species of Tritheism. Still, it was certainly not in the corruptions of evangelical doctrine which he found mixed up with the truth, that the

<sup>1</sup> See the Koran, Sura 14, f. 375, ed. Maracci : the words ascribed to God : *Non misimus ullum legatum nisi cum lingua gentis suae*. How the various religions were communicated by God to the various people through his revelations in Judaism and Christianity. Sura v. f. 236. How the revelations by Muhamed were destined for those who could not read the Old Testament and the gospels, because the language was unknown to them. Sura vi. f. 262.

principal cause of Muhamed's hostility existed. It was to be traced rather to the relation between his own religious standing-point, and the original, peculiar nature of Christianity itself. It was from that standing-point of a Monotheism, which created an unfathomable gulf, a chasm never to be closed between God and his creatures, that the notion of a divine mediation, through which the Deity might bring human nature into communion with himself, must have appeared to him as injurious to the glory of the infinite and the Most High, and as an approach to idolatry. But it was not a mere speculative representation of the doctrine of the Trinity which scandalized Muhamed as a visible Tritheism; but the real element of Christianity itself which lay at the root of the doctrine; and which is as opposed to the rough, one-sided Monotheism, representing God apart from man, and man apart from God, as it is to the nature-worship of Polytheism corrupting and destroying the consciousness of Deity. This was incomprehensible to Muhamed. The doctrine of Christ's divinity<sup>1</sup> must, therefore, have been equally so, and all, in fact, which Christianity has above the mere general principles of Theism. Whatever essentially distinguishes Christianity from Judaism appeared to Muhamed as a falsification of what he wished to represent as the original form of that religion. He adduced the evangelical history only in that fabulous character in which it appears in the old apocryphal gospels. But even had he enjoyed the opportunity of learning the genuine history of Christ, his imagination and poetical feeling would have been far more deeply touched by those fantastic representations; and the picture which they gave of Christ would have agreed better with the entire spirit of his religious notions, than that which is drawn by the authentic narrative.

It appears, from what has been said, that Muhamedanism answers, in most respects, to Judaism; but to a Judaism which, torn from its union with a theocratic development, and robbed of its distinguishing character, of the predominating idea of the holiness of God, of the prophetic element and its peculiar light, concentrated in the animating idea of the Messiah, becomes mythic

<sup>1</sup> According to the Koran, God shall say to Jesus, at the last judgment, *O Jesu, fili Mariae, tunc dixisti hominibus: accipite me et matrem meam in duos Deos praeter Deum? And Jesus shall call God to witness, that he never taught this. Non dixi eis, nisi quod praecepisti mihi: Colite Deum Dominum meum et Dominum vestrum. Sura v. f. 236.*

instead of historic, and is thus better adapted to the popular character of the Arabs. We find here a remarkable law for the development of the kingdom of God in man. Within the church itself we meet with a Judaism clarified, penetrated by Christianity, or a Christianity in the form of Judaism (the Catholicism of the middle ages), and which furnished a transition-point for the rude converts, before their acceptance of Christianity in the form and essence of its own pure and glorious character. So also without the church, a Judaism, brought down to the character of natural religion, afforded in Muhamedanism a Theistic transition-point from idolatry, in its lowest degree, to the perfectly developed, and peculiarly simple Theism of Christianity, penetrating the whole of life.

To understand the relation of Christianity to Muhamedanism, and how this was viewed by the Christian teachers among the Muhamedans in the eighth century, we must refer especially to the apologetic writings of that period, as far as we are furnished with the means of doing so by the existing fragments of the apologetic works of John of Damascus, and his scholar Theodore Abukara, who wrote in the eighth century,<sup>1</sup> on the doctrine of free will, and on the divinity of Christ. But whilst such writers were engaged in assailing the point of view from which Muhamedanism deduced evil and good equally from divine causality, and thereby denied the distinction between what God permits and what he does,<sup>2</sup> these same writers, in their endeavour to save the principle of free-will and moral responsibility, fell, as is so frequently the case, while contending for one extreme into the opposite. Hence they favoured anthropopathic exhibitions of the relation of God to the creature, leading directly to Pelagianism, without being conscious of the consequences which would flow from such a mode of reasoning. When God had once completed the creation, He no longer continued to work, but left the universe to fashion itself according to the laws appointed it ; and all

<sup>1</sup> The dialogue between the Christian and the Saracen, by Johannes Damascenus, t. i., in his works, ed. Le Quien, f. 466, Galland. Bibl. Patrum t. xiii., f. 272, and the *ἑρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις* between the *Βάρβαρος* and the *Χριστιανός* of Theodore Abukara in Bibliotheca Patrum Parisiens, t. xi., f. 431. What the original form of this dialogue was, and from which of these two it proceeds, it is difficult to determine.

<sup>2</sup> The Muhamedan cites as an example the Christian disputing *κατ' ἀνθρώπων* the question: Was it the will of God or not that Christ should be crucified?

things to develop themselves in obedience to the energy of the creative word, uttered originally by God, and from the seed thus endowed by him with its own proper force.<sup>1</sup>

Through the divisions which existed among the oriental Christians, and the hostility of the persecuted Schismatic party, in Egypt and Syria, to the Byzantine empire and its dominant church, great facility was given to the victorious advance of the Muhamedan Saracens; and they were naturally inclined, from political interest, to favour the hitherto persecuted parties, especially the numerous Monophysites and Nestorians in Egypt and Syria.<sup>2</sup> The Saracens, indeed, who, in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries, exercised rule in Asia (in Syria and the neighbouring provinces) and in Northern Africa, did not persecute the old Christian inhabitants on account of their faith, if they paid the appointed tribute; but there were not wanting occasions for the exercise of wilful oppression, of insult, and cruelty, and a very slight provocation was needed to excite the fanatical rage of such rulers to deeds of violence.<sup>3</sup> Those, on the other hand, who still only adhered in uncertainty to a dead faith, might allow themselves, without much difficulty, to become converts to a religion which was extending itself by manifold influences, conjoined with a fresh and youthful spirit, which flattered the passions of the natural man, and was supported by all the weight of authority.

The Nestorian communities which had their settlements in Eastern Asia, and which had been favoured by the Persians, and afterwards, from the same cause, by the Muhamedan rulers, had devoted themselves to the diffusion of Christianity in this part of the world; and we have already remarked, in the foregoing

1 *Ἴδου ἐγὼ αὐτεξούσιος ὦν ἐν τε καλοῖς, ἐν τε κακοῖς, ὅπου ἐὰν σπείρω, κἂν εἰς ἰδίαν γυναικα, κἂν εἰς ἄλλοτρίαν, τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ χρώμενος, ἀναβλαστάνω, καὶ γίνεται τῷ πρώτῳ προστάγματι τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπακούουσα, ὅτι τὸ κατά βληθὲν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ σπερματικὴν δύναμιν· οὐχ ὅτι δὲ νῦν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὁ θεὸς πλάττει καὶ ἐργάζεται ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε.* Theodor. Abukara. l. c., f. 432.

2 The greater part of the population of Egypt, the Copts, were devoted to the Monophysite faith; and they helped the conquerors to drive out the descendants of the Greeks, who, as supporters of the doctrine prevailing in the empire, were called Melchites. All the churches were now given up to the Copts, and the Coptic patriarchate was founded. See the accounts in the *Historia Coptorum Christianorum* of Makrizi, a work of great utility in reference to Egypt. Ed. Wetzer, 1828, p. 89. Renaudot *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum*. p. ii.

Instances are given in Makrizi, Renaudot, and Theophanes.

period, that a Christian colony had proceeded from the Persians to various provinces in the East Indies. Timotheus, the patriarch of the Nestorians in Syria, who possessed this dignity from 778 to 820,<sup>1</sup> occupied himself especially in the establishment of missions. He sent monks from the monastery of Beth-abe, in Mesopotamia, as missionaries to the people inhabiting the countries on the borders of the Caspian Sea, and even as far as the East Indies, and particularly to China. Among these missionaries were two active men, named Kardag and Jabdallaha, whom Timotheus ordained bishops. Jabdallaha rendered the patriarch an account of the happy success of the mission, and the patriarch gave them authority to ordain many of the monks, wherever there was necessity, as bishops. He expressly instructed them that sometimes, in order to observe the rule that three bishops always should be present at the ordination of a bishop, a book of the gospels might supply the place of the third. One named David<sup>2</sup> is mentioned as appointed bishop for China. According to an inscription, discovered by the Jesuits, in the Chinese-Syrian language, and belonging apparently to the year 782,<sup>3</sup> a Nestorian priest, Olopuen, arrived in 635 from the eastern provinces, bordering westerly on China, and laboured with considerable success in that kingdom, enduring many persecutions at the beginning, but gaining at last the favour of the emperor in his efforts to propagate Christianity. But even if the authenticity of this inscription be disputed,<sup>5</sup> it will yet appear, according to what has been stated above, that, at this period, experiments were made by the Nestorians to open a pathway for Christianity in Eastern Asia, which should extend to China.

<sup>1</sup> See Assemani *Bibliotheca Oriental.* t. iii., p. i., f. 158.

<sup>2</sup> *L. c.*, f. 163.

<sup>3</sup> An Arab, Ibn Wahab, who, in the ninth century, travelled to China, found with the emperor an image of Christ, and images of the apostles; and he heard from the emperor that Christ had exercised the office of a teacher thirty months. See the "Journey of an Arab," in Renaudot *Anciennes Relations des Juves, et de la Chine*, p. 68. Compare Ritter's *Asien.* B. i., p. 286.

<sup>4</sup> Among others copied by Mosheim, *Hist. Eccles. Tartarorum*, Appendix N. iii.

<sup>5</sup> The dispute respecting the authenticity of this inscription is not yet decided; but we may look for a surer determination of the question from the more accurate knowledge of Sinitic literature in modern times. A very distinguished witness in this department, and sufficiently unprejudiced on the subject, has declared himself in favour of the inscription. See Abel Rémusat *Mélanges Asiatiques*, t. i. 36. On the other side is Professor Neumann, from whom the result of an extended enquiry on this matter is to be expected.

Under the emperor Justinian, the gospel had found a passage from Egypt to Nubia.<sup>1</sup> In Nubia a Christian kingdom was established, as in Abyssinia; and the churches of both kingdoms recognised the Coptic patriarch in Egypt as their head, and allowed him to consecrate their bishops.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the explanation of an inscription of a Christian prince of Nubia, with remarks on the introduction of Christianity into Nubia in Letronne: *Matériaux pour l'Hist. du Christianisme en Egypte, en Nubie, et en Abessynie*. Paris, 1832.

<sup>2</sup> See Renaudot *Hist. Patriarch. Alex.* p. 178, and in other places. The union of the Indian Christians with the Coptic patriarch is worthy of remark. See Renaudot, p. 188, Makrizi, p. 93. It cannot but seem strange that these Christians should have connected themselves with Egypt, rather than with their mother-church in Persia. We should be inclined to suppose that they were an Ethiopian tribe; but even then this connexion would have its difficulties.



## SECTION SECOND.

## HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

## I. RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE.

With Christianity itself the entire edifice of the church, with all its ordinances, was given to the newly converted people. The whole appeared to them in the light of a divine institution; and at the point of cultivation, at which they had arrived, they were little capable of distinguishing the divine and human, the inner and the outer, the changeable and the unchangeable, from each other. But the church system, formed originally under such different relations, could not but undergo many changes when subjected to the new circumstances in which it was now to exist. As far as the original relation of the church to the State was concerned, it was especially important for the good of the church, and the attainment of the object contemplated in the culture of the people, that while in the course of its development, its independence should be protected against the rude power of the world, and its destructive influences. The capricious attacks of the barbarian princes could, in this respect, be no less dangerous than the tyrannical assaults of a base Byzantine court from the high places of corruption. The Frankish princes were as little likely as the Byzantine emperor to take a point of view from which it might appear, that there could be a territory within their states to which their authority would not extend; a power altogether independent of their own.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chilperich, king of the Franks in the sixth century, who added to the number of letters in the Latin alphabet, and issued an order, that the boys in the schools of his kingdom should all be instructed in reading and writing, and that all old books should be rubbed over with pumice-stone, and be re-written, according to this alphabet, was also well inclined to furnish the church with a Justinian. And what would have been the consequence, if such a prince had not been obliged to yield to the superior power of an

But to counterbalance this, there was their belief in a visible theocracy, represented by the church, and intimately connected with the idea of priestly dignity. This was especially the case in the Western church, where the theory had been very long established, and was transmitted to the people in union with Christianity itself. According to the degree of cultivation attained, this point of view enlarged, like faith in an invisible church, and in its power working outwardly from within. The rude mind, impressed with religious convictions, was disposed to see, in the visible church, in the person of the priest, God himself, and to manifest a corresponding fear and homage. But the point of view, in which the church was thus contemplated, must have been favoured by the entire relation in which it stood to these people. To them it appeared as the only organization of human society really effected, and as the only source to which a barbarous people could look for cultivation. It was the only institution which, by inspiring an awe of divine power, could counteract the force of human tyranny.

But while the sentiment of reverence for the church, as the representative of God, might, on the one side, operate powerfully on the minds of those to whom its administration was committed, so, on the other, might the independent feeling of authority, and the force of the wild passions and desires common to barbarians, become so much the more open to momentary excitement. Many cases of opposition, therefore, must have occurred in this state of things; and the church theocratic system, which could only secure the independence of the church itself, and its inner development, under these relations, must have had to endure, in the course of its progress, numerous conflicts with the temporal power. The greatest influence exercised by the civil government, and espe-

independent church? In the year 580 he composed a little treatise, in which he disputed the distinction of the three persons in the Trinity, asserting that it was unworthy of God to be denominated a person, as a natural man. He appears to have adopted a Samaritan or Sabellian view of the Trinity. Thus he appealed to the Old Testament, where the discourse is always of one only God, who appeared to the prophets and patriarchs, and who revealed the law. He had this treatise read in his presence by Gregory, bishop of Tours, and then said to him, "I will that you, and the other teachers of the church, should thus believe." He imagined that he understood this doctrine better than the fathers of the church, whose authority was opposed to him; but the impressive manner in which Gregory, and the other bishops, supporting themselves by the respect due to ecclesiastical tradition, met his arguments, induced him to desist from his purpose.

cially by the Frankish princes, on the church, was on the side most prejudicial to its interests, and most calculated to render it altogether dependent on the sovereign. This was especially the result of the influence which they gained by the nomination of bishops, who, according to the existing ecclesiastical constitution, had in their hands the entire government of the church. Hence, while they themselves became the servants of princes, the prejudicial consequences of this their servitude were experienced in every department of the ecclesiastical polity. In the old Romish empire, and especially in the east, the influence of the monarch extended only to the appointment of the bishops of the most important dioceses. But to the princes of whom we are now speaking, it appeared somewhat strange, that offices of such dignity, and to which so large a revenue, and so many political privileges were attached, should exist in their territories, and be disposed of without their concurrence. And the clergy who strove to obtain bishoprics through the influence of the temporal power, contributed to increase this feeling, by encouraging the monarch in the belief that the appointment was his right. Thus, in the Frankish kingdom, and under the successors of Chlodwig, the ancient custom of church-elections fell altogether into disuse, or, if followed in any case, the monarch regarded them as not binding, if it was his will to supply the vacant benefice in any other way. The old church laws on the "Interstitia," on the degrees by which an ecclesiastic might ascend to the higher spiritual offices, and those against the immediate exaltation of a layman from any temporal employment to such positions,—these laws, which had hitherto been more strictly observed in the Western than in the Eastern church, were now, although renewed by the decrees of synods, but little regarded in practice.<sup>1</sup> Princes conferred bishoprics on their favourites as they pleased; sold them to the highest bidder; or to those who, avoiding open simony, made them the best presents.<sup>2</sup> Thus it often

<sup>1</sup> See Third Council of Orleans in 538, e. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory of Tours relates in his memoir of Gallus, Bishop of Arverna (Clermont) *Vitæ Patrum* e. vi. f. 1171, ed. Ruinart, that the clergy of Clermont went, with many presents, to Theodore, a son and successor of Chlodwig, in order to obtain from him the confirmation of their election. Gregory observes: *Jam tunc germen illud iniquum œperat fructificare, ut sacerdotium aut venderetur a regibus aut compararetur a clericis.* The king, however, on this occasion, would not allow himself to be influenced by presents, but gave the bishopric to a deacon, who had gained great respect by his life and

very naturally happened that unworthy men were appointed to bishoprics, while the worthy were rejected.<sup>1</sup> Happily, however, it was still frequently the case, that the respect which a good man had won by his conduct, and his reputation as a saint, availed more with the prince than the bribes and machinations of the wicked.

Laws, indeed, had been early passed<sup>2</sup> against these invasions of the right of election ; but the men in power had not allowed them to become binding. The third Council of Paris, held in 557, had endeavoured anew to suppress these abuses. In its eighth canon it ordained, that the choice of bishops should proceed from the congregation and the clergy, with the consent of the provincial bishops and the metropolitan ; that he who had obtained the office not according to these conditions, but by the command of the king, should not be recognized by the bishops of the province as their colleague.<sup>3</sup>

conversation. This was Gallus, and the king gave a feast, at the public expense, in honour of the new bishop, and that all might shew their joy at his appointment. And so customary was bribery of one kind or the other, that Gallus was wont to say in jest, that he had not given more for the bishopric than a *Trians* (the third part of an *as*), which was for drink-money to the cook who prepared the repast. So also, l. iv. c. 32, Hist. Francor., it is said that the usual way to obtain a bishopric was *offerre multa, plurima promittere*.

<sup>1</sup> And thus it happened, after the death of the Gallus above mentioned, that an arch-deacon Cratinus, a drunken, avaricious man, obtained the office by the decision of the prince, while the presbyter Crato, who, although endowed with no slight degree of clerical vanity, had distinguished himself in the exercise of all his several functions, by a faithful discharge of his duty, and a benevolent care for the poor, was rejected, and this although he had in his favour the votes of the community, and of the clergy and bishops. He afforded, at a subsequent period, further proofs of his virtue. When, during the prevalence of a deadly pestilence (*lues inguinalis*), which raged in France about the middle of the sixth century, the bishop and many others of the clergy fled terrified from the city, Crato remained behind, attended to the burial of the dead, performed mass for every one, and, at length, falling a sacrifice to the plague, died in the performance of his duty. See Gregor. Hist. l. iv. c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Concil. Arvernense. an. 535, c. ii. on the regulations to be followed in elections. *Electio clericorum vel civium, et consensus metropolitani, and of the person to be elected it is said, non patrocinia potentum adhibeat, non calliditate subdola ad conscribendum decretum alios hortetur præmiis, alios timore compellat.* And, Concil. Aurelianense v. 549 c. 10, *ut nulli episcopatum præmiis aut comparatione liceat adipisci, sed cum voluntate regis juxta electionem cleri ac plebis.*

<sup>3</sup> *Nullus civibus invitis ordinetur episcopus, nisi quem populi et clericorum electio plenissima quaesierit voluntate ; non principis imperio neque perquamlibet conditionem contra metropolis voluntatem vel episcoporum comprovincialium ingeratur. Quodsi per ordinationem regiam honoris istius culmen pervadere aliquis nimia temeritate præsumserit ; a comprovincialibus loci ipsius episcopus recipi nullatenus mereatur, quem indebite ordinatum agnoscunt.*

In conformity with this decision, a synod assembled at Xaintes (Santones) in the year 564, under Leontius, archbishop of Bordeaux (Burdegala) as metropolitan, pronounced sentence of deposition upon Emeritus, bishop of Xaintes, because he had accepted the office, at the command of the late King Chlothar, without a regular election. It also ventured to choose another bishop in his place. But King Charibert, who was then reigning over this part of the Frankish territory, on being made acquainted with the decision, which the Synod communicated to him by a presbyter, as their representative, was bitterly offended. "Do you think," said he furiously to the messenger, "that none of Chlothar's sons remain to see that the will of their father shall be executed?" He then ordered the ambassador of the Synod to be ignominiously placed in a waggon full of thorns, and so to be carried out of the city. Sentence of banishment was also passed upon him; the members of the Synod were punished by a fine, and Emeritus was replaced in his office.<sup>1</sup> Gregory the Great made it his especial care to induce the Frankish bishops and princes to correct this abuse, the evil consequences of which he forcibly represented. Having earnestly exhorted them to summon a synod for this purpose,<sup>2</sup> "It troubles us deeply," he said, in an epistle addressed to the meeting, "to learn that money can have any influence in procuring church-offices, and that that which is holy can be made worldly. He who wishes to buy such an office, desires not the office, but the name of a priest to satisfy his vanity. What is the consequence of this? No care is taken about the life or manners of the man. He only who has money is esteemed worthy. But he who hastens to appropriate to himself, for vain glory, an office instituted for useful purposes, is from this very cause unworthy of it."

The fifth Synod, held at Paris in the year 615, renewed, by its first canon, the order respecting free elections, and King Chlothar II. confirmed the decree. But he introduced clauses which provided for numerous exceptions to the rule. Thus it was allowed to the prince to test the worthiness of the candidate, and to determine his ordination accordingly; while it was even admitted as

<sup>1</sup> See Gregor. Turon. Hist. Francor. l. iv. c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> See his Epistles, lib. xi. ep. 58, l. ix. ep. 106.

possible, that the King might choose a bishop immediately from his court.<sup>1</sup>

But even had the decree of the synod been unconditionally confirmed by the king, much would still have been needed to confine him to the course prescribed. Boniface found these abuses in respect to the appointment of bishops still prevailing, and, although he was able to do much by his personal influence, he could effect no permanent change. Among the reforms introduced by Charles the Great, was the restoration<sup>2</sup> of the free elections, whereby, however, the right of confirming was quietly given to the prince. The following history will also shew that a vast gap still always remained between the law and its fulfilment. In the English and Spanish churches, indeed, the princes, on the whole, exercised no such immediate influence on the appointment of bishops, but even in these churches their approval was deemed necessary.

Under the new relations, moreover, which now existed, the state naturally took a certain share in giving laws to the church. In the old Roman empire, the temporal power confined the exercise of its authority to the general councils; the provincial synods were left to themselves. But in the new states the idea of a two-fold legislation could not be understood; and the church stood in need of the authority of the state to enable it to carry out a portion of its rules, such as those which regarded the suppression of heathen customs, the practice of penance, and the observation of the Sabbath. Thus the synods which were convened for the purpose of passing laws, met by the consent of the prince,<sup>3</sup> who was present at their discussions, and authorized the publication of their decrees. At length, the synods became confounded with the general councils, at which the princes were accustomed, with the noblest of their vassals, to propose laws for the government of the State, and hence ecclesiastical and civil laws were enacted

<sup>1</sup> Si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinationem principis ordinetur, vel certe, si de palatio eligitur, per meritum personæ et doctrinæ ordinetur.

<sup>2</sup> The capitulary of the year 803 sets forth: "Ut sancta ecclesia suo liberius potiretur honore, adensum ordini ecclesiastico præbuimus, ut episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de propria diocesi remota personarum et munerum acceptione ob vitæ meritum et sapientiæ donum eligantur, ut exemplo et verbo sibi subiectis usque quaque prodesse valeant."

<sup>3</sup> See the order addressed by the Frankish king Sigebert, ad Desiderium episcopum Cadurcensem (bishop of Cahors in the year 650) ut sine nostra scientia synodale concilium in regno nostro non agatur. Baluz, Capitular. t. i. f. 143.

together. Thus, in the Frankish church, the meeting of bishops for purely ecclesiastical purposes had been growing more and more rare, when, in the eighth century, it fell altogether out of use. This may, no doubt, be attributed, in great measure, to the internal political struggles and consequent confusion which then prevailed, and to the indifference of so many worldly-minded bishops. The abbot Columban complains, in his letter to the bishops, who were assembled on account of their dispute with him, that no synods were now held; but allows that, owing to the disturbed state of the world, they could not be convened so often as formerly.<sup>1</sup> Gregory the Great<sup>2</sup> was obliged to appeal to the Frankish princes and bishops, in order to secure the meeting of a synod for the correction of church abuses; and, as we have already remarked, Boniface complained at the long interval which had passed since any Synod had been held. In those which assembled at his desire, the principal nobles of the kingdom took part, and laws which had no connection with ecclesiastical affairs were passed at the same time with those which regarded the church. This continued to be the practice under King Pepin and Charles the Great. At every general assembly of the kingdom, both civil and ecclesiastical laws were proposed, although, under particular circumstances, synods were called for simply ecclesiastical purposes. In this case they were held by express permission of the prince. By these means the bishops, who took part in those general legislative assemblies, exercised a certain degree of influence in the government of the State, and on the institutions of society. But this influence was gained not by the mere chance operation of the circumstances above stated. It was involved in the entire constitution of the theocratic system. As, on the one side, the church needed the arm of State authority to support it in a part of its legislation, so, on the other, did the authority of government, when the contest was to be waged with barbarians, and their unbridled will, require that sanctity and awe-commanding grandeur which the church was able to bestow. The feeling of this necessity was no doubt general. It proceeded from the

<sup>1</sup> In reference to the assembly then held: *Utinam sæpius hoc ageretis, et licet juxta canones semel aut bis in anno pro tumultuosis hujus ævi dissensionibus semper sic servare vos non vacat, quamvis rarius potissimum hoc debuit vobis inesse studium, quo negligentes quiqui timorem haberent, et studiosi ad majorem provocarentur profectum.*

<sup>2</sup> See the epistle quoted above.

circumstances which characterized the social state of the people, and from the prevailing direction of their religious views. But it was the result of a peculiar state of things that this feeling especially predominated in the West-Gothic kingdom of Spain. The successors of Reckared, the first among the Catholic kings of that country, found themselves obliged to seek in the honour conferred by the church, a compensation for the sanctity of their throne, harmed by the law of inheritance, and a defence against the spirit of insurrection. Several of the Spanish Synods, in the seventh century, made it their object to confer this honour on the sovereign. Thus, for example, the sixteenth council of Toledo, held in the year 693, declared, that every man was bound to keep unbroken faith, next after God, to the king as his vicegerent;<sup>1</sup> and interpreting certain passages, not well agreeing with a pure view of the gospel, according to the doctrine of the Old Testament, they represented kings as the inviolable anointed of God.<sup>2</sup> Thus it was that in the Spanish church a constitution was established which effectually repelled the contracting influence of the civil power, while, on the other hand, the church was only allowed to exercise such an influence on the State as was needed to give it a character of holiness. The seventeenth council of Toledo decreed, in the year 694, that in the first three days of every such assembly, the ecclesiastical affairs of the clergy should be debated, and then, but not till then, the common affairs of State. Charles the Great, who, according to his independent judgment, was inclined to keep church and political affairs apart,<sup>3</sup> considered it right that bishops, abbots, and counts, should be divided in these general assemblies into three chambers, and that each should employ itself with the matters pertaining to its condition. Thus the bishops were to be engaged about the affairs of the church; the abbots with all that which relates to monasticism; and the counts with political busi-

<sup>1</sup> Post Deum regibus, utpote jure vicario ab eo praelectis, fidem promissam quemque inviolabili cordis intentione servare.

<sup>2</sup> According to the New Testament, Jesus only is the Lord's anointed; or through Him all believers have, in like manner, been made the anointed of the Lord.

<sup>3</sup> See the capitulary of the year 811, c. 4. *Discutiendum est, in quantum se episcopus aut abbas rebus secularibus debeat inserere, vel in quantum comes, vel alter laicus in ecclesiastica negotia. His interrogandum est acutissime, quid sit, quod apostolus ait: "Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis secularibus."* 2 Tim. ii. 2, vel ad quos sermo iste pertineat. See Baluz. *Capitular. t. i. f. 478.*



ness. This was the order adopted at the Council of Maynz, in the year 813. But all decrees, of whatever kind they might be, were published under the authority of the emperor.

With regard to the exemption of the church from the burdens of the State, the old laws were also, in this respect, retained under the new relations, but, necessarily, with many changes in their application. The incompatibility of the spiritual profession with military employments had been generally acknowledged in the preceding age; but it was still deemed necessary to take precautions against the admission of those who were engaged in any military service into the number of the clergy. Even at the commencement of the present period, the emperor Mauricius fell into a controversy with Gregory the Great, because he had published a prohibition to this effect.<sup>1</sup> But in the new states, greater difficulties must have attended this subject; not only particular classes of citizens, but all free men being pledged to military service. It was sufficiently understood, how little war agreed with the calling of a minister of religion; but it was for the benefit of the nation, that it was now allowed to no one to become a clergyman or a monk, without the permission of the highest authority in the State.<sup>2</sup>

The church saw itself constrained hereby to choose members of the clerical body out of that class which was not affected by the obligation of military service, the class, that is, of serfs. Hence also it often was, that less rudeness was found among persons of this order; and that such of the bishops as were disposed to exercise despotic power over their clergy, could more easily accom-

<sup>1</sup> Gregory was quite ready to allow, that there ought to be no passing from political or military offices to holy orders (as was always the rule in the East), because by such a change suspicions might arise that worldly motives existed: *Quia qui secularem habitum deserens, ad ecclesiastica officia venire festinat, mutare vult seculum, non relinquere.* But it seemed to him to be injurious to the interests of piety, to forbid, in the same manner, the relinquishment of offices of this kind for a monastic state, which could be attended with no such suspicions. He appeals to the instances of genuine conversions of this character known to himself. *Ego scio, quanti his diebus meis in monasterio milites conversi miracula fecerunt, signa et virtutes operati sunt.* L. iii. ep. 65, et 66.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. Aurelianense i., under King Chlodwig, in the year 511, c. 4. *Ut nullus secularium ad clericatus officium præsumatur, nisi aut cum regis jussione, aut cum judicis voluntate.* The capitulary of Charles the Great, of the year 805, c. 15, Baluz., t. i., f. 427. *De liberis hominibus, qui ad servitium Dei se tradere volunt, ut prius hoc non faciant. quam a nobis licentiam postulent.* The last law was passed in reference to those only who desired holy orders, not from devout, but unholy motives.

plish their end when many of the clergy were servants belonging to the estates of the church. This so often happened, that it was found necessary to oppose some check to the excess to which the practice of admitting serfs into holy orders was now carried, without forbidding, however, the thing itself. Thus it was decreed by the fourth Council of Toledo, in the year 633, c. 74, that it should, by all means, be allowed to admit priests and deacons, taken from the bondsmen of the church, to benefices, supposing them to be recommended by their pious lives and manners, and already emancipated. In the rule of Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, adopted and published by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 816, we find the following remarkable direction, which plainly intimates that bondsmen were often ordained without being previously made free: <sup>1</sup> “ There are many who elect their clergy only from among the servants of the church; and they seem to take this course, in order that if they do anything prejudicial to these men, or deprive them of their dues, they may not be able to complain against them, being restrained by dread of severe bodily ill-usage, or of renewed slavery.” <sup>2</sup> It is, however, added: “ This is not said, to prevent the acceptance of men of approved conversation from the class of bondsmen, for God is no respecter of persons, but to prohibit any prelate from admitting men of low rank, for the reasons above named, to the exclusion of all of a higher grade.” Hence it appears that the bishops, though wanting, for the most part, the Christian spirit which should have moved them, were induced, from interested motives, to employ the influence, which Christianity had, from the beginning, exercised to this end, in restoring the excluded classes to the enjoyment of the common rights of humanity.

We will, therefore, refer for a moment to that which had hitherto taken place in this respect. Christianity had, from the first, not indeed by a sudden revolution, but by an internal operation on the minds of men, on their modes of thinking and feeling, prepared the way for the overthrow of a notion opposed to the common dignity of the human race.<sup>3</sup> New ideas were given respect-

<sup>1</sup> See Can. 119.

<sup>2</sup> *Timentes scilicet, ne aut severissimis verberibus afficiantur, aut humanæ servituti denuo crudeliter addicantur.*

<sup>3</sup> See the author's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, B. ii., s. 253, and his *Chrysostom*, B. i., s. 376;

ing the image of God in universal man ; of redemption pertaining to all ; of the same sublime and living communion embracing all, without distinction, both bond and free, the communion of the kingdom of God ; and hence the point of view from which these classes of men, their rights and duties, had hitherto been regarded, was wholly changed. The treatment which they were henceforth to receive was to be proportionally milder. Eminent teachers of the church expressed themselves forcibly on this subject. The church itself was especially engaged in the emancipation of slaves ; and thereby acknowledged that such an occupation was peculiarly fitted to its character. Numbers of slaves were set free, and it was considered as a work of piety thus to put them in a situation to become monks. Many witnesses, among which the Eastern monks were conspicuous, raised their voices against slavery as altogether degrading to the glory of God's image in mankind. Thus the abbot Isidore of Pelusium wrote to a nobleman with whom he was treating respecting one of his slaves :<sup>1</sup> " that he could not have believed that the friend of Christ, who knew the grace which gave freedom to all, could still retain a slave." It is related by Johannes Eleemosynarius, who was patriarch of Alexandria from the year 606 to 616, that he directed those who treated their slaves harshly to appear before him, and then addressed them in language of reproof like the following : " God has not given us servants that we should beat them, but that they should serve us ; perhaps even not for this end, but that they should receive their support out of the means which God has given us. Tell me then, I pray you, what has man given to purchase him who was created after the image of God, and who has been so honoured by God ? Have you, his master, more limbs than he ? Have you another soul ? Is he not in all things like yourself ? Do you not hear what the great light of the church, the apostle Paul, says ? ' As many of you as are baptized have put on Christ.' Here is neither bond nor free, for you are all one in Christ. If, then, we are equal in Christ, let us become equal among each other. Christ took the form of a servant in order to

also Kirchengeschichte (Church History) B. i., s. 298. Comp. Dr Möhler's treatise in the Theological Quartalschrift, Jahrgang 1834.

<sup>1</sup> οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι οἰκέτην ἔχειν τὸν φιλόχριστον εἰδὸτα τὴν χάριν τὴν πάντας ἐλευθέρωσασαν.

teach us that we should not be high-minded towards our servants ; seeing also that we have all one master in heaven, who has regard to the lowly. What is the gold which we have given to subject to us the man who is honoured by the Lord equally with ourselves ; and who was redeemed by the same blood ? For his sake were heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, created. No less true is it that the angels minister to him ; that for his sake Christ washed the feet of his disciples ; that for his sake He was crucified ; for his sake endured all other sufferings. And yet you dare to shame him who has thus been honoured by God, and treat him as unsparingly as if you had not the same nature in common with him !”

If the patriarch heard that these rebukes proved of no avail, and that the servant received no better treatment, then he purchased him for himself, and gave him his freedom.<sup>1</sup> The oriental monks strictly abstained from employing slaves, partly because they regarded it as their duty to perform for each other the services formerly rendered by slaves ; and partly, because they believed themselves bound to honour the image of God in all men.<sup>2</sup> When the celebrated Greek monk, Plato, at the end of the eighth century, retired from the world, he gave his slaves freedom,<sup>3</sup> and would have no bondsmen for servants in the monastery.<sup>4</sup> These principles were further promoted by his scholar and friend, the famous Theodorus Studita at Constantinople. The latter also taught his own scholar, the abbot Nicholaus,<sup>5</sup> never to use as slaves men who were created after the image of God ; neither for himself, nor for the monastery entrusted to his care, nor for the work of the field. Such an employment of slaves was only allowed to the worldly ; and the principles thus inculcated he set down in his will.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Life of Johannes Eleemosyn., written by Leontius, and translated by Anas-tasius in the *Actis Sanctorum* Januar. t. ii. § 61, fol. 510.

<sup>2</sup> Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, says in his “*Capitulis*” c. 8, *Græcorum monachi servos non habent ; Romani habent.*

<sup>3</sup> See his Memoirs written by his scholar, the celebrated Theodorus Studita, in his works, edited by Sirmond, or in the “*Actis Sanctorum*,” April. t. i. Appendix f. 47, § 8.

<sup>4</sup> § 23, l. c. *πῶς γὰρ ἂν μονάστης ἀληθινός, ο δεσποτείας φόβον δούλοις ἔπινα τεινόμενος ;*

<sup>5</sup> L. i. ep. 10.

<sup>6</sup> See Opp. Theodori in Sirmond, opp. t. v. f. 66.

Gregory the Great announced the emancipation of two slaves in a document thus worded :<sup>1</sup> " Since our Redeemer, the Author of the whole work of creation, took upon himself human nature, in order that he might free us by his grace from the bonds of that slavery in which we were held, and restore us to our original liberty, so does it appear that something salutary is done, when men, whom nature created free at the beginning, but whom the law of nations has subjected to the yoke of bondage, are restored to liberty."<sup>2</sup> Among the barbarous Franks, the slaves had much to endure at the hands of their savage masters. Their only refuge was in the church, and with the priests.<sup>3</sup> The asylum furnished by the former was an especial protection for slaves fleeing from the rage of their masters. When such were given up, it was on the expressed condition, confirmed by oath, that they should suffer no corporal punishment. If the master broke his promise, he was excluded from church communion.<sup>4</sup> The redemption and emancipation of slaves were especially reckoned among the works of pious love, and such as were particularly becoming in those laymen and monks who were distinguished for holiness. But now the bishops were often induced by motives<sup>5</sup> of selfish interest freely to emancipate slaves, in order to receive them into the number of their clergy, and sometimes to ordain them without this

<sup>1</sup> L. vi. ep. xii.

<sup>2</sup> The same Gregory writes, in reference to the discovery, that a woman who had been regarded as a slave had proved herself free-born, *quod revelante Deo libertatis auctore approbata sit libera.* L. vii. ep. i.

<sup>3</sup> Gregory of Tours relates in his history, v. l. iii., that a young man and woman, the slaves of a severe and cruel master, falling in love with each other, at length went to the priest, and were betrothed. The master hastened to the church as soon as he heard what had taken place, and demanded the slaves to be delivered up to him. The priest would only consent to his wish, reminding him in the meanwhile of the reverence due to the church, on the condition that he promised not to dissolve the union, nor to inflict any corporal punishment. The savage and cunning master promised with a double meaning that he would not separate the pair, and thus deceived the priest. He had them buried alive together in one grave. As soon as the priest heard what had happened, he hastened to the man, and succeeded in obtaining an order that the sufferers should be immediately taken up. The young man only was saved : the girl was already suffocated.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. Epaonense. an. 517, c. 39. *Servus reatu atrocior culpabilis si ad ecclesiam confugerit, a corporalibus tantum suppliciis excusetur.* Concil. v. auel. an. 549, c. 22. *Of the master who breaks his word, sit ab omnium communione suspensus.*

<sup>5</sup> Many slaves were also received as monks into the monasteries : hence the law of the emperor Charles in the capitulary of the year 805 c. xi. Baluz. t. i. f. 423. *De propriis servis vel ancillis non supra modum in monasteria sumantur; ne desertentur villæ; that is, that the tillage of the lands might not be neglected.*

dissolution of their former bonds. But, at all events, a new light, most advantageous for this class of men, was now diffused through the world. Since by the rule of Chrodegang, and of the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, an order was passed against the exclusive admission of slaves to clerical functions, we are plainly warned, as remarked above, against committing the error of supposing that such people were regarded as unworthy, on account of their birth, of receiving holy orders, or that the dignity of human nature and Christian excellence was not equally recognized in men of all classes.

The possessions and riches of the church,<sup>1</sup> especially in lands, greatly increased under the new relations. To this not only the pious interest which was taken in its affairs, but superstition, largely contributed. People believed that by giving presents, or leaving legacies to the church for some particular service, they might atone for their sins, according to the statement in the formulary *pro remissione peccatorum, pro redemptione animarum*.<sup>2</sup>

But this wealth was very insecurely held.<sup>3</sup> It was constantly exposed to the rapacity and exactions of the nobles and princes, whose attacks it was attempted to resist by horrible anathemas introduced into the deeds of gift, or by the circulation of legends, describing the punishments which awaited the spoilers of the church. The lands of the church in France were subject, for the most part, to the same taxes as all the possessions of the old inhabitants. A small portion of land, regarded as the original

<sup>1</sup> One of the new sources of wealth opened to the church was the obligation imposed on the laity to pay tithes. The confusion of Old and New Testament principles had already, in several cases, led to the demand being made on the people to consecrate the tenth of their goods, in the name of God, to God and the priests. Thus, for example, the letter of the Bishop of Tours, in the year 567: "Illud vero instantissime commone-mur, ut Abrahæ documenta sequentes decimas ex omni facultate non pigeat Deo pro reli-quis, quæ possidetis, conservandis offerre, ne sibi ipsi inopiam generet, qui parva non tribuit, ut plura retinet." But it was the emperor Charles who first allowed himself to be induced, by this argument from the Old Testament, to legalize the demand of tithes. He met with considerable resistance in this proceeding. We have seen above how Alcuin expressed himself on the subject.

<sup>2</sup> The Frankish king Cluiperich often complained: *Ecce, pauper remansit fiscus noster: ecce, divitiæ nostræ ad ecclesias sunt translatae; nulli penitus, nisi soli episcopi regnant: perit honor noster, et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum.* Gregor. Turon. l. vi. c. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Stewards, or advocates, were appointed for the defence of the church against injustice. *Vicedomini* (analogous to the *advocatores* of the ancient church) were taken from the laity, the several relations then existing obliging them to undertake many affairs which the clergy could not have managed.

inheritance of the church,<sup>1</sup> might from the first, perhaps, be exempted from this charge. It was legally so from the time of Charles the Great.

It was least of all things for the church to expect that the exemption of its lands from imposts should extend to the obligation, an obligation affecting all the possessions of the Franks, to contribute to the common military defence of the country. The bishops and abbots had, indeed, been declared exempt from a personal attendance in the field; but, as we have remarked in the history of Boniface, many of the Frankish bishops and clergy, contrary to their spiritual calling, took part in warlike proceedings, nor was Boniface able, by all his efforts, wholly to suppress these abuses of a barbarous age. But it being found that a very bad impression was made on the minds of the multitude, when clergymen fell wounded, or dead, in battle, the emperor Charles was entreated to make a provision against the occurrence of such things in future.<sup>2</sup> He accordingly directed, in a capitulary for the year 801,<sup>3</sup> “that no priest should thereafter engage in battle; but that two or three chosen bishops should attend the army, with a certain number of priests, who should preach, give the blessing, perform mass, receive confession, attend the sick, administer extreme unction, and take especial care that no one left the world without the communion. What victory could be hoped for, when the priests, at one hour, were giving the body of the Lord to Christians, and at another were, with their own wicked hands, slaying those very Christians to whom they gave it, or the heathen to whom they ought to have been preaching Christ, whom they especially designated as the salt of the earth?”

But while this order was issued in respect to the ministers of religion themselves, the bishops who remained behind were desired to send their people well armed to the general levy. And the common feeling that for a man to be excluded from taking part in war was to be disgraced, was so powerful, that the emperor was obliged to connect his prohibition of the clergy from

<sup>1</sup> The *mansus ecclesie*.

<sup>2</sup> In the epistle of the laity addressed to the emperor on this subject, it is said, “*Novi Dominus, quando eos in talibus videmus, terror apprehendit nos, et quidam ex nostris timore perterriti, propter hoc fugere solent.*”

<sup>3</sup> Mansi Concil., t. xiii., f. 1054.

personally engaging in war, with an especial safeguard for their honour.<sup>1</sup>

In the Roman empire, both Christianity itself, and the church which represented it, had exercised a direct influence on the administration of government. The sacredness of human life;<sup>2</sup> human justice, as an emanation of divine justice; the right administration of the laws, to be tested by God himself; righteousness illumined by love, and grace and mercy softening its severity, were now brought prominently forth, and seen in a new light. But the more plainly this was the case, so much the more must the operation of these principles have been found opposed to the barbarous and lawless condition of the people, to whom they were thus made known. This operation of Christianity was not such, indeed, as might have been looked for, had it proceeded from the gospel in its purity. It was modified by the form in which the religion existed among the people; and by the blending of the principles of the Old with those of the New Testament. On the one side, Christianity now, for the first time, made known to these people the idea of a legal system and judicial punishment. Hitherto they had been familiar only with the old custom of exacting fines as a sufficient penalty

1 *Quis audivimus, quosdam nos suspectos habere, quod honores sacerdotum et res ecclesiarum auferre vel minorare eis voluissemus.* Alcuin also complains, that bishops were drawn off from the duties proper to their calling to attend to the strange occupations of war. Thus he states, ep. ccviii., to Bishop Lantfrid, who himself must have spoken on the subject, how offensive this practice was to him. *Vere fateor, quod tua tribulatio torquet animum meum, dum audio te in periculo esse statutum, nec officii tui implere posse ministerium, sed bellator spiritualis bellator cogitur esse carnalis.* Which letter, if the law of the emperor was brought into force when passed, must have been written after its publication.

2 Christianity also exercised a powerful influence on public opinion through the manner in which it spoke on the subject of suicide, which was probably not rare among the barbarians. The second Council of Orleans, in the year 533, ordered in its fifteenth canon, that oblations should be accepted for those who had been executed for some crime, but not for those who had committed self-murder. The "*Synodus Antisiodorensis*" (*Synod of Auxerre*), held in the year 578, ordered, c. 17, that no oblation should be received on the part of any one who had committed suicide, either by casting himself into the water, or by strangling himself, or by falling from a tree, or by means of a sword, or in any other way. In the "*Capitulis*" of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, c. 63, it is directed, that for self-murder no mass should be solemnized, but that prayers and alms might be offered. Some exceptions, however, were made in the case of any one who might commit the crime in a sudden plrenzy. Since many, in a fit of despair, on being sentenced to church-penance, had sought to destroy themselves, the sixteenth council of Toledo, held in 693 c. 4., thus describes such conduct: *Animam suam per desperationem diabolo sociare conari,* and commanded that he who might be delivered from such an attempt, should be excluded two months from church communion.



for almost every crime, even for murder itself. Thus by means of Christianity a greater degree of severity could be exercised ; and it is possible that the barbarous people, not yet thoroughly impressed or softened by its principles, might regard this greater severity of the new religion as coloured with cruelty or revenge. On the other side, however, ideas of grace and mercy proceeded from the church, and tended to give a milder character to the administration of justice. While, therefore, on the one part, Christianity taught that there is an inviolable sanctity in the life of man, and that murder consequently must be punished ; so on the other, it could discover, even in the criminal, the darkened image of God, the fallen man, who might still become the object of God's redeeming love, and to whom, therefore, the opportunity ought to be afforded of repentance and improvement. The voice of an Alcuin was accordingly raised against the punishment of death.<sup>1</sup> It is frequently mentioned, as deserving of praise, that pious monks and clergymen employed their interest with the judges to soften the sentences passed on criminals. This was especially the case in regard to those condemned to death ; and when they could not succeed in obtaining a remission of the sentence, they strove, as we have seen, to restore life to the body taken from the gallows. If these pious men sometimes overstepped the proper limits of mercy ; or if social order occasionally suffered,<sup>2</sup> when the administration of justice yielded to their influence, far greater, in

<sup>1</sup> See Alcuin, ep. clxxvi. This epistle can scarcely be understood as referring to any thing but the murder of Pope Leo III., and the choice of his successor (in this passage perhaps, it should be, *caput ecclesiarum orbis.*) But as Leo was not murdered, but only dangerously wounded, and Alcuin (see ep. xcii.) declared himself opposed to his deposition, it is most reasonable to conclude, that Alcuin wrote this epistle while the exaggerated report of the Pope's assassination was still rife. Now in reference to the murderer of the Pope, Alcuin, after having demanded his punishment, says, " Non ego tamen mortem alicujus suadeo : dicente Deo Ezech. 33, ' Nolo mortem peccatoris, sed ut convertatur et vivat.' Sed ut sapienti consilio vindicta fiat per alia pœnarum genera vel perpetuum (perhaps, *carcerem vel omitted*) exilii damnatione (m.)"

<sup>2</sup> There lived in the sixth century, in the city of Angoulesme, a Clausner Eparchius, to whom much gold was brought by the devout, and he employed it all for the support of the poor, and the ransom of prisoners. The magistrates could not resist his benevolent spirit, and they often allowed themselves to be moved by him to shew mercy to criminals. But on one occasion, when a robber, who had been guilty also of many murders, was condemned to die, and the judge was inclined to spare his life at the prayers of this Eparchius, he saw himself compelled to yield to the violence of the people, who cried that there would be no security in the whole land, if this man were allowed to live. Gregor. Turon. l. vi., c. 8.

proportion, was the barrier thereby created to the rude feeling of the people ; the influence thus exercised in softening their mode of thinking ; and the sanctifying of human life connected therewith. Even monasteries were sometimes founded as penitentiaries for such favoured criminals.

The privilege already accorded to churches in the Roman empire, allowing them to become inviolable sanctuaries for the wretched and the persecuted, might be the more easily transferred to the new churches, the custom, without doubt, having a connection, not difficult to be traced, with the old times of heathenism. Such a privilege must have been especially useful and important in this age of tyranny and barbarism. By the refuge thus provided, the persecuted might escape for the moment the fury of their persecutors ; slaves that of their masters ; and the clergy, in the meantime, might go forth as their advocates. It would sometimes happen that the powerful, when excited to wrath, would pay no regard to these asylums ; but if, after having been guilty of some violence of this kind, they were overtaken by any misfortune, which might be the natural consequence of the rage which led them to disregard the sanctity of the asylum, advantage was commonly taken of the event to convert it into a terrible warning for others.<sup>1</sup>

The emperor Charles decreed, that asylums for the persecuted should not be made a shelter to screen all offenders, without discrimination, from punishment. Thus it was ordered by a law, passed in 779, that no sustenance should be given to murderers, or other criminals guilty of capital offences, who might have fled to a sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, in the laws of the English king Ina, it was especially provided, that if such offenders sought re-

<sup>1</sup> Thus, for example, a duke had fled for refuge from the pursuit of the Frankish prince Chrammus into the church of St Martin at Tours. Chrammus had him so closely shut in on all sides, that he could not once obtain water, and he hoped that he would be compelled by hunger and thirst to leave the church. When he was almost half dead, some one revived him by bringing him a vessel full of water. But the magistrate of the place hastened to the spot, tore the vessel from him, and poured the water upon the ground. The impression made upon the minds of the people by this act was greatly increased, when it was known that the magistrate was seized with a fever the same day, and died during the night. The consequence was that abundance of food was brought on all sides to the captive, and he was accordingly saved. Chrammus himself died a miserable death. Greg. Turon. l. iv. c. 19, com. l. v. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Baluz. Capit. i. 197.

fuge in a church, the means of existence should be granted them, and they should only be called upon to pay a moderate composition for their crime.<sup>1</sup> It was acknowledged to be the office of the church to watch over the suffering and the oppressed, and to soften the wretched condition of the prisoner. Hence it was ordered by the twentieth canon of the fifth Council of Orleans, held in 549, that prisoners should be visited every Sunday by the arch-deacon, or chief minister of the church, that their necessities might be mercifully cared for, according to the divine law; and that the bishop should see that a moderate provision was made for them out of the funds of the church. In Spain, especially, where the consciousness of weakness in the State led the civil power to seek more anxiously for the support of the church, this its influence was proportionally advanced. The fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633, directed, by its thirty-second canon, that the bishops should not be negligent in the defence and support of the people committed to their care; and that, if they saw that the magistrates, and other men in power, were oppressors of the poor, they should, in the first place, admonish them with priestly earnestness, and, if they became no better, should, in the next, report them to the king. It had been already decreed by a royal ordinance,<sup>2</sup> at an earlier period, that the magistrates and collectors of taxes should attend the assembly of bishops, in order to learn from them how to treat the people with piety and justice, while the bishops were particularly directed to take the oversight of these officers.<sup>3</sup>

It is easy to discover, from the picture which Gregory of Tours gives of a pious bishop, that it was expected in those times that he should obtain justice for the people, help for the poor, consolation for widows, and the most thorough protection for the young.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Wilkin's *Concil. Aug.* f. 59. Alcuin also regarded it as a crime that an offender *fugitivus ad Christi Dei nostri et sanctorum ejus patrocinia de ecclesia ad eadem reddi vincula*. See ep. 195 to Charles the Great.

<sup>2</sup> See *Concil. Tolet.* iii. an. 589, c. 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Sunt enim prospectores episcopi secundum regiam admonitionem qualiter judices cum populis agant.*

<sup>4</sup> *Gregor. Turonens.* l. iv. c. 35. We do not speak of the law passed by the emperor Charles, whereby he extended the ancient judicial power of the bishops beyond its proper bounds, and according to which, although only one party appealed to their tribunal, the other, against its will, was compelled to follow: later enquiries have brought into question the genuineness of this law, which agrees so little with the character of Charlemagne's government.

Hence, through the peculiar light in which, by virtue of their office, the bishops appeared to both the people and the princes, and through the power which they gradually acquired as political authorities, they were able to exercise a very great and wholesome influence on the entire social system.

But this could only be the case when they understood their calling in the true spiritual sense, and knew how to conduct the business not proper to their office according to this view. Great were the temptations to which they were exposed, drawn as they were into manifold worldly engagements, to forget the spiritual in the temporal calling; and thus they were obliged to render themselves independent of that very power which it was their object to guide by the spirit of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. THE INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

In regard to the internal constitution of the church, many dangers were necessarily created by the manner in which Christianity was first introduced among the people, and by the establishment of new social relations. A natural consequence thereof was the increasing importance of the monks in respect to the clergy.<sup>2</sup> They were, for the most part, the founders of the new churches, whence the improvement of the people and of the land

<sup>1</sup> Alcuin complains of this, ep. 112. *Pastores curæ turbant seculares, qui Deo vacare debuerunt, vagari per terras et milites Christi seculo militare coguntur, et gladium verbi Dei inter oris claustra qualibet cogente necessitate recondunt.* He also complains of the priests, who were anxious about worldly honours only, and neglected their spiritual duties, ep. 37. *Quidam sacerdotes Christi, qui habent parochias, et honores seculi et gradus ministerii non (we should perhaps read una) volunt habere.* So also he writes to Arno, archbishop of Saltzburg, who himself had lamented that he was obliged, on account of his temporal engagements, to neglect the better labour, the care of souls. *Si apostolico exemplo vivamus, et pauperem agamus vitam in terris, sicut illi fecerunt, seculi servitium juste abdicamus. Nunc vero seculi principes habent justam, ut videtur, causam, ecclesiam Christi servitio suo opprimere.*

<sup>2</sup> The use of the tonsure passed from the monks to the clergy. Thus it was usual for the former, in the fourth century, on their entrance into the monastic state, to have their hair cut off, in sign of their renouncing the world, and in reference, perhaps, to the vows of the Nazarenes, the monks being regarded in the Greek church as Christian Nazarenes. In the fifth century the same sign was employed by the clergy, who were also to renounce the world. It was then the custom for the clergy to make the sign of the tonsure in forma coronæ. *Concil. Tolet. iv. 633, c. 41, Omnes clerici vel lectores sicut levitæ et sacerdotes detonso superius toto capite inferius solam circuli coronam relinquunt.*

took its rise ; while their severe manners and their zeal, active in overcoming all difficulties, placed them in striking contrast with the licentious clergy. This continued to be the case till the wealth which was acquired by the stern labour of the monks themselves robbed monkhood of its original virtue. When now the corrupt state of the clergy in France awakened the wish for a reformation, the respect and honour in which the monks were held, led many to take them as their example, and in many of the experiments thus made, especially since the institution of the Augustine rule, the clergy had united themselves with some monastic order. The most complete experiment of this kind was attempted, about the middle of the eighth century, by Chrodegang, bishop of Mentz, the founder of the so-called canonical life of the clergy. He directed that the union among them should be founded chiefly after the pattern of the Benedictine rule. The clergy were, in fact, mainly distinguished from the monkish orders by the possession of property. They lived together in one house ; eat together at one table ; a portion of meat and drink was measured to each according to a prescribed rule ; at the canonical hours (*horæ canonicæ*) they assembled to join in prayer and song ; meetings of all the members were held at fixed times ; and in these assemblies passages of Scripture, with the rule of the order,<sup>1</sup> were read, and those who had broken it were rebuked. The rule thus adopted was greatly admired, and was received with some few alterations at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 816, as the general law of the French church. This alteration in the life of the clergy had, at the beginning, a very useful influence. On the one side it presented a barrier to their irregularities, and on the other it modified their slavish dependence on the bishops, which had been promoted, partly by the increasing power of the latter in their political character and relations, and partly by the admission of serfs into the clerical order.<sup>2</sup> The beneficial effects thus promoted were further increased by the closer degree of social intercourse which now existed between the clergy and the bishop.

The great extent of many of the new ecclesiastical districts,

<sup>1</sup> *Capitula*: hence the term Cathedral-chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Hence they even dared to inflict corporal chastisement on their clergy.

and the remains of barbarism and heathen superstition which still largely prevailed, demanded the strictest oversight on the part of the bishops. Hence that which had already come into practice, and had been adopted by conscientious bishops as their duty, was now defined by law. Thus the second Council of Braga in Spain,<sup>1</sup> held in the year 572, directed by its first canon, that the bishops should visit every place in their dioceses, and should diligently enquire into the conduct of the clergy, and whether they were well acquainted with all things pertaining to the service of the church. If they should find this not to be the case, they were themselves to instruct them in their duty. Having thus, in the first instance, examined the clergy, they were to assemble the people on the following day, and to exhort them to abstain from idolatry, and from their former vices.<sup>2</sup> The Synod held at Cloveshove in 747 also directed, by its third canon, that the bishops should hold a yearly visitation in their dioceses; and that, in every place, both men and women, of all classes, should be summoned into their presence, that the Word of God might be proclaimed to them, and a warning given against the practice of heathen rites.

In these visitations the bishops of the Frankish churches introduced a regulation which contributed greatly to facilitate their moral oversight of the people.<sup>3</sup> We allude to the institution of the so-called ecclesiastical tribunals,<sup>4</sup> founded in conformity with the rule that the bishops were to hold yearly, in every part of their diocese, a spiritual court. Every member of the community was bound to give information respecting the commission of any crime which might have come to his knowledge. Seven of the most enlightened men in each congregation were appointed, under the name of deans (*Decani*) to take especial charge of the rest. The

1 *Concilium Bracarense. ii.*

2 *Doceant illos, ut errores fugiant idolorum vel diversa crimina, id est, homicidium, adulterium, perjurium, falsum testimonium, et reliqua peccata mortifera; aut quod nolunt sibi fieri non faciant alteri, et ut credant resurrectionem omnium hominum et diem iudicii, in quo unusquisque secundum sua opera recepturus est.*

3 The emperor Charles directed, in a capitulary of the year 801, ut episcopi circum-eant parochias sibi commissas, et ibi inquirendi studium habeant de incestu, de parri-cidiis, fratricidiis, adulteriis, cenodoxiis et aliis malis, quae contraria sunt Deo.

4 These institutions, the popular name of which was probably a corruption of the word Synod, were subsequently known, in reference to the trials there held by the bishops, *Plucita Episcoporum.*

archdeacons set out several days before, in order to announce the intended visitation of the bishop, and to see that all things were prepared for holding his court. At his arrival, the first thing which he did was to receive the oath of the deans, who thereby solemnly promised that they would not be moved by respect to persons to conceal any offence against the divine law. He then questioned them particularly and distinctly in reference to the observance of heathen customs, and whether every father taught his children the creed and the Lord's prayer. He also made enquiry as to the continued practice of those crimes which had been prevalent among the people in former times, and the enormity of which was then altogether disregarded. The appointed punishments, some of which were corporal, were then duly inflicted, and that there might be no difficulty in this administration of punishment, the officers of government were bound, in case of necessity, to assist the bishops with their authority.<sup>1</sup>

These ecclesiastical courts were capable of becoming very serviceable to the people in their then half barbarous state; but they were also attended with some prejudicial consequences. Thus the judgment of the church which, according to its original intention, ought to have been confined to spiritual matters, and to have ordained only spiritual punishments, acquired the form of a civil sentence; while the church itself, assuming an authority not proper to its province or calling, became guilty of various acts of oppression, and of a tyrannous violation of the rights of conscience.

To support the old diocesan union, an opposing power was needed to resist the abuses of various kinds which arose from the new relations of the church, and which threatened to dissolve its former institutions. There existed a law in the early church, according to which no clergyman could be ordained otherwise than to a certain, defined parish.<sup>2</sup> The missions first rendered it necessary to depart from the strict observance of this rule. No definite ecclesiastical district could be assigned to the monks or clergymen who went forth as missionaries. But that which was at first justified by especial circumstances, continued to be practised when those circumstances could no longer be advanced in

<sup>1</sup> Regino of Prüm has given a very exact account of the manner in which these tribunals were held, in his work *De disciplina*.

<sup>2</sup> Or against the *ordinare absolute χειροτονεῖν ἀπολύτως*.

its defence, and when, irregular in itself, it was the cause of numerous other irregularities. Thus unworthy men procured ordination by simony, and then travelled about the country exercising the power of the priestly office for gain. To correct this abuse, the old laws against the *ordinationes absolutæ* were renewed.<sup>1</sup> But this effected little. Another abuse arose. According to the old principles of the church, princes, as well as all other persons, were required to take part in the public services of religion with the rest of the congregation. But the spirit which prevailed in the Byzantine empire, first introduced the novelty, so opposed to the primitive rule, of allowing the emperor and empress to have private chaplains in their palace; whence the origin of court preachers.<sup>2</sup>

Whether tempted by this example, or induced by the necessity arising from the migratory character of their court, the Frankish princes selected certain clergymen to accompany them, and perform the service of the church. At the head of these ministers was an arch-chaplain (*archicapellanus*; *Primicerius palatii*) and this body of clergy exercised, by their constant and close intercourse with the prince, an important influence on the affairs of the church. The example of the prince was followed by other great men. Nobles and knights appointed private chaplains, and placed particular priests in their castles. This practice was attended with very injurious consequences. The clergy thus employed and protected, threatened to make themselves independent of the bishop's inspection.<sup>3</sup> The result was that the proper services of the parish church lost their dignity: they were attended

<sup>1</sup> See the capitularies of the emperor Charles in the year 789 and 794.

<sup>2</sup> Constantine the Great seems to have already introduced this rule. Eusebius (*de Vita Constantini* l. iv., c. 17), merely says, that he converted his palace, as it were, into a church, being accustomed to hold meetings in it for prayer and reading the Bible. Sozomen, however, says, l. i. 8, that he had erected a chapel *εὐκτήριος οἶκος* in his palace; and that it was also his custom to set apart, in war, a particular tent for divine worship, to which certain of the clergy were assigned. It appears also, that several distinguished persons followed the example of the emperor, and had chaplains in their houses; whence the order of the second Council in Trullo, that no clergyman should baptize or celebrate the Lord's Supper in a private chapel without consent of the bishop. C. xxxi., *τοὺς ἐν εὐκτηρίοις οἰκοῖς ἔνδον οἰκίας τυγχάνουσι λειτουργοῦντας ἢ βαπτίζοντας κληρικοὺς ὑπὸ γνῶμης τοῦτο πραττεῖν τοῦ κατὰ τόπον ἐπισκόπου.*

<sup>3</sup> The council held at Chalons sur Saone (*Concilium Cabilonense*) in the year 650, c. 14, complained to the bishops: *quod oratoria per villas potentum jam longo constructa tempore et facultates ibidem collatas ipsi, quorum villæ sunt, episcopis contradicant, et jam nec ipsos clericos, qui ad ipsa oratoria deserviunt, ab archidiacono coerceri permittant.*



only by the peasantry; the rich and poor had now their distinct worship of God.<sup>1</sup> The knights, moreover, often selected for their chaplains worthless men, mere rambles, who contented themselves with the most mechanical repetition of the liturgy, and were ready to become the instruments of any vice or folly. Even serfs were sometimes appointed by their masters to this office, and though chaplains, were still expected to perform the most menial duties. Both religion and the clerical character were disgraced by these abuses. Numerous regulations were introduced to oppose them, and secure the respect due to the public service of the church.

The diocesan authority of the bishops suffered an additional injury from the influence which the laity obtained, as founders of churches, for themselves and their descendants. The emperor Justinian laid the first foundation for this right of patronage by the laws which he published in the years 541 and 555. Thus he granted to those who founded churches, and endowed them with a specific income for the maintenance of the minister, the right which descended to their heirs of recommending to the bishop worthy candidates for these livings. The final decision was, therefore, still dependent upon the appellation of the diocesan.<sup>2</sup> When under the new circumstances which had arisen, numerous churches were erected by private landholders on their estates, it was found necessary to give a more definite form to this arrangement. On the one side, it was considered but just, that the founders of churches should be secured against the danger of seeing the property which they had devoted to a holy purpose, rendered of no avail by the negligence or the avarice of the bishops. The right of inspection was, therefore, allowed them, and they were authorized to present to the bishop properly qualified men to be placed in the churches which they had founded. This was definitely stated by the ninth Council of Toledo, held in the year 655.<sup>3</sup> The

1 The Council of Clermont, in the year 535, c. 15, and the capitulary of the year 787, c. 9, *Ut in diebus festis vel dominicis omnes ad ecclesiam veniant et non invitent presbyteros ad domos suas admissas faciendas.*

2 Thus the novels of Justinian: *εἴ τις εὐκτήριον οἶκον κατασκευάσει καὶ βουλευθείη ἐν αὐτῷ κληρικούς, προβαλλεσθαι, ἢ αὐτοὶ ἢ οἱ τούτου κληρονομοί, εἰ τὰς δαπάνας αὐτοὶ τοῖς κληρικοῖς χορηγήσουσι, καὶ ἀξίους ὀνομάσουσι, τοὺς ονομασθέντας χειροτονεῖσθαι.*

3 C. 2. *Ut quamdiu ecclesiarum fundatores in hac vita superstites exstiterint, pro eisdem locis curam permittantur habere sollicitam atque rectores idoneos iisdem ipsi offerant episcopis ordinandos.*

same privilege was secured to the descendants of such persons; and they were allowed to make an appeal to the king, if, on discovering that the property left by their ancestors to the church was misemployed, their complaint to the bishop or metropolitan should be disregarded. But, on the other side, it could not fail to be soon discovered, that abuses might arise from the patrons themselves; that they might pervert church property to their own objects, as if it were a private possession; that, as the princes acted in respect to bishoprics, they might make a simoniacal trade of livings; or regard the ministers as their dependants, and endeavour to withdraw them from the power of the diocesan. Many laws accordingly were introduced by different synods, from the middle of the sixth up to the beginning of the ninth century, for the purpose of resisting these corruptions.<sup>1</sup> The sixth Council of Arles, held in 513, complains,<sup>2</sup> that the laity were accustomed, for avaricious objects, to recommend men to the priestly office who were unworthy of the calling. It was, therefore, forbidden for the future, that presents should be accepted for such recommendations.<sup>3</sup>

While so many adverse influences threatened to dissolve the diocesan constitution, the bishops, in order to secure and facilitate their oversight of their extensive provinces, began to divide them into several districts (*capitula ruralia*), placing over every such district an arch-presbyter as an inspector of the other priests and ministers. But the deacons, and especially the arch-deacons, had gradually acquired an authority far exceeding that which originally belonged to their office.<sup>4</sup> This was the consequence of

<sup>1</sup> The fourth Council of Orleans, held in 541, c. 7, *Ut in oratoriis domini praediorum mimine contra votum episcopi peregrinos clericos intrmittant*, c. 26. *Si quae parochiae in potentum domibus constitutae sunt, ubi observantes clerici ab archidiacono civitatis admoniti, fortasse quod ecclesiae debent, sub specie domini domus implere neglexerint, corrigantur secundum ecclesiasticam disciplinam.* Compare the third Council of Toledo, 589, c. 19. Thus Boniface ordered: *Ut laici presbyteros non ejiciant de ecclesiis nec mittere praesumant sine consensu episcoporum suorum, ut omnino non audeant numera exigere a presbyterio propter commendationem ecclesiae cuique presbytero.* Bonifac. Epistolae. Ed. Würdtwein, f. 140.

<sup>2</sup> C. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ut laici omnino a presbyterio non audeant munera exigere propter commendationem ecclesiae.*

<sup>4</sup> Thus Concil. Toletan iv. an. 633, c. 39. *Nonnulli diacones in tantam erumpunt superbiam, ut se presbyteris antepoant.* And the Council of Merida in Spain, (Concilium Emeritense an. 666, c. 5, ordered that a bishop should send only an archpresbyter, or presbyter, and no deacon, as his representative to a council.

their constant intercourse with the bishops, by whom they were frequently employed as their representatives, or ambassadors on business of importance. Hence it appears to have been, that the bishops in the eighth or ninth century introduced the custom of appointing archdeacons to inspect certain important portions of their dioceses, and to these officers the parish ministers, though priests, were subjected.<sup>1</sup> Thus arose the great power of the archdeacons. It was intended to act as a check to the abuses which had found their way into the government of the different dioceses; but being itself abused, it became the source of oppression, and operated injuriously on the church.<sup>2</sup>

In respect to the general forms of ecclesiastical union, the institution of metropolitans passed over into the new churches, and many laws were published by the different synods to secure its stability. But while it strictly agreed with the political constitution of the Roman empire, the dead letter of the laws could never inspire it with the vigour which it possessed in the ancient church, various as were the circumstances which now prevailed, and no city existing which answered properly to the metropolis of the Roman empire. The honours and influence of a bishop, under the new state of things, were determined far more by the personal talents, and personal circumstances of the individual, than by the political position of the city which formed the capital of his diocese. The Frankish bishops, therefore, had nothing to tempt them to subject themselves to such a state of dependence, and the free spirit of their nation taught them to oppose it. This dislike of the bishops to recognise any power in their immediate neighbourhood which would thus reduce them to dependence, rendered them so much the more willing to confess their dependence on the distant head of the whole church, less burdensome in itself, and affording them a protection against the hated tyranny

<sup>1</sup> Thus it appears that the archdeacon was the representative or plenipotentiary of the bishop at the Council of Chalons, in the year 650, c. 7. The authority and income appended to the office of archdeacon tempted laymen to desire the appointment. Thus the emperor Charles issued a decree in the year 805, c. 2. *Ne archidiaconi sint laici*. In a similar manner it was ordered by a council held at Rheims in 630, c. 19, in regard to the appointment of archpresbyters: *Ut in parochiis nullus laicorum archipresbyter praeponatur*.

<sup>2</sup> As appears from an order issued by a synod, held in 745, at the wish of Boniface: *Praevideant episcopi, ne cupiditas archidiaconorum suorum culpas nutriat: quia multis modis mentitur iniquitas sibi*. Bonifac. cpp. f. 161.

of the metropolitans. All this had an important influence in promoting the development of that ecclesiastical constitution, the papacy, which was so closely connected with the whole church system.

Everything which had any relation to the progress of the church theocratic system, now depended upon the perfecting of the papacy. So long as the bishops, placed in a position dependent on the prince, had each singly to struggle with his power, it was not likely that the church would generally come out victorious. But all was changed when the highest position in the entire church was occupied by a man, whose situation rendered him independent of princes, and who, systematically pursuing one object, made all things yield to his design. We remarked in the history of the preceding period, how the ideal of such a papacy had been already formed in the souls of the Roman bishops, and how they had already employed whatever means they possessed in support of their views. But in an age which was forcibly disjoined from its historical connection with the preceding centuries, many things of this kind, viewed at a distance, might possess a greater importance than they had in and for themselves.

We begin this period with a man, who, deeply impressed with the conviction that, as the successor of the apostle Peter, he was charged by God with the care and supreme government of the whole church, proved by his energy, and by his thoughtful regard for every part of the church, both far and near, what one man at the head of the whole was capable of accomplishing amid every kind of resistance and distraction. This was Gregory the First, surnamed the Great. Drawn from the quiet of a cloister,<sup>1</sup> and consecrated to meditation, Gregory saw himself involved in the management of the most various affairs. While he would fain have devoted himself entirely to the duties of his pastoral office, he was compelled, for the advantage of his people, and to fulfil at the same time his duty to his church, and to the Greek empire, of which he was a vassal, to undertake many troublesome kinds of business altogether foreign to his spiritual calling. As an eye-witness of the devastations produced by a deadly pestilence, and by the sword of the merciless barbarians ;<sup>2</sup> and while he himself

<sup>1</sup> Gregory says of himself: *Quasi prospero flatu navigabam, cum tranquillam vitam in monasterio ducerem, sed procellosis subito motibus tempestas exorta in sua perturbatione me rapuit.* lib. ix. ep. 121

<sup>2</sup> He himself gives this picture of his times: *Destructae urbes, eversa sunt castra*

was laid prostrate for months on a bed of sickness,<sup>1</sup> he was still obliged to bear these heavy and various burdens. Thus he had to watch for the security of the imperial territory in Italy, contracted more and more by the progress of the Lombards, and to hold frequent communications with that people. If for the peace and safety of his flock he conceded any point to the invaders, he found himself accused at the court of the emperor of having sacrificed their rights. But it was his constant care to lighten the sufferings of the Italians impoverished by the war, and to help all who sought refuge with him from the countries exposed to its ravages. He watched carefully the conduct of the bishops in his particular patriarchate, and punished severely those who forgot their duty, thinking to escape through the general disorder of the times. It was a part of his business to inspect the management of the church property in North-Africa, in Gaul, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and many provinces of the East. For this purpose he sent to these different countries certain of his clergy as *Defensores*, and thereby formed both religious and political alliances in all those provinces,<sup>2</sup> secured the regular transmission of intelli-

depopulati agri, in solitudinem terra redacta est, nullus in agris incola, paene nullus in urbibus habitator remansit, et tamen ipsae parvae generis humani reliquiae adhuc quotidie et sine cessatione feriuntur. Alios in captivitatem duci, alios detruncari, alios interfici videmus. Ipsa autem, quae aliquando mundi domina esse videbatur, qualis remanserit, conspicimus. Immensis doloribus multipliciter attrita, desolatione civium, impressione hostium, frequentia ruinarum. See Ezechiel l. ii. vi. § 21. The desolation effected by the pestilence seemed as nothing when compared with that produced by the sword. Thus he spoke consolingly on death by the plague. Quantas detruncationes, quantas crudelitates vidimus, quibus mors sola remedium et erat vita tormentum. Epp. l. x. ep. 63.

<sup>1</sup> He says: Quam grave sit confusis temporibus locis majoribus esse praepositum, ex nostro prorsus dolore sentimus. Epp. l. x. ep. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory was not likely to be able to judge, at a distance, the conduct of the princes who governed the East-Roman empire, with as little prejudice as he judged that of the Frankish sovereign. He was here blinded by particular ecclesiastical interests; and in his letters, for example, to the emperor Phocas, and to Brunehild, he employed rather the language of the court and of policy than that of Christian simplicity and truth. Thus the manner in which he offered his congratulations to the emperor Phocas l. xiii. ep. 31, on his accession to the throne, although accomplished by crime, and of which he speaks as a glorious work of God, is especially charged against him. He added, however, some excellent advice to the emperor, and in this appeared not as a courtier, but as a Christian bishop. Reformetur jam singulis sub jugo imperii pii libertas sua. Hoc namque inter reges gentium et reipublicae imperatores distat, quod reges gentium domini servorum sunt, imperatores vero reipublicae domini liberorum: excellent advice surely for a Byzantine emperor!

gence from them, and was enabled to exercise corresponding influence on their condition.

Gregory, as we have said, was inspired with the conviction that the care and government of the whole church belonged to him as the successor of the apostle Peter. He believed that he might extend his jurisdiction to the Greek church ;<sup>1</sup> and he regarded it as his duty to uphold the especial dignity of that of Rome, as furthering thereby the spiritual interests of the entire Christian world. Personal honours having no higher object than the individual, he rejected, and considered them as calculated to disturb a bishop in the fulfilment of his pastoral duties. It being the custom in Sicily for the bishops to keep the day on which the Pope was ordained as a festival, Gregory forbade it as a foolish, vain, and superficial mark of respect.<sup>2</sup> If they must needs come together, they should rather select for that purpose the festival of the Apostle Peter, that they might thank him from whom they had received the pastoral office.<sup>3</sup> A bishop of Messina having sent him an elegant robe as a token of honour, he ordered it to be sold, and the price which it obtained to be forwarded to the bishop.<sup>4</sup> With the money he sent a letter, in which he said, that it behoved them to suppress those customs which tended to burden the churches ; that presents ought not to be sent to parties from whom they were rather to be expected ;<sup>5</sup> and that he, accordingly, forbade any to be given him in future. When the same bishop proposed to make a journey to Rome, Gregory besought him not to take this trouble, but rather to pray that the farther they were separated from each other, the more closely they might be united,

1 De Constantinopolitana ecclesia quis eam dubitet, apostolicæ sedi esse subjectam ? Quod et piissimus imperator et frater noster ejusdem civitatis episcopus assidue profitemtur. L. ix. ep. 12. This agrees but badly with the dispute, to be hereafter mentioned, between Gregory and the patriarch of Constantinople. In reference to the proceedings of a Council at Constantinople, he had already laid it down as a principle, l. ix. ep. 68. Sine apostolicæ sedis auctoritate atque consensu nullas quæque acta fuerint vires habeant.

2 Quia stulta et vana superfluitas non delectat.

3 Ex cujus largitate pastores sint. As the authority given to Peter to bind and to loose was the fountain of all episcopal power, so all bishops are the organs of the Apostle Peter. This idea was gradually converted into that idea, according to which all episcopal power, and the nomination of all bishops, should proceed from the Church of Rome. See lib. i. ep. 36.

4 L. i. ep. 66, Non delectamur xeniis.

5 Ne illuc aliqua cogantur inferre, unde sibi inferenda debent potius expectare.

by the help of Christ, in the communion of charity. We have already remarked, that Gregory was far from making the church of Rome the sole pattern for all liturgical arrangements. He proclaimed it as a principle that that which is good, however humble the particular church in which it is found, ought to be imitated.<sup>1</sup> He warned his steward and ministers in Sicily against injuring the rights of others in their zeal to uphold those of the Romish church.<sup>2</sup> Then only could he be properly regarded as a true servant of the Apostle Peter, when in all circumstances he unreservedly supported the cause of truth.<sup>3</sup> The proceedings of Gregory against Natalis, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, afford a striking example of the manner in which he could use his dignity for the punishment of unworthy bishops, and gives, at the same time, a no less striking proof of the fact, that the prelates of this age needed such inspection. The bishop referred to had neglected his spiritual duties, and employed the greater part of his time and money in feasting. He sent the church vessels and furniture as presents to his parents; and because the observation of the archdeacon, Honoratus, who resisted such unlawful proceedings, was offensive to him, he effected his dismissal, under the pretence that he was anxious for his elevation.<sup>4</sup> Gregory commanded him to restore the archdeacon; severely reproved his pastoral conduct, and threatened him with a still heavier punishment. The unblushing sophistical manner in which Natalis ventured to defend his conduct, brought upon him greater disgrace. Thus he justified his feastings by alleging, that Abraham was judged worthy to entertain angels; that such hospitality was a work of charity;<sup>5</sup> that Christ was called "a gluttonous man" (Matt. xi.

<sup>1</sup> L. ix. ep. 12. Ego et minores meos, quos ab illicitis prohibeo, in bono imitari paratus sum. Stultus est enim, qui in eo se primum existimat, ut bona, quae viderit, discernere contemnat.

<sup>2</sup> See l. i. ep. 36, ad Petrum subdiaconum.

<sup>3</sup> Tunc vere Petri Apostoli miles eris, si in causis ejus veritatis custodiam etiam sine ejus acceptatione teneas. And he gave him this advice, certainly honestly meant, Laici nobiles pro humilitate te diligant, non pro superbia perhorrescant. Et tamen quum eos fortasse contra quoslibet inopes injustitiam aliquam agere cognoscis, humilitatem protinus in erectionem verte, ut eis semper et bene agentibus subditus et male agentibus adversarius existas.

<sup>4</sup> A person raised from the office of archdeacon to the rank of presbyter, lost more than he gained. See above.

<sup>5</sup> See lib. ii. ep. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Gregory gave the bishop, who seems to have indulged in some satirical remarks

19), and that he who eats not ought not to judge those who do (Romans xiv. 3.) The exhortation<sup>1</sup> to the study of the Holy Scriptures, Natalis repelled with the remark, that he was oppressed by too many sorrows to be able to read, and that he appealed to the promise of Christ for the illumination of the Spirit. In reference to the first of these apologies, Gregory answered, that as the Holy Scriptures are given for our consolation, the more we are oppressed by suffering, the more ought they to be our study. To the second he replied, that the divine word would have been given in vain, if, because we are filled with the Spirit, we need not the letter of Scripture. But, he observed, a man may doubtless trust to one source of support in times of persecution, while in seasons of rest he must pursue a different course.<sup>2</sup>

While Gregory asserted generally for the Roman Church the right of inspection over all others, this was particularly the case in regard to the church of Constantinople.<sup>3</sup> Still he was far from denying the independence of the bishops, or wishing to injure it. When Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, who, as was common with the Greeks, used words of compliment with little attention to their meaning, employed in one of his letters to Gregory the expression, "As you commanded," Gregory prayed him always to avoid such terms, "for I know who I am and who you are. According to rank, you are my brother; according to piety, my father. I have not commanded you, but only sought to explain to you what seems to me profitable." He had also addressed him as *Papa universalis*; a title of honour, which the Greek bishops

against him, this excellent answer: Convivia, quae ex intentione impendendae caritatis fiunt, recte sanctitas vestra in suis epistolis laudat. Sed tamen sciendum est, quia tunc ex caritate veraciter prodeunt, quum in eis nulla absentium vita mordetur, nullus ex irrisione reprehenditur, et nec inanes in eis secularium negotiorum fabulae: sed verba sacrae lectionis audiuntur, quum non plus quam necesse est servitur corpori, sed sola ejus infirmitas reficitur, ut ad usum exercendae virtutis habeatur. Haec itaque si vos in vestris conviviis agitis, abstinentium fateor magistri estis.

<sup>1</sup> In this respect also Gregory says well: Quia neque ego non comedo neque ad hoc a Paulo dictum est, ut membra Christi, quae in ejus corpore, id est, in ecclesia invicem sibi caritatis compage connexa sunt, nullam de se ullo modo curam gerant.

<sup>2</sup> Aliud est, frater carissime, quod angustati persecutionis tempore absque dubitatione confidere, aliud quod in tranquillitate ecclesiae agere debemus. Oportet enim nos per hunc spiritum modo legendo percipere quae possimus, si contigerit causa in nobis, etiam patiendone demonstrare.

<sup>3</sup> So that an appeal might be made from the decision of the patriarch of Constantinople to Rome. Gregor. ep. lib. vi. ep. 24.



of the larger sees were accustomed to assume in their extravagant rhetorical style of language, without assigning any very strict meaning to the words. But Gregory, who understood the meaning of this predicate more exactly, regarded it as offensive. He disliked a title which seemed injurious to the honour of his colleagues.<sup>1</sup> Far be it from bishops to employ words which tend to inflate vanity, and wound charity. This was the view which Gregory took when Johannes (*νηστευτής*), patriarch of Constantinople, adopted the title of œcumenical bishop, a not unfrequent practice with the prelates of the chief cities in the East. No particular wrong was intended by those who, according to the fondness for titles among the Greeks, assumed this appellation; but Gregory viewed it as full of peril. So blinded, indeed, was he by his passionate zeal for the honour of the Roman see, which he believed to be injured hereby, that he gave importance to things which otherwise were of no weight.<sup>2</sup> Hence he refused to admit any of the representations made to him by the patriarch, and others, who offered their mediation in the dispute. He could only understand the obnoxious expression in its strict sense: not in that in which it was intended to be taken by those who used it.<sup>3</sup> Nor did he act in his proceeding against the patriarch Johannes with Christian uprightness. He reproached him for his arrogance in a mild but earnest tone, not, however, in the spirit of Christian charity, but because, as he acknowledged to his representative at Constantinople, he wished to spare the emperor.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nec honorem esse deputo, in quo fratres meos honorem suum perdere cognosco. Meus namque honor est honor universalis ecclesiæ. L. viii., ep. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Thus he was capable of saying, as if an individual could make the faith of the whole church dependent upon himself: In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere. L. v., ep. 19.

<sup>3</sup> The patriarch Anastasius, of Antioch, had admonished him, and not without reason, that he ought to take care not to be untrue to his own character in this dispute, and to avoid giving room to the evil spirit in his soul, lest he might disturb, through a quarrel on a mere trifle, the unity and peace of the church. But Gregory, who would only view the word in its strictest sense, would listen to no advice, but replied: Si hanc causam æquanimiter portamus, universæ ecclesiæ fidem corrumpimus. Scitis enim, quanti non solum hæretici, sed etiam hæresiarchæ de Constantinopolitana sunt egressi. ep. 27.

<sup>4</sup> L. v., ep. 19. He was unwilling to write two letters: he had, therefore, written only one, quæ utrumque videtur habere admixtum, id est, et rectitudinem et amaritudinem. Tu itaque dilectio eam epistolam, quam nunc direxi, propter voluntatem imperatoris dare studeat. Nam de subsequenti talis alia transmittetur, de qua ejus superbia non lætetur.

Notwithstanding all this, however, the pious spirit of Gregory spoke when he so earnestly argued, that the title referred to ought to be conferred on no man, but on the Saviour only, the invisible head of the universal church. "As Paul, indeed, had heard that some said, 'I am of Paul,' and others, 'I am of Apollos,' and others, 'I am of Cephas,' and exclaimed with the strongest indignation, because he saw how by this separation of the body of Christ other heads were sought, 'was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?' If, then, he would not suffer the members of the Lord's body to subject themselves to any other head than Christ, not even to an apostle, what will you say to Christ, the head of the universal church, at the last judgment? You who have sought by the title of universal bishop to subject all his members to yourself? What, indeed, is even Peter, the first of the apostles, but a member of the holy universal church? What are Paul, Andrew, and John, but heads of particular congregations? All are but members under the one head."<sup>1</sup> Gregory did not accomplish his design; and later Roman bishops made no scruple of assuming the disputed predicate.<sup>2</sup>

In respect to the relation in which the Popes stood to the East-Roman emperors, these, their ancient lords, must have been especially anxious to favour the pontiffs as their richest and most powerful vassals, as those who exercised the greatest influence over the people, and whose aid was more particularly needed, now that the advances of the Lombards threatened every day more and more the safety of the western provinces. Hence they were ready to concede many privileges to the Popes. The latter, indeed, still acknowledged their dependence on the Roman empire. From their first entrance upon their office, they kept up a constant correspondence with the emperors by means of representatives<sup>3</sup> chosen

1 Certe Petrus apostolorum primus membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ, Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? Et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra. L. v., ep. 18.

2 That Gregory was induced, in opposition to the arrogance of the patriarchs, to assume the title of a *servus servorum Dei* in his epistles, is not so certain, nor does it necessarily follow from the words of John the deacon. Vita Gregorii, l. ii., c. 1, Primus omnium se in principio epistolarum suarum servum servorum Dei scribi satis humiliter definiit. This predicate, however, agrees well with the manner in which he viewed his office. L. xi., ep. 44. Ego per episcopatus onera servus sum omnium factus.

<sup>3</sup> Responsales: Apocrisarii.

from among their clergy ; and the confirmation of the election of the Romish clergy, and great men of the community, was sought for at Constantinople before they could be ordained.<sup>1</sup> Some of the Popes, as we shall see in the history of doctrines, suffered disgraceful treatment from the Greek emperors, when they resisted their will. But the nearer the power of these monarchs grew to an end in Italy, the nearer also the dependence of the Popes approached its end ; and this became more and more the case as their relation to the governments and churches which arose on the ruins of the Roman empire acquired a more definite character.

Both ecclesiastically and politically, the position which the Popes occupied in respect to their nearest neighbours, the Lombards, was the most unfavourable. This people were the enemies of the eastern empire, and the devoted champions of Arianism. The latter cause of hostility had ceased, indeed, when Queen Theodolinde, in the year 587, entered the Catholic church ; but the former cause still continued to operate, except as now and then an example occurred of the influence which individual pontiffs exercised on the minds of some of the Lombard princes, as the supposed successors of the Apostle Peter.

The Spanish church had been, from very early times, in close union with that of Rome. This union had only been broken by the establishment of the West-Gothic kingdom in Spain, the founders of which were Arians. But the old Spanish communities kept up their union with the church of Rome even under a foreign yoke, and the intercourse became of still greater importance. When the West-Gothic king Reckared, in the year 589, professed his belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, the whole Spanish church assumed the same relation to that of Rome as had been the case with the little party of which we have spoken above. The most dignified of the bishops now desired to receive the pallium from Gregory as the token of their primacy, and hence the commencement of an actual and vital change. The active Gregory employed this opportunity to exercise his supreme authority in the

<sup>1</sup> In the public records of the Popes in the eighth century, *Liber Diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, we find the form of such a petition to the emperor. *Lacrimabiliter cuncti famuli supplicamus, ut dominorum pietas servorum suorum obsecrationes dignanter exaudiat, et concessa pietatis suæ jussione petentium desideria ad effectum de ordinatione ipsius præcipiat pervenire.*

affair of two bishops, who had been deposed by the tyranny of a Spanish noble, and his efforts were crowned with success. An attempt was made by the Spanish monarch Witiza, in the year 701, to recover the independence of his church. Some Spanish clergymen having addressed their appellations to Rome, he forbade all such appellations; and refused to give any legal sanction to the ordination of a foreign bishop for any of the churches of his kingdom. But soon after this Spain was torn from its union with the rest of Christendom by the invasion of the Arabs; and these circumstances lost their value in relation to the development of ecclesiastical government.

The English church, as we have already remarked, could not fail, through the means and mode of its foundation, to hold a position especially dependent on Rome. This dependence continued, and was perpetually increased. English monks, nuns, and bishops, nobles and princes, made frequent pilgrimages to the grave of St Peter at Rome, and this crowd of pilgrims served to promote the strict, original union. Prejudicial as these pilgrimages often proved to morality, it must not be forgotten that such journeys, and the intercourse with lands where more refinement had been preserved from early times, were well calculated to promote the improvement of a people who were still so rude; England receiving by these means a supply of Bibles and other books, and the seed of various arts.<sup>1</sup> The conduct of some princes who indulged themselves in outbreaks of passion against the Pope's authority, weighs little against the general rule.

Far less favourable were the relations in which the Romish church stood to that of France. The latter had been founded independently of Rome, in a land which had furnished examples of ecclesiastical independence in earlier times; among a people who were characteristically opposed to any foreign yoke; and whose

<sup>1</sup> Beda says of the English abbot Benedictus Viscopius, who lived at the end of the seventh century: *Toties mare transiit, nunquam vacuus et inutilis rediit: sed nunc librorum copiam sanctorum, nunc architectos ecclesiæ fabricandæ, nunc vitrificatores ad fenestras ejus decorandas ac muniendas; nunc picturas sanctorum historiarum, quæ non ad ornatum solummodo ecclesiæ, verum etiam ad instructionem proponerentur, advexit, videlicet ut qui literarum lectione non possent, opera Domini et salvatoris nostri per ipsarum continuum discerent imaginum.* See Bolland. *Acta Sanctorum Mens. Januar. t. i. f. 746.* He also says of the same: *Oceano transmisso Gallias petens cæmentarios, qui lapideam sibi ecclesiam juxta Romanorum, quem semper amabat, morem facerent, postulavit, accepit, attulit.* See Mabillon. *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. ii. f. 1004.*

princes were as little inclined to believe that such a power could have any right to interfere with the institutions of their country. Hence few examples are to be found of the Pope's taking any part in the affairs of the new Frankish church till the time of Gregory the Great.<sup>1</sup>

Gregory, ever active, and extending his watchful care on all sides, formed numerous alliances with the Frankish princes, nobles, and bishops. He took a lively interest in the affairs of their country; considered the church as subject to his inspection, and acted towards it accordingly. But during the political troubles of the kingdom in the following age, the union with Rome became continually feebler. We remarked in the history of missions how many circumstances in this country threatened a powerful opposition to the system of the Romish hierarchy. This was the case till Boniface, by his profound and comprehensive energy, brought the churches which were placed under his control, as papal legate, into a new relation to the papacy.<sup>2</sup> The influence of this change was soon apparent. Pepin, who had appropriated to himself the royal dignity by such unlawful means, now hoped to atone for the offence by obtaining the consent of the Pope. The weight thus given to the voice of the Roman pontiff must, in its turn, have operated powerfully on the minds of the people in their view of the papacy. To this circumstance we may also trace the re-

<sup>1</sup> The following is an example of the degree of respect manifested for the Papal authority in the Frankish church. Two bishops, Salonius of Embrun (Ebreundenensis), and Sagittarius of Gap (Vapingensis), had been deposed from their dignity by the Council of Lyons in 567, their violent conduct being altogether in opposition to their calling. But they afterwards appealed to Pope John III., and intreated King Guntramm, whose favour they enjoyed, to allow them to make a journey to Rome to plead their cause. The French bishops probably took no notice of this appeal, and, therefore, sent no accuser to the Papal court. The Pope allowed himself to be satisfied with the false statements of the appellants, and wrote a letter to the king, desiring him to restore them to their dignity. As this agreed with the wish of the monarch, their protector, the Pope's desire was immediately fulfilled, and by the authority of the king, who allowed himself to be made an instrument in the hands of the Pope, because he was more anxious to satisfy his own momentary caprice than to promote the interests of the church, they recovered the offices of which they had been justly deprived, and continued to shew themselves as unworthy of them as before. Gregor. Turon. Hist. l. v. c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> It was Boniface who introduced the custom, according to which the Pope bestowed on all metropolitans, as a sign of their spiritual dignity, the pallium (byssocandente contextum) or robe of honour, made of fine white linen. Joha. Diacon. Vita Gregor. iv. This robe was at first conferred only on primates, or the especial representatives of the Pope, *apostolicis vicariis*. It was now made a mark of general dependence on the Roman see.

cognition of the Pope's right to a certain share in the civil government of the people. By means of King Pepin, Pope Stephen II. afterwards obtained assistance against the Lombards, who were then threatening Rome and the possessions of the Romish church, and which assistance he had in vain sought from the weak government of the East. When Pepin, in the year 755, recovered from the Lombards the districts which they had seized, he declared that he had fought for the patrimony of the apostle Peter, and refused to restore what he had thus won to the Greeks. Instead of this, he transferred these lands as a fief to the church, and directed his court-chaplain to lay the instrument by which he conveyed them on the tomb of the apostle.

The union between the popes and the eastern Roman empire became weaker and weaker, and in the place of this antiquated relation arose that with the church in France. This latter acquired far greater stability when Charles the Great destroyed the Lombard kingdom in Italy, and founded in its place that of the Franks. He made frequent journeys to Rome, accompanied by his nobles and bishops, and on such occasions manifested great veneration for the tomb of St Peter. It was on one of these visits to Rome, and during the Christmas festival of the year 800, that Pope Leo III. placed on his head the imperial crown, in the cathedral of St Peter, and amidst throngs of rejoicing spectators. Supposing even that this proceeding had no designed or definite connection with the theocratic point of view in which the popes regarded their relation to the new churches and governments; and supposing also that they were not clearly aware of the things connected therewith; yet might it be easy for later popes to trace back the whole to this point of view, and allege it as the foundation of a right thence derived, and now distinctly recognized.

There was still, however, much that was uncertain in this new relation between the popes and the emperors of the West, and which it required a future period to determine. The popes, in their epistles to the emperor Charles, declared it as an undoubted principle, that, as successors of the apostle Peter, they were the head of the universal church; that to them pertained the spiritual government of all; that they themselves could be judged by no one; that all other spiritual power was derived from them; and that, in particular, all ecclesiastical districts had been meted out

according to their authority.<sup>1</sup> Already had the popes brought to the decision of their theocratic tribunal other affairs besides those that were purely spiritual. Pope Stephen II. prohibited King Charles, in the severest terms, from taking a wife of the impure race of the Lombards,<sup>2</sup> whom, confounding worldly and spiritual affairs, he designated, in an unchristian manner, as a people rejected of God, because of their hostility to the Roman see. He wrote to the Frankish princes generally, that they ought to form no marriage contrary to the will of him who was the vicar of the first of the apostles. If they acted contrary to this direction, they would despise not him, but Peter, whose place he occupied, and of whom Christ says: "He who receiveth you, receiveth me; and he who despiseth you, despiseth me." (Matt. x.) Nor should Frankish princes marry any member of the Lombard royal family. The Pope threatened to pronounce a most fearful anathema on those who should violate this command, assuming that it depended on the Pope to close or open the gates of the kingdom of heaven.<sup>3</sup>

As this view of the spiritual power of the papacy was intimately connected with the entire theocratic idea, which was founded in the particular development of the church at that time, so were even the most distinguished men of the age, as Alcuin, for example, completely under its influence.<sup>4</sup> It was not likely to have less power with the emperor Charles. But, on the other side, traces may be discovered of influences at work upon him which

1 Pope Hadrian I. says: *Sedes apostolica caput totius mundi, et omnium Dei ecclesiarum.* Cod. Carolin. ed. Cenni. t. i p. 389. *Cujus sollicitudo delegata divinitus cunctis debetur ecclesiis.*—A qua si quis se absceidit, fit Christianæ religionis extorris, p. 443. *Quæ de omnibus ecclesiis fas habet judicandi, neque cuiquam licet de ejus judicare judicio, quorum libet sententiis ligata pontificum jus habebit solvendi, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura confluit,* p. 519. *Dum unusquisque episcopus per instituta sanctorum canonum, atque prædecessorum nostrorum pontificum privilegiorum et sanctionum jura receperint,* p. 510.

2 He desired, indeed, at the same time, and this he could with far better pretence claim to determine before his tribunal, to prevent the emperor from putting away his lawful wife. This he might have done independently of the other matter.

3 *Sciat se auctoritate domini mei S. Petri apostolorum principis anathematis vinculo esse innodatum et a regno Dei alienum atque cum diabolo et ejus atrocissimis pompis æternis incendiis concremandum,* p. 288.

4 In his epistle (ep. 20) to Pope Leo III., he calls him "princeps ecclesiæ, unius immaculatæ columbæ nutritor," and says: *Vere dignum esse fateor, omnem illius gregis multitudinem suo pastori licet in diversis terrarum pascuis commorantem una caritatis fide subjectam esse.*

tended to create a division between him and the popes, and to excite him to oppose their authority. There were not wanting those whose interest it was to represent the popes and the Romish church in an unfavourable light.<sup>1</sup> But whether such tendencies to reaction against the ruling spirit of the church arose from the personal enemies of the popes, or from the freer dogmatic opinions of Ireland and Spain, they did not finally prevail. The emperor continued to act generally in ecclesiastical matters, according to the principles of the Romish church. But while he frequently sought the opinion of the popes on disputed questions, he by no means allowed himself to be governed absolutely and exclusively by their decision. He took the course which his own free and independent conviction approved; and followed, in many instances, the better advice of his enlightened theologians, when they differed with the prevailing policy of the Romish church, and were at variance with the judgment of the popes. History furnishes many examples of this kind.

With regard to the territorial possessions of the church of Rome, Charles added further grants to those which his father had made. To urge him to this exercise of liberality, an appeal was made to the records of grants conferred by Constantine the Great on the Romish church, and which, it is probable, were partly now fabricated for this purpose,<sup>2</sup> and partly selected from those in-

<sup>1</sup> For example, such fearful things had been related to the emperor respecting the licentiousness of the Romish clergy, that he found it necessary to address the Pope on the subject. The pontiff justified himself, and warned him not to believe the representations of those who wished to destroy the friendly relation which existed between them. *Nunc vero quaerunt aemuli nostri, qui semper zizania seminaverunt, aliquam inter partes malitiam seminare*, p. 371. Thus, too, a report was spread (perhaps, also, there might be forged letters from the king to the emperor) that the English king Offa had desired the emperor to depose Hadrian, and exalt, in his stead, another pope of French origin, l. c. 506. He warned him against the influence of heretics, who sought to draw him away from the doctrine and discipline of the Romish church: *procaces ac haereticos homines, qui tuam subvertere nituntur orthodoxam fidem, et undique te coarctantes, angustias et varias tempestates seminant*. p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> The words of Pope Hadrian I. to the emperor Charles in the year 777, are remarkable in this respect. *Et sicut temporibus St Silvestri a piissimo Constantino m. imperatore per ejus largitatem Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et potestatem in his Hesperiae partibus largiri dignatus est, &c., ecce novus Christianissimus Constantinus imperator his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctae suae ecclesiae apostolorum principis Petri largiri dignatus est. Sed et cuncta alia, quae per diversos imperatores, patricios etiam et alios Deum timentes procorum animae mercede et venia delictorum in partibus Turciae, Spoletio, seu Benevento, atque Corsica et Savinensi (Sabinensi) patri-*



vented, in an earlier age, for similar ends. The Pope, however, was, in no wise, the absolute sovereign of these territories. He was but the chief officer of the emperor, who governed such lands, as in the case of those belonging to his other vassals, by his "missi." When in the year 800 Pope Leo III. was wounded by the conspirators who sought his life, and the culprits endeavoured to justify themselves by accusing the Pope, the emperor assembled a synod at Rome, over which he himself presided, in order to examine the affair. But the bishops who were chosen to constitute the synod, declared, that it was for the Pope to judge them, not for them to judge the Pope, who was amenable to no man's judgment. Alcuin was of this opinion.<sup>2</sup>

monio Petri apostolo concessa sunt, &c. Vestris temporibus restituantur. He appeals to the *donationes in scrinio Lateranensi reconditas*, which he had sent as a proof to the emperor.

<sup>1</sup> See Anastas. life of Leo III. in the *Vitis Pontificum*.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. xcii. to Arno, archbishop of Saltzburg: he appeals to the apocryphal fragments on church rights, which were afterwards inserted in the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

## SECTION THIRD.

## THE CHRISTIAN LIFE: AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

Wide as was the circle over which Christianity was spread in its diffusion among the people who had settled themselves on the ruins of the Roman empire, it naturally could only acquire its proper influence on their minds, and penetrate the mass, by slow degrees. By how much the easier it was for the old superstition, by finding a connecting point in the strange elements which had already been mixed up with the Christian faith, as the notion of the magical power of the sacraments, and the worship of saints, to return under the guise of Christianity; and by how much it was easier also for the original corrupt dispositions of the people to find a support in this superstition, by so much the more necessary it was to promote a system of instruction whereby, through the instrumentality of the visible church, the inward development of the kingdom of God might be effectually carried forward.

This necessity was forcibly urged by the synods which employed themselves in improving the condition of the church. The Council held at Cloveshove imposed it as a duty upon the bishops in their visitations, to proclaim the word of God to the inhabitants of every place; adding that the people had little opportunity of hearing it except on such occasions.<sup>1</sup> In the rule of Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, it was stated that the word of salvation should be preached twice in the month; and that it would be still more wholesome, if this preaching took place on all Sundays and festivals, and in such a manner, that it might be understood by the people. Charles the Great was especially impressed with the conviction, that the safety of the church depended upon the proper performance of the preacher's office. Hence he admonished the clergy,<sup>2</sup> on every occasion, to bear this in mind; and the men whom he was accustomed to consult in ecclesiastical affairs

<sup>1</sup> *Utpote eos, qui raro audiunt verbum Dei.* c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> C. 44. *D'Achery Spicileg. i. 574.*

strengthened him in the sentiments which he had thus formed. Alcuin was conspicuous among those advisers of the emperor, who regarded preaching as so important for the fostering of Christian life, and the management of the preacher's office as a main duty with the bishops.<sup>1</sup> To this end, he exhorted them to be diligent in the study of the Bible, that they might be fitted to fulfil this obligation as became them.<sup>2</sup> In an admonitory epistle addressed to the people of Canterbury,<sup>3</sup> he says, "There is no knowledge of God without the holy scriptures; and if the blind lead the blind, they will both fall into the ditch. On the contrary, many wise men are the safety of the people. Provide for yourselves teachers of holy scripture, that there may be no want of the word of God among you; that men capable of guiding the people may not fail; that the fountain of truth may not become dry among you."<sup>4</sup> In a letter to the emperor Charles, he urges, that not bishops merely, but priests and deacons ought to preach; and he besought the emperor, if it was actually the case, that the bishops hindered them from so doing, and that the presbyters did not merely pretend this as an excuse for their own negligence, to take some precaution against this abuse.<sup>5</sup> He appeals here to the words of the Apocalypse xx. 17, "Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." In which he finds the admonition, that the water of life should be offered to all by the preaching of the clergy. And further: the apostle, 1 Cor. xiv. 31, says that all should prophecy, that is, teach, in

<sup>1</sup> The following is an example of his admonitions to the bishops: *Ut magis ac magis in sancta Dei ecclesia studiose ac vigilantia cura laborare studeas in praedicatione ac doctrina salutari, quatenus per tuam devotissimam sollertiam verbum vitae coeternae crescat et currat et multiplicetur numerus populi Christiani in laudem et gloriam salvatoris nostri Dei.* See Mabillon *Analector.* Tom i. p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> For example, ep. 193. His letter of congratulation to Theodulf, archbishop of Orleans, on his receiving the pallium from Rome. *Sicut regium diadema fulgor gemmarum ornat, ita fiducia praedicationis pallii ornare debet honorem. In hoc enim honorem suum habet, si portitor veritatis praedicator existit. Memor esto, sacerdotalis, dignitatis linguam coelestis esse clavem imperii et clarissimam castrorum Christi tubam; quapropter ne sileas, ne taceas, ne formides loqui; habens ubique operis tui itinerisque Christum socium et adiutorem. Messis quidem multa est, operarii autem pauci; eo instantiores qui sunt, esse necesse est.*

<sup>3</sup> Ep. ix. To an English archbishop: *lectio scripturae saepius tuis reperitur in manibus, ut ex illa te saturare et alios pascere valeas.*

<sup>4</sup> Ep. lix.

<sup>5</sup> See ep. 124. *Audio per ecclesias Christi quandam consuetudinem non satis laudabilem, quam vestra auctoritas facile emendare potest; si tamen vera est opinio et non magis falsa excusatio, ut quod facere non voluit presbyteri, suis injiciant episcopis.*

order; and so also in 1 Tim. v. 17, "Would that they might learn," he adds, "how many, and what wonderful preachers from various classes of the clergy, had appeared in the whole world: would that they might cease to regard that as proper only for some, which might, to the great gain of souls, become common to many." Why, he asks, were homilies read in the churches by all classes of the clergy? <sup>1</sup> It was a marvellous thing, indeed, that they should be read, but not explained, so that they might be understood by all. What was this but to leave the hearers without fruit? <sup>2</sup>

We see here how important it was in the eyes of this excellent man that Christian knowledge should be diffused among the laity, and that they should be led to take an intelligent share in the services of the church. He was impressed, moreover, with the conviction that the promotion of the kingdom of God was not a work for the clergy only; but that it ought to be the common care of all Christians; and equally far was he from supposing that the former only were concerned about the divine word. Great was the joy which he expressed when he found the laity engaged in its study; and it was his most earnest wish that the emperor might have many servants of the State diligent readers of scripture. <sup>3</sup>

As the emperor, following the advice of men like these, urged the instruction of the people especially on the bishops, the synods which were held during his reign <sup>4</sup> directed their attention particularly to this subject. The Council of Mainz, in the year 813, c.

<sup>1</sup> The homilies here referred to were those selected from the fathers, and which were read on Sundays and festivals.

<sup>2</sup> Et impleatur Virgilianum illud: Dat sine mente sonos.

<sup>3</sup> In his ep. 124 to Charles, on Matt. xxv. 21, *Nec enim hoc solis sacerdotibus vel clericis audiendum ibi arbitreris, sed etiam bonis laicis, et bene in opere Dei laborantibus dicendum esse credas; et maxime his, qui in sublimioribus positi sunt dignitatibus, quorum conversatio bona et vitæ sanctitas, et admonitoria æternæ salutis verba suis subjectis prædicatio poterit esse.* And in the same epistle in reference to a layman, who had proposed a question on a passage of scripture: *Vere et valde gratum habeo, laicos quandoque ad evangelicas effloruisse quæstiones, dum quendam audivi virum prudentem aliquando dicere; clericorum esse evangelium discere, non laicorum. Tamen iste laicus quisquis fuit, sapiens est corde, et si manibus miles, quales vestram auctoritatem plurimos habere decet.*

<sup>4</sup> Gheerbald, bishop of Liege, says of him in his pastoral letter to his people: *Excitat pigritiam nostram, ut non dormiamus, et prædicationis officium unusquisque consideret.* Mansi Concil. t. xiii. f. 1084.

25, ordained, that if the bishop himself was not at home, or was sick, or otherwise hindered, there should always be some one in his place who might be able to preach the word of God to the people on Sundays, and other festival days, in a fit and intelligible manner.<sup>1</sup> And in the same year the sixth Council of Arles directed, that the priests should preach not in all cities only, but in all parishes.<sup>2</sup> Among those who laboured most diligently in promoting religious instruction, Theodulf, archbishop of Orleans, was conspicuous. The charges which he addressed to his clergy (*capitulare ad parochiæ suæ sacerdotes*) afford a lively proof of his zeal and wisdom in the administration of the pastoral office. He admonishes<sup>3</sup> the ministers under his charge that they ought to be prepared to instruct their congregations; that he who understood the Holy Scriptures well should expound the Holy Scriptures; that he who did not thus understand them, should state only that which was most familiar to him; that they all should avoid evil and do good. No one ought to attempt to excuse himself by asserting that he wanted language to edify others. As soon as they saw one taking a wrong course, it was their duty instantly to do what they might to bring him back. When they met the bishop in a synod, each minister should be prepared to give him an account of the result of his labours, and the bishop, on his side, should be ready to afford them such support as they might need.

It appears, from the small demands which Theodulf could venture to make upon his clergy, how little the generality of them were qualified for the profitable fulfilment of their duties by cultivation or the knowledge of scripture. And this is further shewn by a comparison of what has been here related with what was required by various synods; as, for example, when provision is made for the case in which the priests might not understand the Latin of the Liturgy, and could only say it by rote. In reference to this, the Synod of Cloveshove directed, by its tenth canon, that the priests should be made to translate the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the customary formularies employed in the service of

<sup>1</sup> Qui verbum Dei prædicet, juxta quod intelligere vulgus possit.

<sup>2</sup> C. 10, Ut non solum in civitatibus, sed etiam in omnibus parochiis presbyteri ad populum verbum faciant.

<sup>3</sup> C. 28, Harduin. Concil. t. iii. f. 918.

baptism and the Lord's Supper, into the vulgar tongue, and should be able to explain them in the same, and seek to understand the spiritual sense of that which they performed, so as not to be like dumb and senseless tools."<sup>1</sup>

Nothing more, therefore, could be effectually accomplished for the religious instruction of the people, till something had been done for the improvement of the clergy themselves. This object was greatly aided, as well by the schools instituted by the bishops and parochial clergy, as by those established in the monasteries. The plan thus commenced was zealously promoted in the age of Charles the Great. The second Council of Chalons, in the year 813, directed by its third canon that the bishops should found schools, in which instruction should be given in the sciences generally, and in the exposition of scripture, and in which those should be formed to whom the Lord might be able to say, "Ye are the salt of the earth."<sup>2</sup> But, at first, there was a great want of clergymen capable of undertaking the work of instructing the people, according to the directions of the synods. To assist those who were unable to compose their own sermons, provision had been already made by selections from the discourses of the Fathers, and which it was permitted the clergy to read in their churches. But these selections (*Homiliaria*) having been greatly corrupted through the ignorance of the age, the emperor Charles directed an improved collection to be made by one of his clergy, Paul Warnefrid, or Paulus Diaconus, of the abbey of Montecassino. He himself stated, in a preface, that this new book was intended for the use of the churches, and he exhorted the clergy, citing his own example to encourage them to the diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, and appealing to the fact that he had endeavoured to provide himself by his own labour with a correct copy of the Bible.<sup>3</sup> The sermons preached on Sundays and festi-

<sup>1</sup> Ne vel in ipsis intercessionibus, quibus pro populi delictis Deum exorare possunt, vel ministerii sui officii inveniantur quasi muti et ignavi, si non intelligant nec verborum suorum sensum nec sacramenta, quibus per eos alii ad aeternam proficiunt salutem.

<sup>2</sup> Et qui condimentum plebibus esse valeant et quorum doctrina non solum diversis hæresibus, verum etiam antichristi monitis et ipsi antichristo resistatur.

<sup>3</sup> Ad pernoscenda sacrorum librorum studia nostro etiam quos possumus invitamus exemplo. Inter quæ jampridem universos veteris ac novi testamenti libros librorum imperitia depravatos Deo nos in omnibus adjuvante examussim correximus. See *Maillon Analec. t. i. p. 26.*

vals being collected by means of this Homiliarium, and properly arranged, and that order of biblical texts being observed which had been gradually formed in the Roman church, from the time of Gregory the Great, that order became more generally received, and tended to produce in this respect a greater degree of uniformity. It was also, no doubt, intended that this collection of sermons, which, while it aided the activity of some, encouraged the slothfulness of others, should be translated into the different languages of the Christian world, a design especially intimated by the decrees of several councils.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen, from what has been stated above, that there was certainly no intention, in the Carlovingian era, to banish the language of the country from the services of the French church. There is evidence to shew, on the contrary, that efforts were made to promote its culture. But it had incidentally happened, that the Latin language had long become the prevailing language of liturgies. In the provinces belonging to the Roman church, the Roman language was commonly understood and used; and, in this case, there was no necessity for translating the Bible, the church hymns, or the liturgical forms, into the old popular dialects, which, through the general use of Latin, had fallen into neglect. But where the people of German origin had settled themselves in Roman provinces, and amid the seats of Roman civilization, there the Roman language continued to be the language of education, of the courts of law, and of the church, and it was only by degrees that a peculiar dialect was created, by the combination of Latin with the modern forms of speech. The missionaries who proceeded from the Romish church followed also the old custom, and could not persuade themselves to adopt the rude language of the people to whom they brought the gospel, either for the purpose of teaching the divine word, or for prayer; till gradually the practice of the clergy led to the theory, that the Roman language was pre-eminently the language of the church. The desire to effect a union with Rome, which so generally prevailed, must have tended to promote a corresponding feeling in favour of liturgies in the

<sup>1</sup> As, for example, in the 15th canon of the second Council of Rheims, held in 813, *Ut episcopi sermones et homilias S. Patrum, prout omnes intelligere possint, secundum proprietatem linguæ prædicare studeant*; and the third Council of Tours, held the same year, orders, c. 17, *Ut easdem homilias quisque aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam, aut Theotiscam, quo facilius euncti possint intelligere, quæ dicuntur.*

Roman language, and according to the Roman form. Here there must have been a mutual reaction. King Pepin doubtless found a Latin psalmody in the Frankish church, as derived from the old Gallic church. But this was originally different to the Romish system. The latter had been vastly improved since the time of Gregory the Great, who had laboured very anxiously to reform church singing, while that of the Frankish church had become more and more corrupt through the long intervening period of barbarism. Hence, it was Pepin's wish to refine it according to the pattern furnished by Rome. He desired to replace the rude habits of the Franks by the culture of the Romans, and following the course indicated by Boniface, to bring the churches of the two people into close agreement.<sup>1</sup> In this respect, he was especially supported by that diligent promoter of ecclesiastical power and discipline, Chrodegang, bishop of Metz.<sup>2</sup> But partly through the peculiarity of the French pronunciation, and partly through the impossibility of wholly suppressing the old Gallic form of church-singing established by Pepin, the Romish system soon became modified; and Charlemagne, when present at the celebration of the great festivals at Rome, could not help remarking the vast difference between the Frankish-Gallican mode of singing, and the Gregorian-Roman chant. This observation inspired him with a fresh desire to assimilate the former to the refined example of the Roman church.<sup>3</sup> His friend, Pope Hadrian, in order to further his wishes, gave him the two most skilful of his singers, Theo-

<sup>1</sup> In the capitulary of the emperor Charles, for the year 789, published at Aix-la-Chapelle, it is said of Pepin, c. 78, *Gallicanum cantum tulit ob unanimitatem apostolicæ sedis et ecclesiæ pacificam concordiam*; and in the preface to the *Homiliarium: totas Galliarum ecclesias suo studio Romanæ traditionis cantibus decoravit*.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Warnefrid, or Paulus Diaconus, says, in the *Gestis Episcoporum Mettensium* of bishop Chrodegang: *Ipsium clericum abundanter lege divina Romanaque imbutum cantilena morem atque ordinem Romanæ ecclesiæ servare præcepit, quod usque ad id tempus in Mettensi ecclesia factum minime fuit. Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, ed Pertz., t. ii., f. 268.*

<sup>3</sup> In the "*Annales Einhardi*," in a supplement to the year 786, it is related, that during the celebration of Easter in Rome, a dispute arose between the Roman singers, and those brought from France by the emperor, whom the former designated *rusticos et indoctos velut bruta animalia*. The emperor settled the quarrel by telling the disputants that it was far more proper to go back to the fountain, than to follow afar off the streams derived therefrom. *Revertimini vos ad fontem S. Gregorii quid manifeste corrupistis cantilenam ecclesiasticam*. The anecdotes related by the monk of St Gallen, in his peculiar style, are not so credible.



dorus and Benedictus, and made him a present also of the Roman Antiphonarii.<sup>1</sup> Two singing schools were established, the one at Soissons, the other, and the most celebrated, at Metz; and by the means thus employed, the entire system of church music in France was modelled according to that of Rome.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, in the reign of Charles the Great, the use of the Latin language in the services of the French church became firmly established, not as formally introduced, but as naturally resulting from the close union of the two churches. The notion, however, that certain languages only were proper for religion, was expressly opposed. "Let no one suppose, that he may pray to God in three languages only: God may be worshipped in any language, and he who prays aright will always be heard."<sup>3</sup> The missionaries, following the example of Ulfilas, had given the people the Bible in their own language, and had employed it in the service of the church. Much was done thereby for promoting the worship of God in spirit and in truth. But this was greatly hindered by the introduction of an unknown language. The devotion of the people was carried on mechanically, or with ill-defined feelings, and a ready hold was thus afforded for superstition.

It required especial caution to resist effectually the manifold arts of heathenism, still prevalent among the barbarians, as the

1 In the passage referred to it is said: *Correcti sunt ergo antiphonarii Francorum, quos unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vitiaverat, addens vel minuens, et omnes Franciæ cantores didicerunt notam Romanam, quam nunc vocant notam Franciscam; excepto quod tremulas vel vinnulas (h. e. lenes et molles) sive collisibiles et secabiles voces in cantu non poterant perfecte exprimere Franci, naturali voce barbarica frangentes in gutture voces potius quam experimentes.*

2 The use of the organ also, the first musical instrument employed in the church, began in that of France. A present made by the emperor Constantinus Copronymus to king Pepin gave occasion to this. *Annal. Einhard. an. 757.* Hence the Grecian name, *organum*. But that which is said in these annals, l. c. an. 786, seems to imply, that the art of playing the organ, and using it in the church service, commenced in the Roman Church. *Similiter erudierunt Romani cantores supradicti (see above) cantores Francorum, in arte organandi.* And if this seems to be contradicted by its being stated, that a century later, Pope John VIII. desired a good organ, and skilful organist to be sent him from the church at Freysingen, (see *Batuz. Miscellan. t. v.*), we must suppose that the Frankish church subsequently excelled that of Rome in this art, which might be accounted for by the decline of the latter in the following age.

3 In the capitulary published at Frankfurt on the Main, in 796, c. 50, it is said: *Ut nullus credat, quod nonnisi in tribus linguis Deus orandus sit; quia in omni lingua Deus adoratur, et homo exauditur, si justa petierit.*

use of amulets for healing the sick, or averting danger.<sup>1</sup> But it required no less care to prevent the return of the old superstition in the form of Christianity, the imperfect idea of which greatly facilitated such an evil. Thus, for example, the custom had arisen of not looking for the way of eternal salvation in the Holy Scriptures, but of consulting them as an oracle capable of revealing what was next to happen, in important earthly junctures. When a man, therefore, was about to undertake any particular or dangerous business, he would open the Bible; and the first passage which met his eye was regarded as an oracular answer to his inquiry. The same application was at other times made of the first words which might be sung or read on a person's entering the church.<sup>2</sup> It was an especially favourite custom to lay various books of scripture on the tombs of the saints, particularly in the famous church of St Martin at Tours; and after fasting and prayer, to open the books, with the assurance that the passages first occurring were the oracular answers of the saints, *sortes sanctorum*.<sup>3</sup> Whatever appearance of Christian feeling these practices might wear, the voice of the church, in its synods, from the first, was decidedly against them. The first Council of Orleans,<sup>4</sup> in the year 511, directed, that the clergy and monks who suffered the use of such oracles, and those who believed in them, should be excluded from church communion;<sup>5</sup> and this order was repeated by the Council of Auxerre, in the year 578.<sup>6</sup> But particular laws would not suffice to root out a superstition interwoven with the very principles of religious feeling; and the emperor Charles was ac-

1 Against this the Council of Auxerre (Antissiodorensis), in the year, 578, c. 4, orders: *Quæcunque homo facere vult, omnia in nomine Domini faciat.* In a capitulary of the emperor Charles, an. 814, c. 10, we read: *Ut inquirantur sortilegi et aruspices et qui menses et tempora observant; et qui omnia observant et ita phylacteria circa collum portant nescimus quibus verbis scriptis;* and in the third capitulary of the year 789, c. 18: *Ne chartas per perticas appendant propter grandinem.*

2 When Chlodwig proposed to make war on the West-Goths in Gaul, he prayed God to reveal to him, when he entered St Martin's church, the happy issue of the expedition; and as the words of Psalm xviii. 40, 41, were sung, he considered this as a sure oracle, promising him success. The victory which he gained strengthened him in this conviction. *Gregor. Turonens. Hist. l. ii. c. 37.*

3 See an example in *Gregor. Turon. l. v. c. 14.*

4 *Aurelianense i.*

5 C. 30. *Sortes, quas mentiuntur esse sanctorum.*

6 C. 4.

cordingly obliged to issue a new edict against the obnoxious practices.<sup>1</sup>

Another species of ordeal, employed in judicial examinations, was still more intimately connected with the manners and modes of thinking common to these people. We find in nations occupying other zones ; among tribes of German origin ; in China, Japan,<sup>2</sup> and in the East Indies ;<sup>3</sup> and among the ancient Greeks,<sup>4</sup> the prevailing belief, that nature reveals herself, in doubtful cases, as the judge between right and wrong. This belief rests on the conviction of a moral government of the world, to which nature ministers ; and the more unskilful and unpractised the understanding may be in bringing the truth to light, the more inclined have men been to appeal for aid to a divine ordeal. Thus it was especially the practice among these people of German descent, to look for the manifestation of innocence or guilt in the issue of a single combat ; from the working of the elements ; from fire and water. In the form in which the Theocratic principle which Christianity introduced, was regarded by these people, it was easy to find an argument in support of such ordeals. But when King Gundobad introduced them into the Burgundian legislation, Avitus, bishop of Vienne, severely reprobated the proceeding.<sup>5</sup> The king replied that in war an ordeal decided between the contending people, and gave victory on the side of right. Avitus answered, that if rulers and their subjects regarded the judgment of God, they would read with awe the words of the 68th Psalm, verse 30, “ He scattereth the people that delight in war,” and they would act according to what is written in Romans xii. 19, “ Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord.” Could not divine justice decide without spears and swords ? Was it not often the case that man conquered in war by overpowering force or cunning, though his cause was wrong ? But such voices were raised in vain against the old customs and natural temper of the people. Trial by ordeal was adopted as part of the ordinary judicial proceedings of the coun-

1 In the third capitulary of the year 789, c. 4 : *Ut nullus in psalterio vel in evangelio vel in aliis rebus sortire præsumat.*

2 Kämpfer. *Amœnitates Exoticæ.*

3 Compare among others, Rosenmüller's *Altes und Neues Morgenland.* B. ii., s. 226.

4 Sophocles : *Antigone.*

5 The words of Avitus, in the Book of Agobard of Lyons : *Adversus Legem Gundobadi.*

try; and even the emperor Charles, who zealously opposed corresponding superstitions, yielded, in this instance, to the spirit of the times, and approved the appeal to ordeals.<sup>1</sup>

It was another characteristic of the period, that men were generally disposed to seek for justification in outward works; in bestowing presents on churches, especially those which were consecrated to the memory of the saints; in enriching them with splendid ornaments; and in almsgiving; and thus to lessen the demand of Christianity for an entire change of mind. But a reaction to this error, so calculated to promote security in sin, was not wholly wanting on the part of the Christian spirit. Thus the emperor Charles, in a capitulary addressed to the bishops and abbots, in the year 811,<sup>2</sup> says, that care ought to be taken, while so much anxiety was shewn about the building of beautiful churches, not to neglect that true ornament of the church which consists in virtuous manners. The desire to build churches pertained rather to the spirit of the Old Testament: the improvement of morals belonged peculiarly to the New.<sup>3</sup>

Theodulf of Orleans says in his admonitions to his clergy: It is indeed the duty of Christians to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and the captive, and to afford hospitality to the stranger (Matt. xxv.); but all this will avail almost nothing towards the attainment of eternal life, if, other good works being neglected, men will yield themselves to pride, revelry, and the corresponding sins. The clergy, he added, must remind their hearers that true charity could only be proved by this, that he who pretended thereto loved God more than himself, and his neighbour as himself: that he acted not towards others in a way in which he would not have them act towards himself; for that they greatly erred, who supposed charity to consist in merely bestowing meat and drink, and other outward gifts, whereas the Apostle

1 In a law passed in the year 809: *Ut omnes iudicio Dei credant absque dubitatione.* Baluz. Capitular. t. i. f. 466. The proof of innocence in relation to a murder in the capitulary an. 803, *ad novem vomeres ignitos iudicio Dei examinandus accedat.* l. c. f. 389. That a vassal of the bishop submitted himself to the trial by ordeal, in order to prove his innocence of the charge of high treason, see capitular. an. 794 l. c. f. 265.

2 Mansi t. xiii. f. 1073.

3 *Quamvis bonum sit, ut ecclesie pulchra sint aedificia, praeferendus tamen est aedificiis bonorum morum ornatus et culmen, quia, in quantum nobis videtur, structio basilicarum veteris legis quandam trahit consuetudinem, morum autem emendatio proprie ad novum Testamentum et Christianam pertinet disciplinam.*

says, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink." All this is then only good when it proceeds from love.

The second Council of Chalons,<sup>1</sup> held in 813, pronounces against the false trust placed in the *opus operatum* of pilgrimages to Rome, and to the church of St Martin at Tours, "There are clergymen who lead an idle life, and trust thereby to be purified from sin, and to fulfil the duties of their calling; and there are laymen who believe that they may sin, or have sinned, with impunity, because they undertake such pilgrimages; there are great men who, under this pretext, practise the grossest extortion among their people; and there are poor men who employ the same excuse to render begging a more profitable employment. Such are those who wander round about, and falsely declare that they are on a pilgrimage; while there are others whose folly is so great, that they believe that they become purified from their sins by the mere sight of holy places, forgetting the words of St Jerome, who says, that there is nothing meritorious in seeing Jerusalem, but in leading a good life there." The only kind of pilgrimages here spoken of as worthy of any praise, are those which have been undertaken with true devotion, and with the earnest desire of improving thereby the entire life.<sup>2</sup> Thus Alcuin wrote to a nun, who lamented that she had not been able to complete a pilgrimage upon which she had set out. "This disappointment cannot harm you much. God has provided some better thing for you; only what you intended to employ upon so long a journey, you should now expend in assisting the poor."<sup>3</sup>

Theodulf of Orleans also dictated one of his little poems against the excessive passion for pilgrimages to Rome; and he says, that a pious life only could carry a man to heaven, whether he lived in Rome or in any other place.<sup>4</sup>

The excessive veneration paid to the saints, and the worship of

<sup>1</sup> C. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Qui vero peccata sua sacerdotibus, in quorum sunt parochiis, confessi sunt, et ab his agendae poenitentiae consilium acceperunt; si orationibus insistendo, eleemosynas largiendo, vitam emendando, mores componendo, apostolorum limina vel quorumlibet sanctorum invisere desiderant, horum est devotio modis omnibus collaudanda.

<sup>3</sup> See ep. cxlvii.

<sup>4</sup> Non tantum isse juvat Romam, bene vivere quantum;  
Vel Romae, vel ubi vita agitur hominis:  
Non via credo pedum; sed morum ducit ad astra:  
Quicquid ubique geris, spectat ab arce Deus.

Mary, of the origin of which we have spoken in the history of the preceding age, afforded, through the deification of humanity, in an isolated form, the best support that could be had for those modes of heathen thought which resisted the power of Christianity. It is true the worship of saints, according to the doctrine of the church, was limited by its connection with the spiritual feeling of the believer, and by the reverence entertained for God. His grace was honoured in the saints as his instruments only; and the intercession of the perfectly redeemed alone was to be sought for by the worshipper. But in ordinary life, particular saints became a sort of tutelary deities, to whom men might appeal in all dangers and sicknesses, and in their most important undertakings; and thus the relation of the entire self-consciousness to the manifestation of God in Christ, the consciousness of communion with God, effected for every believer through Jesus, was greatly injured. The feeling of the necessity of redemption, morally and religiously regarded, being no longer the key-note of the inner life, men employed themselves rather in seeking deliverance from temporal evils by praying to the saints, than in striving after deliverance from sin, and the wants of their inner being. In both respects, that is, in the deification of what is human, and in the sensual notion of religious necessity, the heathen element exhibited its power. Gregory of Tours thanks God that he had given mankind such a physician as St Martin, and employs expressions which would become a Christian, showing his gratitude for the appearance of a Redeemer, or a heathen for that of an Æsculapius.<sup>1</sup> He appeals to the fact, that the touching of his grave had stopped a bloody flux; enabled the lame to walk; given sight to the blind; and even cured the sorrows of the heart. He even himself had recourse to the grave of St Martin in all his bodily ailments, holding the afflicted part close to the tomb, or to the curtains by which it was surrounded. True it is, that for the success of this application, the honest devotion of a penitent mind was required; and it is possible that the sensible impression made by

<sup>1</sup> Thus he says at the beginning of the third book of the *Miracles of Martin*: *Gratias agimus omnipotenti Deo, qui nobis talem medicum tribuere dignatus est; qui infirmitates nostras purgaret, vulnera dilueret, ac salubria medicamenta conferret.*

<sup>2</sup> *Si ad ejus beatum tumulum humilietur animus et oratio sublimetur; si defluant lacrimae et compunctio vera succedat; si ab imo corde emittantur suspiria, invenit ploratus laetitiam, culpa veniam, dolor pectoris pervenit ad medellam.*

the place, with which, through what they had heard in childhood, men of those times united so many solemn recollections, may have tended to produce a wholesome agitation of feeling. Hence we may understand how the vicious were here brought to reflection; how their conscience was awakened by the sudden anguish which followed some terrifying vision; and how, by the startling reaction on their nervous system, they were sometimes thrown into sickness. But we see also that in many cases, the manner in which Martin was addressed and worshipped, was altogether like the worship paid by the heathen to their idols. The language employed was of this kind, "If you do not grant what we ask, we will light no more tapers at your tomb; we will show you no more reverence."<sup>1</sup> The things which were brought out of the tomb were also employed in the same manner as heathen amulets.<sup>2</sup> It was easy for the popular mind, when thus disposed,<sup>3</sup> to be deceived by the supposed virtue of relics,<sup>4</sup> or to be induced to render homage to those as saints, after death, who during their lives were utterly unworthy of respect. To check such errors, the emperor Charles directed by the capitulary,<sup>5</sup> published at Frankfurt in the year 794, that no new saints should be worshipped, and that no chapels, erected on the highway, should be dedicated to their memory; but that this honour should be confined to those who

<sup>1</sup> See Gregor. Turon. de Miraculis Martini. l. iii. c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> When Gregory of Tours saw one of his vineyards year after year laid waste by hail-storms, he fixed on one of the highest trees a piece of wax, which had been taken from near the grave, and the place was no longer injured by the storm. De Miraculis Martini. Oil was used as an amulet against the murrain in cattle. Ib. l. iii. c. 18.

<sup>3</sup> A monk who had already acquired in his life time the reputation of a worker of miracles, wished, on that account, not to be buried in his convent, because he foresaw that after his death great crowds of people would assemble about his grave to seek the cure of their disorders. Greg. Turon. Vitae Pat. c. i. Vain bishops also, it seems, were anxious for the honour of having miracles wrought in their name. The monk of St Gallen relates a characteristic anecdote illustrative of this circumstance. A man who could not gain the favour of his bishop and landlord, at length hit upon this happy expedient. Having unexpectedly caught a fox, he carried it to the bishop, Recho, as a present. When the bishop expressed his wonder how he could have so caught the fox, he replied, that when the fox was running at full speed, he called to him: In the name of my lord, Recho, stop, and move not; and the fox stood still till he took him prisoner. The bishop was enraptured at finding his holiness made so manifest, and the man had won his favour for ever. Should this anecdote not be true, it is still doubtless a characteristic satire derived from the times to which it refers.

<sup>4</sup> See Gregor. Turon. Hist. l. ix. c. 6.

<sup>5</sup> C. 40.

had been particularly designated thereto on account of their sufferings for the gospel or the holiness of their lives.

The number of festivals, as shown by the Council of Maynz in 813,<sup>1</sup> had continued to increase in the Western church, from the early times, when a few great holidays only were observed, to the end of this period. In the first place, were the two Marian festivals. As the observance of Christmas naturally led to the celebration of other days, which had reference to the childhood of Christ, this gave rise to the festival of his presentation in the temple, called in the Greek church, because Simeon and Anna had recognized him as the Messiah, the *έορτή ύπαπαντής (του κυρίου.)* But in the Western church, the reverence entertained for Mary led to the institution of a festival in her especial honour, called by the Council of Maynz, "*Festum purificationis Mariæ.*" The comparison between Christ and Mary gradually induced men to suppose that both at her entrance into earthly existence, and at her departure from the world, some corresponding wonder must have taken place. The silence of the evangelists on the subject of her death favoured this supposition.<sup>2</sup> Hence the feast of the assumption. Then the octaves of the nativity were observed as the feast of the circumcision, and as answerable to the heathen festival of the new year. Afterwards came the feast of St Michael. The Apocalypse had given occasion to many imaginative speculations respecting that angel; and numerous were the accounts of his appearances. On one of these, said to have taken place in a Roman church, at the time of its consecration, was founded the argument for instituting the "*Dedicatio Sancti Michaelis.*" The feast was thus named by the Council of Maynz; and the idea which gave it birth was that of the communion of the faithful upon earth with the perfected spirits of the world above; the memorial of the church triumphant.

To the fifth century may be traced the twofold commemoration of the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, and the nativity of John the Baptist; the only nativity besides that of our Lord celebrated

<sup>1</sup> C. 35.

<sup>2</sup> The legend was at last exhibited in its perfect form in the work of Gregory of Tours. *De Gloria Martyrum*, l. i. c. 4. When she was at the point of death, all the apostles assembled and watched with her. Then Christ appeared with his angels, and committed her soul to the archangel Michael; but her body was carried away in a cloud.



in the church, but allowed on account of its especial connection with the birth of the Saviour. Then followed the *natales* of Andrew Remigius (of Rheims) and Martinus; and the festivals to be kept in particular parishes in honour of saints buried there, or commemorating the consecration of churches. Another festival also had its origin about the same time. It is not mentioned by the council; but it subsequently became generally observed. A festival was early kept in the Greek church in honour of all the saints; and formed very usefully the *octaves* of Whitsunday, in so far as the union of the saints represents the union of the operations of the Holy Ghost. But in the Western the institution of such a festival arose from particular circumstances. When the Greek emperor Phocas granted the Pantheon in Rome to Boniface IV., who ascended the throne in the year 610, that pontiff determined to convert this heathen temple into a church dedicated to Mary and all the saints, and hence the idea of the festival of which we are speaking. Alcuin regarded it as especially significant of the glory bestowed on human nature by the gospel; as indicating, that is, that men might now, as organs of the Holy Ghost, keep the feast of spiritual concord with the perfected members of the church.

We remarked in the history of the preceding period, how the idea of the Lord's Supper, as a sacrifice, proceeding from the pure Christian element, continually tended to assume the magical instead of the symbolic character. In this respect Gregory the Great appears especially as the representative of the Christianity of the times, which, under his influence, became more and more imbued with this particular character. The idea that the Lord's Supper ought to exhibit to the believer's mind a living picture of the sufferings of Christ, of those sufferings whereby man is reconciled to God, and the communion between heaven and earth is restored,—this idea led to the conviction in his mind that, when the priest offers this sacrifice, heaven opens itself at his word;

<sup>1</sup> Alcuin ep. 76, to Arno, archbishop of Saltzburg. Quoniam si Elias unus ex illis in veteri Testamento oratione sua dum voluit claudere coelum potuit praevaricatoribus et aperire conversis, quanto magis omnes sancti in novo Testamento, ubi eis specialiter et patenter claves regni coelestis commissae sunt, et claudere coelum possunt incredulis et aperire credentibus, si intima dilectione honorificentur, a fidelibus, et honorificentur glorificatione eis condigna.

the chorus of angels appears ; the high and low, the earthly and the heavenly, the visible and the invisible, become one.<sup>1</sup>

Who can fail to recognize here the working of a mind deeply impressed with a sense of the blessing of redemption? The fundamental truth was, indeed, combined with the erroneous notion of priestly power, and with the corresponding misrepresentation of the sacrament as an offering made by the priest, all of which was the result of the importance given to what was outward in the rite. But, notwithstanding this, Gregory, while viewing the Sacrament in the way described, could say, "What must not that sacrifice effect which continually represents and repeats to us the redeeming sufferings of Christ?"<sup>2</sup> Nor did Gregory entertain this idea of a sacrifice in its mere outward form. He cherished it in its connection with the entire law of the inner life ; in the same manner as Augustine regarded the spiritual sacrifice of himself as essential to the living enjoyment of the sacrifice of Christ, and therefore offered it to the Redeemer by one uninterrupted course of self-denial.<sup>3</sup> But, while he thus contemplated the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in its true moral and religious signification, and in its proper reference to the union of the church with the Redeemer, the influence of that magical element of which we have spoken led him to combine therewith the notion of the objective magical operation of the sacrifice for the quick and dead.<sup>4</sup>

With regard to its influence on the state of the latter, this is to be considered in connection with the account before given of the *ignis purgatorius*, intended for those who, although on the whole possessed of saving faith (that is, of faith working by love), yet are oppressed by many sinful dispositions, for which they must atone, and from which they must be purified, and which has not

1 See Gregor. Dial. l. iv. c. 58.

2 Quæ illam nobis mortem per mysterium reparat, pro absolutione nostra passionem unigeniti semper imitatur. Christus iterum in hoc mysterio sacræ oblationis immolatur.

3 Sed necesse est, ut eum hæc agimus nosmet ipsos Deo in cordis contritione mactemus, quia qui passionis dominicæ mysteria celebramus, debemus imitari quod agimus. Tunc ergo vere pro nobis hostia erit Deo, cum nos ipsos hostiam fecerimus.

4 The offering of this sacrifice had such power, that a distant prisoner, for whom his wife desired it to be made, was freed from the chains which bound him ; and a mariner, who was tossed about in a little boat on a stormy sea, was by the same means furnished with heavenly food, and saved from shipwreck.

been effected before their death. Now, the sacrifice of the Communion being offered for them, and they obtaining thereby an interest in the redeeming sufferings of Christ, the result is, that they obtain a quicker release from the purifying fire, and are sooner admitted to happiness. The accounts which Gregory gives in his Dialogues, in support of these notions, were especially calculated to effect his object. The ruling temper of the age, the subjection of religious feeling to the sensual element, the prevailing force of imagination, and the discouragement given to thought and enquiry, were all in favour of such impressions.

Connected, moreover, as the Old Testament view of the priesthood were with this doctrine of the Sacrament, a new abuse thence arose. The utmost importance was attached by the people to the offering made by the priest for the living and the dead. Hence the priest was invited by rich gifts to perform masses for the repose of departed souls, while the laity themselves felt less and less interested in partaking of the Communion. Thus it came to pass, that the priests frequently solemnized mass by themselves alone, the congregation taking no part whatever in the rite, or so-named *missa privata*. Efforts were made in the time of Charlemagne to suppress this evil custom, so opposed to the proper intention of the Sacrament, and many were the voices raised by the church to prove its contradiction to the ancient liturgies. Thus the Council of Maynz, in the year 813, inquires, How can the priest say *Sursum corda*, or *Dominus vobiscum*, when no one is present? <sup>1</sup> Theodulf, in his admonitions<sup>2</sup> to his clergy, strongly urges the same objection, and cites the words of the Lord, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." It was their duty, therefore, he remarked, to exhort the people to a more frequent participation of the Communion. The Synod of Cloveshove spoke to the same purport; but Theodulf did not neglect to press upon the people the necessity of a due preparation before they came to the Supper of the Lord.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> C. 23.

<sup>2</sup> C. 7. The rite could not be solemnized, sine salutatione sacerdotis, responsione nihilominus plebis.

<sup>3</sup> C. 44. Admonendus est populus, ut nequaquam indifferenter accedat, nec ab hoc nimum abstineat, sed cum omni diligentia eligat tempus, quando aliquamdiu ab opere conjugali abstineat, et vitii se purget, virtutibus exornet, elemosynis et orationibus insistat.

The old regulations of the church respecting penance had been handed down to this period; but many changes had crept into its discipline in the attempt made to accommodate it to its new circumstances among a barbarous people. Thus it was permitted those who confessed their sins to the priest himself,<sup>1</sup> to perform the appointed penance privately, instead of openly. Another deviation, also, from the old church discipline was seen in the custom of allowing the priest to grant immediate absolution to those who confessed their sins, and declared themselves ready to fulfil the appointed penance, even though they were not prepared to partake of the communion.<sup>2</sup>

But while many of the laws of the church, and especially those which regarded penance, were unfitted for the age, or could not be applied without creating violent opposition, occasion was thus given for changes which were often allowed to take place with such irregularity, that the discipline which might otherwise have operated so beneficially upon a rude people, lost its force, and even furnished a cloak for immorality. At the time when great efforts were made, as was especially the case in the age of Charlemagne, for the improvement of the church, it was a main object with the reformers to banish the *libelli poenitentiales*, which had favoured so many corruptions, and to restore the primitive laws of the church to their proper authority and force.<sup>3</sup> The orders published by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and by Egbert of York, in the eighth century, as also by Halitgar, bishop of Cambrai, at the beginning of the ninth century, on the administration of penance, must have greatly contributed to facilitate the

<sup>1</sup> A distinction existed between *peccata occulta* and *peccatis publicis*, which were made known to the bishops by other means than confessions, and were punished openly in conformity with the sentence which he openly pronounced.

<sup>2</sup> This appears from the directions of Boniface, in which it is spoken of as an indulgence granted to the circumstances of the age. *Et quia varia necessitate praevidemur, canonum statuta de conciliandis poenitentibus pleniter observare; propterea omnino non dimittatur* (it should not be neglected, that is, more than was absolutely necessary.) *Curet unusquisque presbyter statim post acceptam confessionem poenitentium singulos data oratione reconciliari.* Würdtwein f. 142.

<sup>3</sup> Thus the second Council of Chalons, c. 38. *Repudiatis penitus libellis, quos poenitentiales vocant, quorum sunt certi errores, incerti auctores. Qui dum pro peccatis gravibus leves quosdam et inusitatos imponunt poenitentiae modos, consunt pulvillos secundum propheticum sermonem Ezech. xiii. sub ouni cubito manus et faciunt cervicalia sub capite universae aetatis ad capiendas animas.*

application of the early laws of the church on this subject to the present manners and requirements of the people. They had been long accustomed to the payment of fines in money. Such fines were so well known in the administration of justice, that a man might free himself from the punishment due to him as a thief, or a murderer, by the payment of a certain sum to the person whom he had defrauded, or to the relations of the victim who had fallen by his hand.

This custom was now made the foundation of a new system in regard to ecclesiastical penance.<sup>1</sup> The payment of a fine (*compositio*) became one of the recognised punishments of the church; and in the case of those who, according to the ancient rule of discipline, were bound to submit themselves to certain inflictions, but from which circumstances obliged them to withdraw, permission was granted them to exchange the prescribed penance for a fine; and the money thus paid was to be employed in alms for the poor; in the ransom of captives; or in meeting the common expenses of the church.<sup>2</sup> This was the origin, in itself sufficiently innocent, of indulgences. According to the account here given, the indulgence was nothing more than the change of the old mode of inflicting penance for one more adapted to the manners of the people concerned. But the most ruinous errors, errors confirming ill-informed men in their sinful courses, might be easily attached not only to this, but to any system of penance, when once the distinction was lost between the judgments of the church and the judgments of God; or the absolution of the for-

1 Even as early as the fifth century, a church doctor, perhaps Maximus of Turin, felt himself constrained to speak, in the strongest terms, against the abuses introduced by the Arian clergy among the barbarians, through the system of indulgences, and its accommodation to the ruling manners of the age. See the passage, already quoted in reference to another subject. *Praepositi eorum, quos presbyteros vocant, dicuntur tale habere mandatum, ut si quis laicorum fassus fuerit crimen admissum, non dicat illi: age poenitentiam; desiste peccata; sed dicat: pro hoc crimine da tantum mihi, et indulgetur tibi. Vanus plane et insipiens presbyter, qui cum ille praedam accipiat, putat, quod peccatum Christus indulget. Nescit, quia salvator solet peccata donare, et pro delicto quaerere pretiosas lacrimas, non pecunia smunerosas. Denique Petrus, cum ter negando Dominum deliquisset, veniam non muneribus meruit, sed lacrimis impetravit. Apud hujusmodi praeceptores semper divites innocentes, semper pauperes criminosi.* See Mabillon *Museum Italicum*. t. i. p. ii. p. 28.

2 Halitgar. *Liber poenentialis*. It is here stated, that he who could not submit himself to the prescribed fasts, must pay a sum of money according to his means, and the duration of the fast. *Sed unusquisque attendat, cui dare debet, sive pro redemptione captivorum, sive super sanctum altare, sive pro pauperibus Christianis erogandum.*

mer and the pardon of sin from heaven ; when once, indeed, penance ceased to be viewed in strict dependence upon the general aids to salvation, then the practice of which we have spoken became quickly united with the false belief, that it was possible to purchase an exemption from the punishment due to sin, and to buy a pardon. The trust placed in the merit of almsgiving was nothing new.

These errors, and the evil customs to which they gave rise, were opposed by many of the reforming synods of this period. The Synod of Cloveshove, already alluded to, declared in the year 747, c. 26, that a man ought not, by any means, to give alms from the expectation of acquiring thereby a right to commit certain sins, even the smallest ; that alms ought to be given only of wealth justly acquired ; that if this rule were broken in the giving of alms, divine justice, instead of being pacified, would be provoked to greater indignation. So also a man must not give alms to the hungry, and then, as if justified thereby, indulge himself in gluttony and drunkenness, unless, by thus undervaluing divine justice, he meant to involve himself in heavier guilt. Those who acted, or thought in this way, while they seemed to give their goods to God, did, in reality, through their lusts, give themselves to the devil.<sup>1</sup>

This same synod also spake against the dangerous and capricious manner in which it was now the custom to allow penitents to escape by almsgiving from all the more difficult kinds of penance ; whereas the usual discipline of the church ought to have been strengthened rather than weakened thereby.<sup>2</sup> The practice thus deprecated was doubtless that which had arisen from the introduction of compositions into the administration of penance. The second Council of Chalons, held in the year 813,<sup>3</sup> also protested against those who thought by almsgiving to redeem themselves from the punishment of their sins.<sup>4</sup> Even the mechanical

1 Hoc enim modo facientes sive aestimantes sua Deo dare videntur, seipsos diabolo per flagitia dare non dubitantur.

2 Postremo sicuti nova adinventionio nunc plurimis periculosa consuetudo est, non elemosyna porrecta ad minuendam, vel ad mutandam satisfactionem per jejunium et reliqua expiationis opera, a sacerdote jure canonico indicta, sed magis ad augmentandam emendationem.

3 C. 26.

4 C. 36. Qui hoc perpetrarunt, videntur Deum mercede conducere, ut eis impune peccare liceat.

repetition of certain prayers and psalms, and the performance of good works by others, in the place of the offender, were made a foundation of false trust. Hence the Council of Cloveshove declared,<sup>1</sup> that the singing of psalms was properly only an expression of the feelings of the heart so speaking.<sup>2</sup> This council was led thus strongly to protest against the obnoxious practices, because it had witnessed their operation in its worst form. A rich man, who had obtained absolution for some grievous offence, stated in a letter, that he had given so many alms, had had so many psalms sung for him, and so many fasts kept in his behalf, that, if he should live for three hundred years, he had done enough. But if, replied the council, divine justice could be thus satisfied, Christ would not have said, that the rich have the greatest difficulty in entering the kingdom of heaven.

In the orders issued during the reign of Charlemagne, on the subject of penance, it was particularly insisted upon, that the utility of penance was not to be estimated by length of time, but by the disposition of the mind.<sup>3</sup> Care was also taken to distinguish between the priestly absolution, and the forgiveness to be sought for from God. While the council referred to the opinion of those who asserted, that it was sufficient to confess sins before God, it stated its objections to such a notion, by remarking that the two modes of confession ought to be combined; and added: We must confess our sins to God, who is the forgiver of all sins, according to Psalm xxxi., and pray for our salvation. By this confession before God, a man is purified from his sins; by confession to the priest, he learns from him by what means he may be cleansed from his offences. For God, the author and giver of salvation and health, bestows these blessings sometimes through the invisible operation of his power, and sometimes through the operation of physicians.<sup>4</sup> It is also here said, that the divine forgiveness may

<sup>1</sup> C. 37.

<sup>2</sup> The Intima intentio cordis.

<sup>3</sup> Thus the second Council of Chalons, held in the year 813, c. 34. *Neque enim pensanda est poenitentia quantitate temporis, sed ardore mentis et mortificatione corporis. Cor autem contritum et humiliatum Deus non spernit.*

<sup>4</sup> *Confessio itaque, quæ Deo fit, purgat peccata, ea vero, quæ sacerdoti fit, docet, qualiter ipsa purgentur peccata. Deus namque salutis et sanitatis auctor et largitor plerumque hanc præbet suæ potentiae invisibili administratione, plerumque medicorum operatione.*

be obtained without priestly absolution; that the priest can avail nothing but as an organ of heavenly grace, that is, by leading men to seek the pardon of God.<sup>1</sup>

Halitgar speaks in similar terms.<sup>2</sup> "If any one," he says, "has committed a sin which cuts him off from the body of Christ, let him by all means depend rather upon a broken heart, than upon any calculation of times and seasons. Still, as no one can see into the heart of another, the overseers of the church have rightly chosen certain periods at which satisfaction may be given to the church, in which the forgiveness of sins has been pronounced." It is evident from this, how much better the moral and religious state of the community would have been, if there had not existed such a want of priests capable of carrying out the system of ecclesiastical penance, according to the principles here laid down.

But while these changes were produced in the nature of penance, by the prevailing laxity of manners, we have to remark, on the other hand, that a new and severer species of penance, though but rarely inflicted, was allowed in the case of heavy offences, as, for example, in that of murder. In such instances, the offender was laden with a heavy mass of iron chains and rings, into which his limbs were forced, and he was then compelled to wander about, or, thus fettered, to journey to some distant sacred spot, as to the tomb of St Peter, where, according to circumstances, he might obtain absolution.<sup>3</sup> The wanderings of these penitents had more the character of oriental self-torture, than of Christian discipline, and were likely to be imitated by fanatics and hypocrites in other

<sup>1</sup> Theodulf of Orleans also makes the pardon of sins depend only on the inward confession before God: *Quia quanto nos memores sumus peccatorum nostrorum, tanto horum Dominus obliviscitur.* The object of confession he describes as this, namely, that following the directions of the priest, and applying the means prescribed, a man may obtain, aided by the supplications of the priest, purification from the stains of sin. *Quia accepto a sacerdotibus salutari consilio, saluberrimis pœnitentiæ observationibus, sine mutuis orationibus, peccatorum maculas diluimus.* C. 30. According, indeed, to the ecclesiastical theory of satisfaction, a person might still feel it necessary, after having obtained forgiveness of sins, to seek deliverance from the punishment of his offences, through a free submission to church penance, in order not to be subjected to the purifying process of the *ignis purgatorius*.

<sup>2</sup> In his preface de Pœnitentiæ utilitate.

<sup>3</sup> The following is the picture given of such a pilgrim: *Pauperculus quidam presbyter propter homicidii centum cerculis ferreis tam in collo quam in utroque constrictus brachio, quam gravibus quotidie suppliciis afficeretur per sulcos, quos ferrum carnibus ejus infixerat, videntibus fidem fecit.* Vita. S. Galli. l. ii. c. 34.



circumstances than those above mentioned. At length, in the year 789, Charlemagne, passed an especial law to prohibit the continuance of such a practice.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nec isti nudi cum ferro (sinantur vagari), qui dicunt se data sibi pœnitentia ire vagantes. Melius videtur, ut, si aliquid inconsuetum et capitale crimen commiserint, in loco permaneant laborantes et servientes et pœnitentiam agentes secundum quod sibi canonice impositum sit. Baluz. Capitular. l. 239.

## SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF  
CHRISTIANITY IN RESPECT TO DOCTRINE.

## 1. IN THE LATIN CHURCH.

GREGORY the Great, with whom we begin this period, closes the line of the classic doctors of the West. Through him, the developed form of doctrine which had grown up in the Christianized Roman world, was transmitted to succeeding ages, and he is to be regarded as constituting the middle point between the declining creation of Christianity, in its Roman form, and its new creation, destined to arise from among the people of Germanic origin. He was born at Rome between the years 540–550, and was descended from a noble patrician family. His education answered to his rank, and though not instructed in Greek literature, he became well acquainted with that of his own country. For a considerable period, he exercised the office of Roman praetor; and retained this dignity till, in his fortieth year, he became a monk. Having founded six monasteries, he retired into one of these in the neighbourhood of Rome, and was subsequently made its abbot. Pelagius II., by choosing him for one of the seven deacons of Rome, brought him into the active service of the church. This Pope was glad to avail himself of the worldly skill and knowledge which Gregory had acquired in his civil capacity, and sent him as his ambassador to Constantinople.

On the death of Pelagius in the year 589, Gregory was elected his successor. Though regarding it as a duty to attend diligently to the manifold affairs of a temporal nature connected with his office,<sup>2</sup> and which he felt to be a necessary sacrifice of love to the

<sup>1</sup> Ἀποκρισιάρχιος: responsalis.

<sup>2</sup> He himself speaks of his numerous worldly engagements, l. i. in Ezechiel h. xi. §

necessities of the weak, a fitting obedience to the example of Christ who, for man's salvation,<sup>1</sup> took upon him the form of a servant—yet the truly spiritual duties of his calling were those which he viewed as the weightiest and most satisfactory. Thus he paid particular attention to the improvement of church music,<sup>2</sup> and of the liturgical portions of divine worship, and the influence of these his labours was seen in the peculiar character of the services of the church prevailing in after times. Nor did he neglect the duty of preaching, but regarded it as one of the especial obligations of the priestly calling.<sup>3</sup> Thus he insisted upon the necessity both of public preaching to the congregation, and of those admonitions which might be given by the clergy in private conversation with individuals of their flock.<sup>4</sup> He complains that the bishops in his time neglected preaching, which was essential to their office, for mere ordinary occupations, and called themselves bishops, to their peril, without doing that which was implied in the very name.<sup>5</sup> He lamented that he himself, compelled by the necessity of the times, was thus obliged, however unwillingly, to engage in temporal affairs.<sup>6</sup> Heavily oppressed also must he have been by the frequent returns of sickness to which he was subject, as well as by the distractions to which he alludes. But notwithstanding all, he continued to preach diligently, a fact proved by

6. Cogar namque modo ecclesiarum, modo monasteriorum causas discutere: saepe singulorum vitas actusque pensare; modo quædam civium negotia sustinere, modo de irruentibus Barbarorum gladiis gemere, et commisso gregi insidiantes lupos timere; modo rerum curam sumere, ne desint subsidio eis ipsis, quibus disciplinae regula tenetur.

1 Nec taedere animum debet, si sensus ejus contemplationi spiritalium semper intentus; aliquando dispensandis rebus, minimis quasi minoratus inflectitur; quando illud verbum, per quod constant omnia creata, ut prodesset hominibus, assumpta humanitate voluit paulo minus ab angelis minorari. l. 19. in Job. § 45.

2 There was still shewn in Rome, at the beginning of the ninth century, the *sopha* upon which Gregory used to sit, directing the singing of the youths admitted into the "schola cantorum." Joh. Diaconi Vita l. ii. c. 1.

3 *Præconis officium suscipit, quisquis ad sacerdotium accedit. Sacerdos vero si prædicationis est nescius, quam clamoris vocem daturus est præco mutus?* L. i. ep. 25.

4 Et qui una eademque exhortationis voce non sufficit simul cunctos admonere; debet singulos, in quantum valet, instruere, privatis locutionibus aedificare, exhortatione simplici fructum in filiorum suorum cordibus quaerere. l. i. Hom. xvii. in Evangelia § 9.

5 Ad exteriora negotia delapsi sumus, ministerium prædicationis relinquimus, et ad poenam nostram, ut video, episcopi vocamur. l. c. § 14.

6 Me quoque pariter accuso, quamvis Barbarici temporis necessitate compulsus valde in his jaceo invitus.

the circumstance that the greater part of his writings consists of sermons. While urging others to exercise similar diligence, he never forgot to impress upon their minds, that the efficiency of the preacher's labours must greatly depend upon the agreement between his discourses and his conduct. "Words which come from a cold heart can never kindle ardent desires after heaven in the hearts of the hearers, for that which does not itself burn can set fire to nothing else."<sup>1</sup>

In order to arouse the clergy to a due sense of the dignity of their office, and of that which was necessary to its proper execution, he drew up his "Regula Pastoralis," in which he collected together many of the precepts scattered over different portions of his writings. He endeavoured thereby to show, in what sense, and in what manner, the spiritual shepherd attains his office; how he ought to live and conduct himself according to the various circumstances and capacities of his flock; and how he must guard himself against an overweening self-conceit, if his labours should be crowned with success.

This book exercised a remarkable influence in the next generation, when it served to create a better feeling among the clergy, and contributed to the general reformation of the church. The synods, which were engaged in effecting these improvements in the time of Charlemagne, adopted Gregory's book as the rule of their proceedings.<sup>2</sup> Soon after its appearance its author had been asked by a bishop, "What should be done if men like those described in that work could not be found to fill the offices of the church? Whether it was not enough to know Jesus Christ and Him crucified?"<sup>3</sup> He who wrote this could scarcely have consi-

<sup>1</sup> Ad supernum desiderium inflammare auditores suos nequeunt verba, quae frigido corde proferuntur, neque enim res, quae in se ipsa non arserit, aliud accendit. *Moralia* l. i. viii. in cap. viii. *Job* § 72. So also l. i. in *Ezechiel* h. xi. § 7. Only then is it possible for the preacher to inflame the hearts of his hearers with the love of the heavenly fatherland, when, *lingua ejus ex vita arserit*. Nam *lucerna*, quae in semetipsa non ardet, eam rem, cui supponitur, non accendit. He applies to this subject the words of John the Baptist, *Joh. v. 35*, *Lucerna ardens et lucens, ardens videlicet per caeleste desiderium, lucens per verbum*.

<sup>2</sup> See the preface to the Council of Maynz 813. The Council of Rheims, held in the same year, and the Council of Tours, in its third canon, directed that no bishop, if possible, should fail to make himself acquainted with the Canons of the Councils, and the "Liber Pastoralis," in quibus se debet unusquisque quasi in quodam speculo assidue considerare.

<sup>3</sup> *Lib. ii. ep. 54*.

dered how much is required rightly to know and understand these words in the sense of Saint Paul.

In regard to the peculiar theological character and ethical principles of Gregory, the study of Augustine, whom he especially venerated,<sup>1</sup> exercised the greatest influence on his mind. But the doctrine of Augustine was, through him, transmitted to the following age, rather in its milder and more practical, than in its speculative form. His uniformly practical disposition induced him to view the principles of Augustine only on one side, on that, namely, which made them appear to him as especially necessary to the formation of the Christian character, on the foundation of true humility and self-denial. He did not trouble himself with speculative questions, but reprov'd the heretical practice of turning scripture from the object for which it was given to man in the work of salvation; of leaving unnoticed that which is revealed for a useful end to search after the hidden and the incomprehensible;<sup>2</sup> of presumptuously inquiring into the essence of God, while the enquirer himself is ignorant of his own wretchedness.<sup>3</sup>

Gregory represents God's knowledge as causal, creative, and eternal, whereby a conditional predestination, founded on a prescience, having respect to any thing allowed, seemed to him altogether excluded. It is only by introducing a kind of necessary anthropopathism that we can speak of a divine prescience. The relations of time pertain not to God. Eternal knowledge only peculiarly belongs to him.<sup>4</sup> But Gregory's practical mind led him, when applying this opinion, so far to extend the principle that

<sup>1</sup> When a prefect of Africa wrote to him requesting a copy of "Moralia" for his own instruction, Gregory replied, l. x. ep. 54, *Sed si delicioso cupitis pabulo saginari beati Augustini patriotae vestri opuscula legite, et ad comparationem siliginis illius nostrum furfurem non quaeratis.*

<sup>2</sup> *Omnes haeretici, dum in sacro eloquio plus secreta Dei student perserutari, quam capiunt, fame sua steriles fiunt. Dum ad hoc tendunt, quod comprehendere nequeunt ea cognoscere negligunt, ex quibus erudiri potuerunt.*

<sup>3</sup> *Plerumque audacter de natura divinitatis tractant, cum semetiptos miseri nesciant.* L. xx. in cap. 30. Job. h.

<sup>4</sup> *Scimus, quia Deo futurum nihil est; ante cujus oculos praeterita nulla sunt, praesentia non traeseunt, futura non veniunt; quia omne quod nobis fuit et erit, in ejus conspectu praesto est; et omne quod praesens est, scire potest potius quam praescire, quia quae nobis futura sunt videt, quae tamen ipsi semper praesto sunt, praescius dicitur, quamvis nequaquam futurum praevident, quod praesens videt, nam et quaeque sunt, non in aeternitate ejus ideo videntur, quia sunt, sed ideo sunt, quia videntur.* L. xx., in cap. 30, Job. § 63.

the causality of evil was referred to God, although he shrunk from any closer inquiry into this relation. Where it is said that God creates both the good and evil (Isai. xlv. 7), the latter refers to that evil only which is ordained by God for good. The creative energy of God cannot be employed on the evil, as that in itself is negative.<sup>1</sup> Thus he explains the expression, that God hardens the hearts of men, as merely signifying that they, having incurred a certain degree of guilt, are no longer allowed the grace which might have softened them.<sup>2</sup> Through the prevailing view of infant baptism, the question was forced upon him, whence it was that a child dying after baptism was saved; while another dying before baptism, was not? Rejecting every other kind of explanation, he replied by simply referring to the incomprehensibility of the divine judgments, before which men ought to bow in silent reverence.<sup>3</sup> Speaking in another place<sup>4</sup> of the incomprehensibility also of the divine proceedings, he draws this practical conclusion: "May we learn to fear from this consciousness of our insignificance.<sup>5</sup> For we should fear, that we may become humble, and cease to trust in ourselves: We should cease to trust in ourselves that we may learn to seek the help of our Creator, and when we become conscious that death only is to be found in self-trust, we shall attain, by the help of the Creator, to life."<sup>6</sup>

It was of great weight with Gregory, in regard to free-will, that every inclination to good proceeds from divine grace; but that the free-will works therewith, grace influencing it according to its proper nature, and the will obeying the call with free determination. All this may be easily reconciled with the Augustine system of *gratia indeclinabilis* as before described; and it is only in this sense that he attributes any degree of merit to free-will.

1 Quæ nulla sua natura subsistunt. L. iii., in cap. 2, Job. § 15.

2 L. xxxi., in cap. 39, Job. § 26; and in Ezechiel, l. ii., b. xi., § 25.

3 Quanto obscuritate nequeunt conspici, tanto debent humilitate venerari, l. 27, in cap. 36, Job. § 7.

4 See l. 29, in cap. 38, Job. § 77.

5 In relation to the question respecting himself, whether he pertained to the number of the predestinated, of which no one could be certain.

6 Et qui in se fidens mortuus est; auctoris sui adjutorium appetens vivat.

7 Quia praeveniente divina gratia in operatione bona, nostrum liberum arbitrium sequitur, nosmetipsos liberare dicimur, qui liberanti nos Domino consentimus. He explains the expression of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 10, thus: Quia enim praevenientem Dei gratiam

But by this combination of ideas, Gregory, while asserting the existence of free-will, could, at the same time, insist upon the operation of a grace influencing irresistibly and changing the corrupted will of man. "O what a mighty artist," he exclaims, "is that Spirit! Without having to wait for learning, a man is led to all which that spirit wills. He teaches as soon as he has moved the soul; his touch is teaching, for he at once both enlightens and changes the human mind, which, under his influence, suddenly denies what it was, and becomes what it was not."<sup>1</sup> He treated of good as the work of God and the work of man, at the same time, in so far as it is derived from the operation of divine grace. But free-will submits itself as an organ to the operation of free grace, without becoming conscious of any compulsion or necessity. Hence, rewards may be spoken of, although the conduct to be rewarded would never have been followed, had it not been for the direct operation of divine grace; and if Gregory had wished to pursue the results of this union of ideas still further, he must have allowed, that this was a necessary operation of grace, however it might appear in the form of an independent determination of a man's own free thoughts.

Gregory represented the salvation of individuals, as depending upon whether they belonged to the class of the predestinated or not; and insisted that none, without an especial revelation, might pretend to belong to that number, or attempt to fathom the inscrutable decrees of God. From this it would follow, that no one can be certain, in the present world, of his own individual salvation; and this uncertainty appeared to Gregory as highly useful, being calculated to keep a man in a constant state of humility and watchfulness. A lady of the bed-chamber (*Cubicularia*), at the court of Constantinople, having stated to him in a letter, that she

*per liberum arbitrium fuerat subsequens, apte subjungit: mecum, ut et divino muneri non esset ingratus, et tamen a merito liberi arbitrii non remaneret extraneus, l. 24, in cap. 33, Job. § 21.*

<sup>1</sup> Gregor. l. ii., Hom. in Evangel. 30, § 8. O qualis est artifere iste Spiritus! Nulla ad discendum mora agitur in omne quod voluerit. Mox ut tetigerit mentem docet solumque tetigisse docuisse est: nam humanum animum subito ut illustrat immutat: abnegat hoc repente quod erat; exhibet repente quod non erat.

<sup>2</sup> Bonum quod agimus, et Dei est et nostrum. Dei per prævenientem gratiam, nostrum per obsequentem liberam voluntatem. Quia non immerito gratias agimus, scimus, quod obsequente libero arbitrio bona elegimus, quæ ageremus, l. 33, in cap. 41, Job. § 40.

could not be happy till Gregory should assure her that it had been revealed to him from God, that her sins were forgiven, he replied,<sup>1</sup> that she had desired something of him which was both difficult and unprofitable;—difficult, because he was unworthy of such a revelation; and unprofitable, because it was not till the last day of her life, when there would be no more time to weep for sin, that she could be assured of forgiveness. Till then, she must always view herself with doubt; trembling at the recollection of her sins, and striving to purify herself by daily tears. This was the state in which Paul found himself, 1 Cor. ix. 27, notwithstanding the sublime revelations of which he could boast.

This mode of considering the subject was transmitted to the following century in the western church, and laid the foundation for a painful asceticism, for gloomy views of human life; and for many kinds of pretended righteousness and superstition, the natural result of feelings attendant upon this uncertainty. But Gregory directed the anxious mind to the objective view of the divine grace in Christ; and concluded one of his sermons with these words: “Let us trust in the mercy of our Creator: let us, being mindful of his righteousness, lament our sins: being mindful of his grace, let us not despair. The God-man gives man trust in God.”<sup>2</sup>

While we discover in the dogmatic system of Augustine two elements, that is, the purely Christian element, which arises from the profound apprehension of the idea of grace and justification, as something inward; and the visible catholic element, derived from ecclesiastical tradition, and which had mingled itself in the inward life with the former; so we discover also these two same elements in the system of Gregory, and trace them as transmitted through him to the following century. From the latter of the two elements proceeded the development of Catholicism in the middle ages, in its sensual-Jewish form; and from the former, the seed of a living and inward Christianity, concealed under the covering of Catholicism, and sometimes opposing a powerful resistance to its ruling principle. The conflict between these two elements was shown in various ways.

While Gregory, on the one side, was easily disposed to receive the accounts which he heard respecting the miracles wrought in

<sup>1</sup> L. vii., ep. 25.

<sup>2</sup> In Evangelia l. ii., h. 34.



his time ; and especially to give credence to such narratives when they regarded the wonder-working power of the Sacrament ; the collection which he made of these stories in his Dialogues,<sup>1</sup> affording nourishment to the love of the marvellous in the following age ; so, on the other side, the view which, from his profound and earnest Christian spirit, he took of Christianity ; of the new creation founded in redemption ; of the inward miracle of life divinely imparted,<sup>2</sup> led him to form a more correct estimate of the value of a visible miracle, as something partial and temporal in relation to the one grand and general object which was to be introduced and proved thereby. Hence he created a species of antagonism to the carnal desire for miracles. He regarded them as mainly necessary to prepare the way for the introduction of the new dispensation among men ; to lead them from the visible to the invisible, from the outward miracle to the far greater miracle wrought inwardly by the Spirit. It was necessary that they who had something new to proclaim, should effect conviction by the new works which accompanied their statements.<sup>3</sup> Where that highest of wonders, the object of all that was done, the divine life in man, had once been wrought, there was no more need of any outward miracle. Paul, on the island which was full of unbelievers, healed the sick man by his prayer ; but to his sick friend Timothy he only recommended the use of natural means. 1 Tim. v. 23. This was done because, in the former case, the outward miracle was necessary in order to render the man susceptible of the inward might of the divine life ; while, in the latter, Timothy being inwardly alive and well,<sup>4</sup> there was no need of the outward miracle.<sup>5</sup> The true miracle is always being wrought in the church, which daily works in a spiritual manner the miracles

<sup>1</sup> We here also meet with many curious exhibitions from the higher sphere of spiritual science ; in which the force of the divine life breaking through its earthly barriers may have discovered itself.

<sup>2</sup> As he speaks of the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit in relation to the incarnation of the Son of God. In illa Deus in se permanens suscepit hominem ; in ista vero homines venientem desuper susceperunt Deum ; in illa Deus naturaliter factus est homo ; in ista homines facti sunt per adoptionem Dei. In Evangelia Lit. ii. Hom. 30, § 9.

<sup>3</sup> Ut nova facerent, qui nova praedicarent. Ad hoc quippe visibilia miracula coruscant ; ut corda videntium ad fidem invisibilium pertrahant ; ut per hoc, quod mirum foris agitur, hoc quod intus est, longe mirabilius esse sentiatur. In Evangel. l. i. h. iv. § 3.

<sup>4</sup> Qui salubriter intus vivebat.

<sup>5</sup> Compare also l. 27, in cap. 37, Job. § 36, ed. Benedict. t. i. f. 839.

which the apostles wrought in a carnal manner. This he illustrates well and spiritually by a reference to the gift of tongues, the gift of healing, &c., adding, "These miracles are by so much the greater, because they are of a spiritual character, and they are also by so much the greater because not bodies but souls are quickened thereby." "Strive," he adds,<sup>1</sup> in the sermon in which these expressions occur, "to perform such miracles whenever you will, by the power of God. Those corporeal miracles do indeed sometimes testify of holiness, but they do not make men holy; whereas these spiritual miracles, wrought in the soul, do not merely bear witness to a holy life; they make it holy. The wicked may perform the one, Matt. vii. 22; the good only can enjoy the other. Seek not, therefore, after the miracles which are common to the evil as well as to the holy, but for those miracles of love and piety which are the more certain the more they are concealed." Having quoted the words of Christ, Gregory says in another place,<sup>2</sup> "It hence appears, that humility and love, not the power of working miracles, are what ought to be honoured in man. The proof of holiness is not the power of working miracles, but to love our neighbours as ourselves."<sup>3</sup> Christ himself declared that brotherly love was the peculiar sign of discipleship. Gregory beautifully develops the idea of a moral energy derived from faith, and the power of which he describes as sufficient to overcome the might of antichrist, however aided by visible miracles.<sup>4</sup> Thus again; although he expressed his admiration of the wonderful cures wrought at the graves of the saints, as instances of the power of divine grace, yet he spoke against the offering up of prayer at these holy stations, when the object sought was bodily aid. "See," he says, in a sermon preached on a martyr's festival, "how many have come together at this festival, to bow the knee, to strike the breast, to utter the words of prayer and confession, and bedew their faces with tears! But consider, I be-

<sup>1</sup> L. ii. in Evangel. h. 29, § 3.

<sup>2</sup> L. xx. in cap. 30, Job. cap. vii. § 17.

<sup>3</sup> He adds: De Deo vera; de proximo vero meliora quam de semetipso sentire.

<sup>4</sup> Ante eum a fidelibus miraculorum divitiarum subtrahuntur, et tunc contra eos antiquus ille hostis per aperta prodigia ostenditur, ut quo ipse per signa extollitur, eo a fidelibus sine signis robustius laudabilisque vincatur. Quorum nimirum virtus omnibus signis fit potior, quum omne, quod ab illo terribiliter fieri conspiciat, per internae constantiae calcem premit. L. xxxiv. in Job. c. iii. § 7.

seek you, the object of your prayers ; reflect whether you pray in the name of Jesus ; that is, whether you pray for the joys of eternal life ; for you are not seeking Jesus in the temple of Jesus, if, in the temple of eternity, you are vainly praying for things temporal. But see ! one man in his prayer desires a wife ; another an estate ; one is thinking of raiment, another about food. And, indeed, if these things fail us, we must seek them at the hands of the Almighty God. But, instead of being so anxious on the subject, we are to remember the words of our Saviour : “ Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness ; and all these things shall be added unto you.” We are not guilty of an error, therefore, in simply asking Christ for such things, but in praying for them too eagerly. He, however, who prays for the death of his enemy ; who in his prayer pursues him whom he cannot reach with his sword, such a man is guilty of murder ; strives, in his prayer, against the will of his Creator ; and converts prayer into sin.”

From that which has been already remarked on Gregory's dogmatic principles, it is easy to perceive how with him, as with Augustine, the ethical stood in near inward relation to the dogmatic, whence his peculiar treatment of the former.<sup>1</sup> This mode of treating ethical subjects was derived from Augustine, who adopted it in opposition to Pelagianism, which violently separated the morality of Christianity from its proper connexion with the doctrines of the gospel. It was a method which sought to refer all to the centre-point of Christian life ; to the divine vital principle which has its root in faith ; to the being of the soul in love, and which was necessarily opposed to the disjointed, outward, and *quantitative* estimation of the ethical. The several branches of righteousness, says Gregory, must all spring from the root of inward righteousness, if our conduct is to be regarded before God as a fitting offering ; as an *oblatio verae rectitudinis* ;<sup>2</sup> and the essence of this inward righteousness consists in love, which of itself produces every kind of good. “ As the many branches of a tree spring from one root, so will many virtues be produced from the one virtue of love. The branch of the good work has nothing green upon it, if it be not connected with the root of love. Thus

<sup>1</sup> He especially occupied himself with this, particularly in his “*Moralia*,” a practical allegorizing exposition of Job, from Homilies on that book.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. xix. in Job. c. 23, § 38.

also the commandments of the Lord are many, and yet but one ; they are many, that is, in relation to the manifoldness of the work, and only one in the root of love."<sup>1</sup> Hence he asserts the necessary inward connection of all the virtues, especially of the so-called cardinal virtues, which he represents as incapable of existing, the one without the other.<sup>2</sup> He employs this, among other arguments, to prove the essential oneness of these cardinal virtues. Thus *prudentia*, which relates to the knowledge of what ought to be done, *can avail* nothing without *fortitudo*, which affords the strength to effect that which is known to be right. Such knowledge by itself would be a punishment rather than a virtue. But he who by means of *prudentia* knows what it is right to do, and by means of *fortitudo* performs it, is indeed just. The zeal for righteousness, however, ceases to be right, when it is not accompanied by moderation.<sup>3</sup>

From this standing-point, Gregory assails many of the different branches of ethical error, as seen in the fragmentary and outward estimation assigned to this or that work of piety as *opus operatum*. He instances, in illustration of his meaning, the giving of alms, and the adoption of the monastic life, otherwise so highly prized by him, but which was often sought by men who were only under the influence of some temporary suffering ; and who, though they changed their garb, changed not their actual dispositions.<sup>4</sup> Such men must be addressed in the language which the Apostle Paul employed, when warning those who observed the outward ceremonies of the law, that "in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but a new creature." To despise the present world ; to love not that which is temporal ; to be truly humble before God and towards our neighbour ; to bear affronts with patience, and by patience to banish every feeling of resentment from the heart ; to covet not that which is another's, but to be ready to share our own with those who are in want ; to love him who is our friend in God ; and for God's sake to love even

1 L. ii. in Evangelia h. 27, § 1.

2 Una virtus sine aliis, aut omnino nulla est, aut imperfecta. Lib. xxii. Moral. c. i. l. ii. in Ezech. h. 10. § 18.

3 In Ezechiel Lib. i. Hom. iii. § 8.

4 Ad vocem praedicationis quasi ex conversione compunctos habitum, non animum mutasse, ita ut religiosam vestem sumerent, sed ante acta vitia non calcarent, et de solo exterius habitu, quem sumserunt, sanctitatis fiduciam habere.

our enemies ; to sympathize with the sufferings of our neighbours, and to rejoice not at the death of an enemy—this is to be a new creature.<sup>1</sup>

In the same spirit Gregory frequently speaks against the supposed worth of ascetic severity, when it proceeds not from true love and self-denial, in which case it rather serves to foster pride and vanity.<sup>2</sup> So too he protests against the affectation of humility, which, under the appearance of self-abasement, may only conceal and nourish a greater degree of haughtiness.<sup>3</sup> The pretended humility in the *opus operatum* of a confession of sin and corruption, made by the mouth, while the insincerity of this confession is proved by the manner in which any accusation of guilt coming from the mouth of another is received, forms another subject of Gregory's reproof.<sup>4</sup> In this respect he carried forward the ethical designs of Augustine, asserting with similar earnestness the principle of veracity, and condemning falsehood.<sup>5</sup>

Gregory had no intention whatever of upholding a faith which should blindly exclude all enquiry on the part of the understanding ; but he followed also, in this respect, opposed as he naturally was to dogmatic speculation, the principles of Augustine on the relation of reason to faith. The church, he says, only desires faith as founded on rational conviction ; and although it sets forth truths which cannot be comprehended by the mere natural understanding, it shews, by an appeal to reason, that the human understanding ought not to attempt to fathom the incomprehensible.<sup>6</sup>

1 In Ezechiel. l. i. h. 10. § 9.

2 See, for example, l. ii. in Evangelia Hom. 32. Fortasse laboriosum non est homini relinquere sua ; sed valde laboriosum est, relinquere semetipsum.

3 Sunt nonnulli, qui viles, videri ab hominibus appetunt, atque omne, quod sunt, dejectos se exhibendo contemnunt ; sed tamen apud se introrsus quasi ex ipso merito ostensæ vilitatis intumescunt, et tanto magis in corde elati sunt, quanto amplius in specie elationem premunt. L. xxiv. Moral. § 22.

4 Sæpe contingit, ut passim se homines iniquos esse fateantur ; sed quum peccata sua veraciter aliis arguentibus audiunt, defendunt se summopere, atque innocentes videri conantur. Iste de confessione peccati ornari voluit, non humiliari, per accusationem suam humilis appetiit videri, non esse. L. xxiv. Moral. § 22.

5 He would allow of no such a thing as a necessary lie : Ut nec vita cujuslibet per fallaciam defendatur, ne suae animæ noceant, dum præstare vitam carni nituntur alienæ, quanquam hoc ipsum peccati genus facillime credimus relaxari. Moral. l. xviii. § 5. So also against his proceeding from a false humility : Qui necessitate cogente vera de se bona loquitur, tanto magis humilitati jungitur, quanto et veritati sociatur. Moral. xxvi. § 5.

6 Ecclesia recta, quæ errantibus dicit, non quasi ex auctoritate præcipit, sed ex ra-

The influence which Gregory exercised in discouraging the study of the old classic literature, has been frequently overrated. In this respect he only adopted the point of view which was always prominent in the Western church. We have remarked above what vast importance he attached to study as the duty of the clergy; but the studies which he desired them to pursue were spiritual studies, such as pertained to their calling;<sup>1</sup> and he severely reproached Desiderius, bishop of Vienne,<sup>2</sup> for giving lectures on grammar and expounding the ancient poets.<sup>3</sup> We must consider more strictly what motive induced the bishop to take this course, and how he could combine such an employment with his calling, which, under the circumstances then existing in France, was doubtless one of high pretension. Without this, we cannot determine how far Gregory was just in passing so severe a censure on the bishop. It does not follow, indeed, that he actually regarded the occupation unworthy of a bishop, or that to be engaged about ancient literature was unbecoming of a Christian. But when he says that it was unfit for even a pious layman to repeat poems which referred to heathen mythology, it seems to follow that he must have considered it wrong for a Christian to become a teacher of the classics. He might, however, in his zeal against such things, express himself more severely towards the bishop than he would otherwise have done.<sup>4</sup>

tione persuadet. He lets the church say: *Ea, quae assero, nequaquam mihi ex auctoritate credite, sed an vera sint, ex ratione pensate.* Moral. l. viii. § 3.

<sup>1</sup> The studies of the clergy, however, rarely extended to the old Greek fathers; partly through their ignorance of the language; partly because the dogmatic views of these fathers had little agreement, in many points, with the prevailing opinions. This will account for the fact that in the Roman libraries not a copy could be found of any of the writings of Irenaeus.

<sup>2</sup> L. xi. ep. 54.

<sup>3</sup> *Quia in uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt, et quam grave nefandumque sit episcopis canere; quod nec laico religioso conveniat, ipse considera.*

<sup>4</sup> If the commentary on the books of Kings, which is ascribed to Gregory, may be taken as an evidence of his mode of thinking, it would appear from thence that he was rather a defender of the study of ancient literature, in the same sense in which Augustine was. He regarded the study of the *artes liberales* as necessary to the right understanding of the Holy Scriptures, and attributed it to the cunning of Satan that Christians were advised not to pursue such studies, *ut et secularia nesciant, et ad sublimitatem spiritualium non pertingant.* Moses, in order that he might be able rightly to administer divine things, was first instructed in all the learning of the Egyptians. Isaiah was more eloquent than all other Prophets, because he was not, as Jeremiah, an *armentarius* but *nobiliter instructus.* So also Paul, probably, was superior to the rest of the Apostles,

The death of Gregory the Great in the year 604 was followed by those political movements and convulsions among the people of the West, which shook more and more the foundations of ancient civilization. Though Rome and Italy were possessed of libraries, the treasures of which subsequently enriched the new churches of England and Germany, the storms which agitated the country, in the following century, prevented the growth of any disposition to employ them. A vast gap exists in theological cultivation and evangelical knowledge between Gregory the Great and the Popes of the eighth century. In the midst of the devastation which now prevailed, providence afforded, in particular countries, a secure retreat for the remains of ancient civilization, as materials to be employed in the new creation of Christianity.

At the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century, Isidorus, bishop of Hispalis or Sevilla, laboured in Spain, and proved himself possessed of all the learning which his age could afford. As a theological writer, he exercised especial influence by his liturgical work "*De Officiis Ecclesiasticis*," in two books; and by another, in three books, which contains a collection of thoughts, arranged according to the most important subjects, and referring particularly to Christian faith and morals: "*Sententiarum libri tres*." Isidore here followed, for the most part even literally, Augustine and Gregory the Great, and contributed greatly to transmit and circulate their opinions during the succeeding age, especially on the subject of grace and predestination;<sup>2</sup> in which he imitated Augustine's severe veracity of state-

particularly *per doctrinam*, quia futurus in coelestibus terrena prius studiosus didicit. l. v. in 1. Reg. iv. 2, 30. But whoever was the author of this book, it indicates a remarkable reaction against the prevailing contempt for ancient literature. Supposing, however, that the expressions here used must be regarded as too strong for Gregory himself, still it appears from remarks unquestionably his, that although he considered many of the writings of antiquity unfit for the study of a Christian, he viewed the knowledge of ancient literature as essential to a theological education. The account of the burning of the Palatine library by Gregory's order, the origin of which is a tradition of the twelfth century (Joh. of Salisb. ii. 26, Polieratic), rests upon no sufficient grounds of credibility.

<sup>1</sup> Where the celebrated Cassiodorus, after having retired from public life to a cloister, collected rich treasures of literature, and by his "*Institutio divinarum literarum*," excited the monks to the study and copying of books.

<sup>2</sup> The expression is remarkable, l. ii. c. 6, *Gemina est predestinatio, sive electionem ad requiem sive reproborum ad mortem*.

men t. In his Chronicle of the Goths he also adopts the views of Gregory, and censures the tyrannical methods employed for the conversion of the Jews.<sup>2</sup>

The seeds of scientific and theological cultivation thus scattered by Isidore long bore fruit in Spain. It is possible that the conquest of the country by the Saracens in the eighth century, and its separation from the rest of Christendom, might contribute to give a quicker movement to the progress of civilization among its people. It was no longer fettered by the systems of the Romish church ; and hence the signs which may be traced of the operation of a freer spirit against the traditional and ecclesiastical.

We have stated above, that the monasteries of Ireland formed a refuge and a rendezvous both for theological and other classes of science. The *Magistri e Scotia* were already celebrated in the seventh and eighth centuries ; and, by their visits, not only to England, but to France and Germany, learning of various kinds was extensively diffused. It was from Ireland, as we have seen, that England was so richly supplied with books, and other means of instruction ; and it was the zeal thus excited which induced the English clergy and monks to collect books for themselves from France and Rome.<sup>3</sup>

In the seventh century, Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and the abbot Hadrian, who accompanied him from Rome, greatly exerted themselves to promote the intellectual advancement of England. They travelled together through the country, and laid the foundation of several schools. Having imparted their knowledge to numerous scholars, they left them behind to fulfil their plans ; and among these scholars, according to Bede,<sup>4</sup> were many

1 L. ii. c. 30, Hoc quoque mendacii genus perfecti viri summopere fugiunt, ut nec vita eujuslibet per eorum fallaciam defendatur, ne suae animae noceant, dum praestare vitam alienae carni nituntur, quamquam hoc ipsum peccati genus facillime credimus relaxari.

2 He says of such rules, as instituted by King Sisabut : *Æmulationem quidem Dei habuit, sed non secundum scientiam. Potestate enim compulit, quos provocare fidei ratione oportuit.* He adds, indeed : *Sed sicut scriptum est Phil. I. Sive per occasionem sive per veritatem, Christus annunciat ; in hoc gaudeo et gaudebo.*

3 In the memoir of abbot, afterwards bishop, Aldhelm, written by William of Malmshury, who indeed did not live till the twelfth century, but collected his materials from earlier sources, it is mentioned, that the merchant ships from France brought among other wares, Bibles and other books. See cap. 3, *Acta Sanctorum Bolland. Mens. Mai. t. vi. f. 82.*

4 *Hist. Eccles. l. iv. 2.*



to whom the Greek and Latin languages were as familiar as their native tongue. It was under this influence that the venerable Bede himself was formed, the man who most eminently deserves to be called England's teacher. He was born in the year 673, in the village of Farrow, in Northumberland; but he received his education, from his seventh year, in the monastery of Weremouth; and this monastery was the seat of those his vast, though unseen, erudite labours, by which so many divines, both in his own and later times, were formed, and enabled to go forth as instructors to other lands. He says of himself,<sup>1</sup> that he employed all labour on the study of the Holy Scriptures; and that, amidst the performance of those devotions and liturgical rites which, as a monk and a priest, it was his duty to fulfil, it had always been his joy to learn, to teach, or to write.<sup>2</sup> The manner of his death corresponded to his life, consecrated in quiet activity to God. For fourteen days, surrounded by his scholars, he looked forward cheerfully and tranquilly to the approach of death. Full of gratitude for the good which he had enjoyed in his life, he regarded his last sufferings with corresponding gratitude, as a means of purification.<sup>3</sup> Even his dying hours were devoted to the great work of his life, the instruction of youth; and he expired in the midst of his beloved scholars, May 26. 735.<sup>4</sup>

1 In the notice of his life and writings, prefixed to his English Church History; also Acta S. Mai. t. vi. f. 721, and Mabillon Acta S. Ord. Benedicti. Sæc. iii. p. 1.

2 Semper aut discere, aut docere, aut scribere dulce habui.

3 His scholar Cuthbert says of him: Vere fateor, quia neminem unquam oculis meis vidi, nec auribus audivi tam diligenter gratias Deo vivo referre.

4 In the last fourteen days of his sickness, he employed himself in translating the gospel of John into Anglo-Saxon, and in correcting the abbreviatures of Isidore for the use of his scholars. He remarked: My scholars must not read what is false, and use their labour, in vain after my death. When his sickness increased, and he could only breathe with difficulty, he taught the whole day. On that which preceded the one on which he died, he dictated cheerfully, and sometimes said to his scholars, "Make haste to learn: I know not how long I may be with you, and whether my Creator may not soon take me to Himself." In the same manner, he employed the last day of his life in dictating to his scholars; in correcting what they had written; and in answering their questions. Having thus occupied himself till three o'clock, he requested one of his scholars to summon the priests of the monastery quickly to his side. "The rich of this world," he said, "can give gold and silver, and other costly things. These I have not; but I will give to my brethren, with much love and joy, what God has given to me." This was some pepper, some incense, and some ecclesiastical garments. When the priests came, he prayed them to read mass for him with diligence. "It is time for me," he said, "if so it please my Creator, to return to Him who made me out of nothing. I have lived long; the time of

Egbert, one of the scholars and especial friends of Bede, laboured in the spirit of his master. As superintendent of the school at York, he gave instruction in all the sciences of the age; but he devoted himself, above all things, to the study of the Bible, and of such of the writings of the fathers as served to explain it. Even when he became archbishop of York, he still watched over this school, at the head of which he placed his scholar Aelbert. This school produced Alcuin, the greatest teacher of his times, and born in the very year in which the pious scholar, whose place he was to supply, but in a far wider sphere of exertion, breathed his last, the year, that is, of Bede's death, 735. He subsequently became superintendent of this celebrated school, which long flourished under his management. Many students from distant parts there became his scholars, and he continued in this employ till the emperor Charles summoned him to share his labour in the great work of civilizing the Franks, and effecting the reform of their church.

The Frankish church, under Charles the Great, was the focus in which all the scattered rays of refinement from England, Ireland, Spain, Italy, were united, and Charles availed himself of every opportunity to excite the bishops of his kingdom to imitate his example in the zealous promotion of scientific studies. When, for instance, he received letters from abbots and bishops, assuring him of their prayers in his behalf, he remarked, to his vexation, how greatly they were wanting in ability to express their thoughts

my deliverance draweth nigh, I desire to depart and to be with Christ; for my soul longs to see my King, Christ, in his beauty." He continued to speak in this manner till evening. One of his scholars then came. He had given him something to write, and had requested him to hasten to complete it. The young man stated that he had still one passage to write. "Write quickly, then," said Bede. Soon after, the scholar said, "The passage is now finished." "Yes," answered Bede, "you have said right. It is finished. Hold my head in your hands. It is a great joy to me to sit opposite the holy place where I used to pray. I would fain there call tranquilly upon my Father." He was then supported by the scholar, upon whose hands his head rested, to the floor of the cell; and he sang the words of the doxology "Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto," and, with the last words of the hymn to the Holy Ghost, he breathed out his earthly life.

<sup>1</sup> His scholar Alcuin, who always clung to him with the greatest affection, said of him, in his poem on the archbishops and saints of York:

Cui Christus amor, potus, cibus, omnia Christus;  
Vita, fides, sensus, spes, lux, via, gloria, virtus.

And,

Indodlis egregiæ juvenes quoscumque videbat,  
Hos sibi conjunxit, docuit, nutrit, amavit.

correctly. He, therefore, directed a circular<sup>1</sup> to be addressed to them, in which he sought to awaken their zeal for study, that they might thereby better prepare themselves for understanding the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures.<sup>2</sup> He regarded it as important that the overseers of the churches<sup>3</sup> should have the same end in view as the learned men by whom he was surrounded. Among the latter, Alcuin was doubtless the most distinguished. Having been despatched, in the year 780, on a mission to Rome, by the archbishop of York, he met at Parma with the emperor, to whom he was already known. Charles urged him to remain with him, and become the conductor of the schools which he had lately established. Alcuin having first returned to his native country, and obtained permission from his king and his archbishop to obey the emperor's call, acceded to the wish of that monarch. The latter bestowed on him a monastery, in the neighbourhood of Troyes, and also the monastery of Ferrieres, in the diocese of Sens; that he might conduct the studies of the monks, and derive a provision from the revenues of the convents. But he especially committed to him the management of the educational establishment which he had formed, for the advantage of the higher class of persons, in the neighbourhood of his court, the *Schola Palatina*. This led to his close intercourse with the emperor, and the most distinguished men in church and state. His counsel was sought in all matters connected with ecclesiastical affairs, and the improvement of the people. He gave instruction even to the emperor himself, who called him his most beloved teacher in Christ.<sup>4</sup> On many occasions Charles proposed to him questions on difficult passages of Scripture; on the meaning of certain liturgical observances; on ecclesiastical chronology; and other theological subjects, to which his attention had been directed by

1 Bouquet. *Collectio Scriptorum rerum Franc.* t. v. f. 621, *Concilia Galliæ*, t. ii. f. 621.

2 *Quum autem in sacris paginis schemata, tropi et caetera his similia inserta inveniuntur, nulli dubium est, quod ea unusquisque legens tanto citius spiritaliter intelligit, quanto prius in literarum magisterio plenius instructus fuerit.*

3 The "*discordia inter sapientes et doctores ecclesiae*" he regarded as the worst thing that could happen. This feeling he expressed on the occasion of a dispute between Alcuin and Theodolph, bishop of Orleans, in a letter to the monks of St Martin's monastery at Tours. It is found among the Epistles of Alcuin, ep. 119.

4 *Carissime in Christo præceptor*: this is how he names him in a letter, from which Alcuin extracts some few lines in his answer. Ep. 124.

their having become the theme of conversation at his court. After Alcuin's departure, a constant correspondence was kept up between him and the emperor till his death; nor did Alcuin refrain from expressing what he thought with the utmost candour.<sup>1</sup>

We have already remarked how important it was to the emperor, both for his own sake, and for that of the church, that the text of the Bible, the then existing Latin version of which, through the carelessness and ignorance of transcribers, was in many parts unintelligible, should undergo correction. This weighty business Charles committed to Alcuin;<sup>2</sup> who, on wishing him joy at his receiving the imperial crown, sent him as a congratulatory present a complete copy of the Bible corrected by himself.<sup>3</sup>

When Alcuin had spent eight years in this sphere of exertion, he again visited his native country, where he remained about two years, and then returned to the scene of his early labours. Finding old age approaching, he wished to retire from the bustle of the court, and the numerous occupations in which he was there involved. It was his especial wish to renounce all employments not immediately connected with religion; and, separated from the world, to prepare himself in tranquil retirement for the end of his earthly life.<sup>4</sup> If we may believe the old memoirs of Alcuin,<sup>5</sup> he

<sup>1</sup> As an illustration of the pious Christian tone of Alcuin's feeling, we may quote the words of consolation which he wrote to the emperor on the death of his wife, Liodgarde, in the year 800: *Domine Jesu! spes nostra, salus nostra, consolatio nostra, qui clementissima voce omnibus sub pondere enjuslibet laboris gementibus mandasti dicens: Venite ad me omnes, qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos. Quid hac promissione jucundius? Quid hac spe beatius? Veniat ad eum omnis anima mœrens, omne cor contritum, fundens lacrimas in conspectu misericordiæ illius; neque abscondat vulnera suo medico, qui ait: Ego occidam et vivere faciam; percutiam et ego sanabo. Dent. xxxii. 39. Flagellat miris modis, ut erudiat filios, pro quorum salute unico non perpercit Filio. He then represents the Son of God as saying to the soul, Propter te descendi et patiebar, quæ legisti in literis meis, ut tibi præparem mansionem in domo Patris mei. Regnum meum tantum valet, quantum tu es. Te ipsam da, et habebis illud. Ep. 90.*

<sup>2</sup> As Alcuin himself says: *Domini regis præceptum in emendatione veteris novique Testamenti. See the letter prefixed to the sixth book of his Commentary on the Gospel of St John, t. i., vol. ii., f. 591, e. Froben.*

<sup>3</sup> Alcuin (ep. ciii.) had, it appears, long thought upon what he should send him. *Tandem Spiritus Sancto inspirante inveni, quod meo nomine competeret offerre, et quid vestræ prudentiæ amabile esse potuisset.*

<sup>4</sup> See ep. clxviii. *Seculi occupationibus depositis soli Deo vacare desidero. Dum omni homini necesse est vigili cura se præparare ad occursum Domini Dei sui, quanto magis senioribus, qui sunt annis et infirmitatibus confracti.*

<sup>5</sup> This is found in the first volume of the Froben edition in the *Actis Sancterum* 19, Mai. Mens Mai. t. iv., and in *Maillon Acta*, s. o. B.

desired to pass the remainder of his days in the monastery of Fulda. But when the emperor consented to his withdrawing from the court, he still wished to employ his ability in carrying on the work to which it had hitherto been devoted, although in a quieter sphere. The abbey of Martinus at Tours falling vacant, in the year 796, Charles resolved to avail himself of the services of Alcuin in restoring the decayed discipline of the monks, and founding a flourishing scholastic institution. Alcuin accordingly continued to exercise, but under different circumstances, the same learned activity which he had long employed with so much zeal.<sup>1</sup> But his increasing infirmities, and the feeling of approaching death, again made him wish to be freed from all external cares. He therefore obtained permission, in his last years, to commit the management of the monasteries which had been given him, to some of his select scholars.<sup>2</sup> It would then be possible for him, he said,<sup>3</sup> to live quietly in St Martin's Abbey; and tranquilly listen for the voice which was to call him from this earthly state.<sup>4</sup> The wish which he had often expressed in his latter years, when looking forward to his end, that he might die on Whitsunday, was fulfilled on the 19th of May 804.

There was too little of scientific energy at this period in the Western church, to foster a dogmatic antagonism, or strife about doctrine. In the age of Charlemagne, during that whole period, in which the scientific life attained its highest point, men were more anxious to retain and apply that which had been transmitted to them, than to engage in new inquiries on the principles of their faith. Still, if it might have been naturally expected, that dogmatic disputes would mainly occupy the Western church at this time,

<sup>1</sup> He speaks of this in his thirty-eighth letter to Charles. Thus he says, that he instructed some in the exposition of Scripture; others in ancient literature; some in grammar, and others in astronomy. *Plurima plurimis factus, ut plurimos ad profectum sanctae ecclesiae et ad decorem imperialis regni vestri erudiam, ne sit vacua Dei in me gratia, nec vestrae bonitatis largitio inanis.* He complains of the want of books, and prays the emperor to allow him to send some of his scholars to England to bring books from thence.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. clxxvi. To Archbishop Arno: *Ut scias, quanta misericordia mecum a Deo omnipotenti peracta est; nam rebus omnibus, quas habui per loca diversa, adjutores mihi ex meis propriis filiis elegi, adnuente per omnia suggestionibus meis Domino meo David;* as he was accustomed to call the emperor Charles.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. clxxv.

<sup>4</sup> *Spectans, quando vox veniat: aperi pulsanti, sequere jubentem, exaudi judicantem.*

it was yet remarkable, that the Spanish church, which, although not oppressed, yet being under the yoke of Muhamedanism, was in no favourable position for scientific development, should have given occasion to a renewal of the old controversy between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria. The peculiar situation, indeed, of the Spanish church allowed a freer expression of controversial opinion than could have been enjoyed under other circumstances. To trace with any degree of certainty the rise of this dogmatic spirit in the then existing Spanish church, we require definite information respecting the origin of the controversy above-named, and the internal relations of the church itself. Great importance must be attached, in this respect, to the question, which of the two chief personages who appear as the champions of the new system, Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, or Felix, bishop of Urgellis,<sup>1</sup> ought to be regarded as peculiarly the author of this revival of the Antiochian theology?

Elipandus, according to the accounts to be found of him in early writings, appears to have been a haughty, passionate man, easily affected by the influences of a blind zeal;<sup>2</sup> a student of the

<sup>1</sup> La Send' Urgelle, in the lordship of Cerdana, in Spain.

<sup>2</sup> So he appears in the first controversy in which he stood openly forth. In his dispute with a Spanish heretic, Migetius, Elipandus, indeed, had occasion to observe strictly the distinction between the humanity and the godhead of Christ, and he may have used expressions which might give rise to the notion that he was infected with Nestorianism. In the letter to Migetius, § 7, *Persona filii, quae facta est ex semine David secundum carnem et ea, quae genita est a Deo Patre*; but he was especially awkward and unskilful in the use of dogmatic language; and no other indication of adoptianism occurs in this controversy. He uses here the term *assumptio*, not *adoptio*. It would be instructive could we examine more closely the doctrine of this Migetius, and thus better determine what relation it bore to the views of Elipandus. But we must despair of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion on this matter, unless new sources of information can be obtained from Spain. The scattered notices respecting Migetius are of no worth, and the letter of Elipandus himself to this man, as given by Florez in the *España Sagrada* t. v. ed. ii. Madrid 1763, p. 524, remains the only important document on the subject. But the style of Elipandus is passionate; he draws too many inferences; and is too little qualified to enter into the mode of another's reasoning, to enable us to derive from his propositions or his statements a fair idea of the doctrine of Migetius. As far, however, as this can be done, he appears to have been inclined to Sabellianism. His opinion, that the Logos did not become personal till its assumption of the manhood of Christ; that it was the personal energy in Christ, whence the offensive expression, *quod ea sit secunda in Trinitate persona, quae facta est ex semine David secundum carnem, et non ea quae genita est a Patre*; that the Holy Ghost first assumed to himself a personality in the Apostle Paul: that in him the Spirit promised by Christ, and who should proceed from the Father and the Son, appeared. In all respects, we cannot but wish that we had clearer information on the notions of Migetius respecting the connection between Paul and the

ancient fathers, but altogether wanting in the qualities of a scientific spirit. We may readily believe that such a man, when once induced by accidental circumstances to adopt a particular dogmatic expression, would retain it more tenaciously, and regard it as increasing in importance, if its introduction was scornfully opposed by those from whom, according to their position, he expected an unreserved obedience to his archiepiscopal authority.

The term *adoption* occasionally occurs in the ancient fathers, as descriptive of the acceptance of the human nature through Christ, into union with the Godhead. It was also often used<sup>1</sup> in the same sense in the authorized Gothic-Spanish Liturgy.<sup>2</sup> Elipandus<sup>3</sup> appealed to the passages in which it is thus employed. It may be supposed, therefore, that he was led by this to speak of an adoption of humanity, through Christ, into sonship with God, and to represent Christ himself, in relation to his humanity, as the adopted Son of God, “*Filius Dei adoptivus* ;” and that, being violently attacked on the subject, he as zealously defended the expression as being of especial importance. But this was not the case with Felix of Urgellis. We discover in him proofs of a mind not excited to controversy by accident, but thoroughly imbued with dogmatic principles. The probability is, therefore, that the opinion respecting the person of Christ expressed by the term *adoption* (*adoptionismus*) originated with Felix, in whose writings it appears in this systematic connection, rather than with Elipandus, who was certainly not fitted to lay the foundation of a peculiar system.<sup>4</sup> He was now eighty years of age, and it would have

progress of Christianity, which, although unjustly, gave rise to the accusations brought against him. Thus he was blamed for asserting that priests must be perfectly holy: *Cur se pronuntiant peccatores, si vere sancti sunt? Aut si certe se peccatores esse fatentur, quare ad ministerium accedere praesumunt, eo quod ipse Dominus dicat: Estote sancti, quia et ego sanctus sum Dominus Deus vester.* But it will here be asked, in what sense did he say this, and whether he actually meant a sinless perfection. If so, he may certainly be regarded as having fallen into a dark and fanatical notion of priestly holiness; and as having, accordingly, refused to eat with disbelievers (Saracens), or to touch any food brought from them. And hence Elipandus appears opposed to him as the representative of the pure Christian spirit: appealing to the words of Paul, that to the pure all things are pure; to the fact that Christ ate with publicans and sinners; and that Paul said, that it is lawful to accept the invitation of an unbeliever to a feast.

<sup>1</sup> *Adoptio* = *assumptio*, ἀνάληψις.

<sup>2</sup> The *Officium Mozarabicum*.

<sup>3</sup> The expressions of the Toledo Liturgy: “*Adoptivi hominis passio* :” the “*adoptio carnis* ; *gratia adoptionis*.” Elipandi Epistola ad Alcuinum, t. i. p. ii. f. 872, ed. Froben.

<sup>4</sup> Historical evidences, little agreeing with each other, can, in a question of this sort,

been strange had he begun at so late a period of his life a controversy on such a subject. But far too great importance has been attached to the single dogmatic expression of *adoptio* and *Filius adoptivus*, which gave name to the whole system, as the term *θεοτόκος* to that of the Nestorians. How the principle referred to might have been supported without any peculiar application of this expression, or the comparison connected therewith between an actual and an adopted son, will appear when we consider this system of doctrine in its inward connection. It is possible, indeed, although by no means demonstrable, that the liturgy in use might have led Elipandus to adopt this comparison; but no one would be justified in tracing to such a source the entire dogmatic system which is thereby exhibited.

The remarkable agreement existing between the mode of dogmatic development adopted by Felix, in regard to this subject, and that of Theodore of Antioch, might lead to the supposition that the former had derived his peculiar dogmatic tendency from his intimate acquaintance with the writings of Theodore. As a close union, moreover, existed at an early period between the Spanish and North-African churches; and as the controversy on the "Three Chapters" may have occasioned the works of Theodore to be translated into Latin for the use of the African theologians interested in the controversy, so it is possible that by means of such translations they were made generally known in Spain. The few fragments merely which remain of the writings of Felix will not justify us in coming to any certain conclusion in respect to this agreement; but without any such outward aid, we may safely trace it to an internal analogy of minds, and to the similarity of the conflicts under which they were developed.

If it be true that Felix had employed himself in the defence of Christianity against the objections brought against it on the side of Muhamedanism,<sup>1</sup> and in proving its truth and divinity for the use of the Muhamedans, a supposition rendered probable by his

which has something mysterious in it, afford but very insufficient help. The man who first brought the subject before the world cannot be identical with him who first developed the doctrine. Although Elipandus may have used certain peculiar expressions in his dogmatic treatise, it does not follow therefrom that he ought to be regarded as the author of the system.

<sup>1</sup> The emperor Charles had heard that Felix had written a *Disputatio cum sacerdote*; but this was not known to Alcuin. See Alcuin, ep. lxxxv.



nearness to them, and by his close connection with the Spanish bishops—if this be true, we have another means of explaining his attachment to the peculiar views in question. The apologetic controversy in which he is thus supposed to have been engaged, would not oblige him to prove generally the divine origin of Christianity, or the divine mission of Jesus. He could shew that this was acknowledged by the Koran itself. But what he had to prove was the doctrine of the incarnation; of the godhead of Christ; against which, as also against the doctrine of the Trinity, the arguments of the Muhamedans were most fiercely directed. In discussing these topics, he was probably induced to attempt such a representation of the doctrines referred to, as might remove, as far as possible, the stone of stumbling from the Muhamedans. Hence might arise the theory of adoption, of the internal connection of which we would now speak.

Felix, like Theodore of Mopsuestia, opposed the interchange of the predicates of the two natures in Christ as not sufficiently defined; and he desired that, if the same predicates were to be applied to Christ in relation both to his godhead and his humanity, it should be strictly determined with what difference of meaning they were so applied, in what sense, that is, Christ was called the Son of God, and God, according to his godhead, and according to his manhood. He here allowed the force of the distinction which the mind makes when, as to the first relation, it looks for what is grounded in the being of God; and as to the second, for what proceeds from an act of free-will; from a particular decree of God, a distinctive *natura, genere*, between, on the one side, *voluntate*; on the other, *beneplacito*. Thus as, in the first respect, Christ according to his essence is God, and the Son of God, so is he, in the second respect, in so far as he has been taken into union with him who, according to his nature, is the Son of God. Directly opposed to the idea of the essential and the natural, is that which can only in another sense, that is, according to a certain *metonymy* (nuncupative) be so designated. Unless we be willing to say, that the humanity of Christ is derived from the essence of the Godhead itself, nothing is left for us, according to the opinion of Felix, but to admit the contrast above established. In the same sense also, he employed the distinction between a son *genere et natura*, and a son *adoptione*. The idea

of adoption, in his mind, was nothing more than that of a sonship grounded not on natural descent, but on the especial act of the Father's free-will. To those who objected that the title of *Filius per adoptionem*, son by adoption, is never applied to the Saviour in the Holy Scriptures, he replied, that the fundamental idea was agreeable to Scripture, for that the other corresponding notions of like import had actually their foundation in Scripture.<sup>1</sup> All such opinions are in close connection with each other; and without them it would be impossible to form a conception of the human nature of Christ as not springing from the essence of God, but as created by the will of God.<sup>2</sup> He who denies one of these notions, must, therefore, deny the true humanity of Christ.<sup>3</sup> The term adoption accordingly seemed to him especially appropriate, because it is clear, from a comparison with human relationships, that a person, by natural descent, cannot have two fathers, and yet may have one by natural descent, and another by adoption.<sup>4</sup> And thus Christ, in his humanity might be the Son of David by descent, and according to adoption the Son of God. Felix sought out all those predicates in the Holy Scriptures, which tended to show the dependent relation of Christ, that he might thereby prove the necessity of the distinction which he had introduced as founded on Scripture. If Christ took upon him the form of a servant, the name of a servant belongs to him, not simply on account of the obedience which he freely rendered as man, but from the natural relation in which he stands as man, as a creature, to God, in contrast to that relation in which, as the Son of God, according to his nature and essence, and as the Logos, he stands to the Father. Felix describes this opposition by the terms, *servus conditionalis*,

1 Si adoptionis nomen in Christo secundum carnem claro apertoque sermone in utroque testamento, ut vos contenditis, reperire nequimus, caetera tamen omnia, quae adoptionis verbo conveniunt, in divinis libris perspicue atque manifeste multis modis reperiuntur. Nam quid quaeso est cuilibet filio adoptio, nisi electio, nisi gratia, nisi voluntas, nisi adsumptio, nisi susceptio, nisi placitum seu applicatio? Si quis vero in Christi humanitate adoptionis gratiam negare vult, simul cuncta, quae dicta sunt, cum eadem adoptione in eo negare studeat. Alcuin contra Felicem. l. iii. c. 8. t. i. opp. 816.

2 Humanitas, in qua extrinsecus factus est, non de substantia Patris subsistens, sed ex carne matris et natus est, l. vi. 843.

3 Rationis veritate convictus velit nolit negaturus est eum verum hominem, l. iii. c. c. f. 817.

4 Neque enim fieri potest, ut unus filius naturaliter duos patres habere possit, unum tamen per naturam, alium autem per adoptionem prorsus potest, l. iii. f. 812.

*servus secundum conditionem.* Nowhere, he contends, is it said in the Gospel, that the Son of God, but always that the Son of Man, was given for our sins.<sup>2</sup> He appeals to what Christ himself says (Luke xviii. 19), in reference to his humanity, namely, that it was not in itself good, but that God in it, as everywhere, is the source of good.<sup>3</sup> So also he quotes what Peter says of Christ (Acts x. 38), that God was in him; and what Paul states to the same purpose (2 Cor. v. 19), but not as if the godhead of Christ was to be denied, but only that the distinction between the human and the divine natures should be firmly asserted.<sup>4</sup> He contended, that by this manifestation of the pure humanity in Christ, the Son of God was glorified as Redeemer, while, at the same time, he only assumed all this out of mere mercy, and for the salvation of mankind. To represent the doctrine of the Scriptures fully and faithfully, we must endeavour to exhibit that which concerns the humiliation of Christ, as clearly as that which is connected with his glory.<sup>5</sup> But Felix was scarcely prepared to enter, without

1 Numquid qui verus est Deus fieri potest, ut conditione servus Dei sit, sicut Christus Dominus in forma servi, qui multis multisque documentis, non tantum propter obedientiam, ut plerique volunt, sea etiam et per naturam servus patris et filius ancillæ ejus verissime edocetur, l. vi. f. 84<sup>o</sup>. But his opponents could not allow the distinction between the propter obedientiam et per naturam to be of any worth. They deduced the latter from the former; and applied the reception of the human nature by the Son of God to his humbling himself, quoting in confirmation Philip. ii. 8, 9. Further, Illum propter ignobilitatem beatæ virginis, quæ se ancillam Dei humili voce protestatur, servum esse conditionalem, f. 839. Where the mode of expression, as he spoke of Mary, might give offence to the prevailing notions of the age.

2 L. c. 834, 835. Alcuin might here oppose to him many passages of the New Testament, as John iii. 16; Romans viii. 32; Ephes. v. 2; Acts iii. 13—15. But Felix had been led into error by adopting the language of the church, in reference to the predicate of the Son, instead of referring to that of the Bible.

3 Ipse, qui essentialiter cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto solus est bonus, est Deus, ipse in homine licet sit bonus, non tamen naturaliter a semetipso est bonus, l. v. f. 837. Here, indeed, Felix, according to the manner in which he expresses himself, seems to have fallen into a contradiction. This arose from the confusion of two principles in his argument; the one derived from his own views, the other from those of the church. He was not led by his own peculiar dogmatic notions to ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων; but he was so by his adherence to the prevailing ecclesiastical dogmatic terminology. Hence he endeavoured to render this transferring of the predicate harmless, through the definitions which he employed, according to his theory of distinction. Consequently, from his own particular point of view, he would much rather have said: The human nature, taken into communion with him, who, according to his essence, is the Son of God, and, according to his essence, is good, is not, according to its own essence, good.

4 Non quod Christus homo videlicet assumptus, Deus non sit, sed quia non natura, sed gratia atque nuncupatione sit Deus, v. 832.

5 Sicut ea, quæ de illo celsa atque gloriosa sunt, credimus et collaudamus, ita humili

prejudice, into the whole meaning of the New Testament writers. As his opponents wished to force this doctrine into the form of their theory, by the transferring of the opposed predicates, or, as it was afterwards the fashion to call it, the idiom-communication, so Felix, on the other side, according to the Scriptural view, allowed himself to do violence to his theory of distinction, forced upon the biblical writers, when he says, in the words of Peter : "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and refers the predicate *Christ* to the manhood, in which he was anointed, and the predicate *Son of the living God*, to the Godhead of our Saviour.<sup>1</sup>

Felix also agreed with Theodorus in respect to the manner in which the humanity of Christ was taken into union with the Godhead, which he compares to that in which, through the Saviour, believers attain to communion with God. Adoption, admission to union with God, through divine grace, and by means of an especial operation of the divine will, according to God's good pleasure, he represents as being all of the same kind ; without wishing, however, to represent as simply identical that which he considered only as relatively like ; especially observing the distinction between that which is grounded in the essence of God, or is immediately derived therefrom, and all other things. On the contrary, he strongly asserted, that, notwithstanding the relative similarity, all which concerned Christ was to be viewed in a higher sense (*multo excellentius*) ; and he here, without doubt, insists upon a distinction, not of degree merely, but of kind, as appears from the fact, that he by no means represents the humanity of Christ in its mere separate existence, and then as entering into union with the Godhead ;<sup>2</sup> but, on the contrary, he starts with the assertion, that the true and actual Son of God had received the humanity into unity with himself from generation ; that the human nature, although preserving its proper laws, was constantly developed in this unity ; that no separate, independent existence was to be ascribed to it ; but that its being was unfolded from the beginning, in combination with the divine

tatem ejus et omnia indigna, quae propter nos misericorditer suscipere voluit, despiciere nullo modo debemus, l. iii. f. 818.

<sup>1</sup> L. v. f. 832.

<sup>2</sup> Qui non natura, ut Deus, sed per Dei gratiam ab eo, qui verus est Deus, deificati dii sunt sub illo vocati.

Logos, into which the human nature was taken at its generation. He appeals to the words of Christ, John x. 35, to show that, in one respect, the Saviour placed himself in the same class with those who, on account of their communion with God, in which they stood by divine grace, bore the divine name. Thus there exists between him and all the elect, the truest communion; in this respect, that he shares with them the divine nature and the divine name, although this is the case with him in a more excellent sense; while, further, he takes part with them also in predestination, election, grace, and the form of a servant.<sup>1</sup> Hence he could say, that he who, in the unity of the divine nature, was true God, was—in the form of humanity, through the grace of adoption, which passed from him to all the elect—made partaker of the divine being, and was thence named God, or the Son of God, having become the Son of Man without change of the divine nature, in so far as he condescended to unite man with himself, in personal oneness, at generation; and thus the Son of Man was Son of God—not in such a way that the human nature was changed into the divine, but so that the Son of Man, in the Son of God (by means of this union) was the true Son of God.<sup>2</sup>

But, like Theodorus, Felix found himself obliged to assail such propositions as this, that Mary was the mother of God,<sup>3</sup> when used without modification. Like Theodore, also, he compared the baptism of Christ to the baptism of believers, and viewed both in connection with the *spiritalis generatio* by adoption. But he certainly could not suppose that baptism had precisely

<sup>1</sup> In hoc quippe ordine Dei Filius Dominus et Redemptor noster juxta humanitatem, sicut in natura, ita et in nomine, quamvis excellentius cunctis electis, verissime tamen cum illis communicat, sicut et in cæteris omnibus, id est, in prædestinatione, in electione, gratia, in adsumptione nominis servi, iv 820.

<sup>2</sup> Ut idem, qui essentialiter cum patre et Spiritu Sancto in unitate Deitatis verus est Deus, ipse in forma humanitatis cum electis suis per adoptionis gratiam deificatus fieret et nuncupative Deus. And in other passages, more closely harmonizing with the language of the Church, at the beginning of the fifth book: Qui illum sibi ex utero matris scilicet ab ipso conceptu in singularitate suae personae ita sibi nuivit atque conseruit, ut Dei Filius esset hominis Filius, non mutabilitate naturae, sed dignatione, similiter et hominis Filius esset Dei Filius, non versibilitate substantiae, sed in Dei Filio esset verus Filius.

<sup>3</sup> Although he, perhaps, did not venture to find fault with this expression so generally in use, yet he required his opponents to give their authority for the introduction of such a proposition as this: quod ex utero matris verus Deus sit conceptus et verus sit Filius Dei, vii. 857.

the same relation to the adoption of Christ, as to the adoption of believers. He describes, indeed, the adoption of Christ in relation to his humanity, as beginning with his generation. It was probably, therefore, only his intention to say, that the signs of this adoption began to be openly shown at the baptism of Christ, when divine strength was publicly bestowed upon him, as the Son of God, according to his humanity. We may also suppose, that, like Theodorus, he adopted the view of a revelation of the actual divine energy existing in the form of Christ's humanity, and following gradually the development of the human nature; and hence he also probably found the fulfilment of this progressive revelation in the resurrection of Christ, as he beheld its beginning in the supernatural circumstances of his baptism.<sup>1</sup> This theory of the revelation of the Godhead in the form of human nature, furnished Felix with the means of accounting for the *agnoëtismus* of Christ; and he appealed to Mark xiii. 32.<sup>2</sup>

From this account of the doctrine of adoption, we may easily see, that its opponents would regard it, as viewed through the usual medium of the church, in the light of a renewed Nestorianism, of a corruption of the doctrine of Christ's divinity. The struggle, in relation to matters of dogmatic interest, was similar to that which prevailed between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria in the early ages. On the one side, the contest was for the interest of the rational, on the other for that of the supernatural, view of Christianity; on the one part, the object was to uphold the interest of the analogy arising from the human nature in the person of Christ; on the other, to exhibit that whereby Christ is set forth as exalted above human nature.<sup>3</sup>

Two clergymen in Spain were the first to attack the theory of

<sup>1</sup> L. ii. c. Felicem, f. 809. Accepit has geminas generationes, primam videlicet, quae secundum carnem est, secundum vero spiritalem, quae per adoptionem fit. Idem Redemptor noster secundum hominem complexas in se continet, primam videlicet, quam suscepit ex virgine nascendo, secundam vero, quam initiavit in lavacro (et consummavit) a mortuis resurgendo. The sentence has no meaning without the insertion (et consummavit).

<sup>2</sup> L. v. f. 835.

<sup>3</sup> When Felix put the question: Quid potuit ex ancilla nasci nisi servus? Alcuin answered him: Hujus nativitatis majus est sacramentum quam omnium creaturarum conditio. Concede Deum aliquid posse; quod humana non valeat infirmitas comprehendere, nec nostra ratiocinatione legem ponamus majestati aeternae, quid possit, dum omnia potest, qui omnipotens est, l. iii. c. 3. Alcuin c. Felix.

adoption; the one was Beatus, a priest in the province of Libana; the other, Etherius, bishop of Othma. According to the account given by his opponents, the former must have been a man of debased moral character; but the violence of his adversaries renders their testimony doubtful.<sup>1</sup> The accusation brought against him as *pseudopropheta* seems deserving of more credit. He employed himself much with the exposition of the Apocalypse. The position of the Spanish church under the yoke of the Saracenic Muhamedans was peculiar,<sup>2</sup> and well calculated to excite expectations of some especial divine interference; to fix the imagination on the future; and easily to beget fanatical notions. Thus it appears that Beatus had prophesied the speedy coming of Christ to take vengeance on the infidel,<sup>3</sup> and had referred to certain signs of the times in support of his predictions. The controversy was carried on in Spain, on both sides, with great violence. Each party accused the other of injuring the cause of the gospel. Elipandus called his opponents heretics and servants of Antichrist, who must be rooted out.<sup>4</sup> It appeared to him as something unheard of, that a priest of the province of Libana should pretend to instruct the church of Toledo, which had always been considered as the seat of pure tradition.<sup>5</sup> He made his own dignity, as the first bishop of the Spanish church, avail against his adversaries; and

<sup>1</sup> This accusation may be regarded, perhaps, as rendered more worthy of credit by the circumstance, that Elipandus seems to refer to the fact that Beatus had been deprived of his spiritual rank on account of immorality. He alludes to this in his letter to Alcuin, where he says: Antiphrasius (that is, the *κατ' ἀντιφρασιον*, the predicate commonly applied to him by his opponents) Beatus, antichristi discipulus, carnis immunditia foetidus et ab altario Dei extraneus. And also, in the letter of the Spanish bishops to the emperor Charlemagne, he is called *Carnis flagitio saginatus*. But we must know more of the cause of this deposition to be able to draw any certain conclusion therefrom.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from a letter of Elipandus that the Spanish Christians must have felt themselves oppressed. Thus he says, at the conclusion of his epistle to Alcuin (Alcuin opp. ed. Froben. t. i. p. ii. f. 870): *Oppressione gentis afflicti non possumus tibi rescribere cuncta*; and in his letter to Felix, l. c. f. 916, *Quotidiana dispendia, quibus duramus potius quam vivimus*.

<sup>3</sup> As in the epistle to the Spanish bishops, Alcuin opp. t. ii. f. 573, it is said that he had prophesied the end of the world on a particular day; and that the people had, in consequence, passed the time from the night of Easter Sabbath to three o'clock on Easter Sunday fasting, and in the most anxious state of expectation.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Elipandus writes: *Qui non fuerit confessus Jesum Christum adoptivum humanitate et nequaquam adoptivum divinitate, et haereticus est, et exterminetur*. See the fragment in the work of Beatus against Elipandus, lib. i., in the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Canis, ed. Basnage t. ii. f. 310.

<sup>5</sup> *Non me interrogant, sed docere quaerunt, quia servi sunt antichristi.*

seems to have obtained the aid of the temporal power.<sup>1</sup> Not merely theologians and the clergy, but even the common people, were divided into parties by this controversy.<sup>2</sup>

While neither party could distinguish its particular views from the actual principles of faith in the Redeemer, each contended with the other, as *Beatus* expresses it, for the one Christ; whereas the common duty of resistance against the common foe, *Muhamedanism*, ought to have inspired both with a deeper consciousness of their communion in the principles of their faith. But the controversy extended itself beyond the boundaries of Spain into the neighbouring Frankish provinces. *Felix*, bishop of *Urgellis*, being the most distinguished representative and supporter of the doctrine of adoption, his influence led to its diffusion in France. Both the friends and opponents of *Felix* agree in describing him as a man remarkable alike for purity of life and Christian zeal. The fragments which remain of his writings show that he was superior in acuteness not only to *Elipandus*, but to all his opponents; and that he was distinguished from the other theologians of the age by a tranquil, unimpassioned mode of inquiry. His main fault appears to have been a frequent obscurity in his style; but this may, in part, be accounted for by the state of the Latin language in Spain at the period when he wrote.<sup>3</sup>

The introduction of this controversy into the Frankish provinces induced the emperor *Charles* to summon a council at *Ratisbonne*, in the year 792, for the purpose of discussing the question at issue. *Felix* was desired to attend. His doctrine was condemned, and he was called upon to pronounce his retractation. *Charlemagne* sent him to Rome. This was done partly in conformity with the emperor's unquestionable reverence for that see, without the concurrence of which he would take no important step; partly from his personal friendship for *Pope Hadrian*; and

<sup>1</sup> *Beatus* says, l. c. fol. 201: *Et episcopus metropolitanus et princeps terrae pari certamine schismata haeticorum unus verbi gladio, alter virga regiminis ulciscens*. If a Saracen governor be here meant, it affords a remarkable indication that the theory of adoption was the more acceptable to the *Muhamedans*. But the allusion may be to a West-Gothic prince, if, according to the then existing political relations of Spain in this province, such a one may be supposed to have been there.

<sup>2</sup> *Duo populi, duae ecclesiae*, says *Beatus*, l. c.

<sup>3</sup> We may also remark the incorrectness of the copy which has come down to us of the statements of *Felix*.



partly from his hesitation to pronounce lightly against the uprightness of Felix. The statements hitherto made by the latter were not likely to have given much satisfaction at Rome. He was apprehended ; and a new, written retractation was demanded of him in prison. But these retractations cannot be regarded as indicating any real change in his mode of thinking, which could hardly have been effected by such a treatment. On his return home, he repented having suppressed his convictions, and fled into the Spanish provinces subject to the Saracens, that he might there freely again expound his views. The Spanish bishops thereupon sent two letters to the emperor, and to the bishops of France. That to the latter was a full, polemical, and dogmatic defence of the theory of adoption, and contained a proposal both for the renewal of the discussion, and the restoration of Felix. The emperor transmitted this epistle to Pope Hadrian. Without, however, awaiting his decision, he instituted an inquiry into the subject in the council held at Frankfort-on-the-Main in the year 794. The decision of the assembly, as might have been expected, was against the theory of adoption ; and the emperor sent a report of the proceedings of the synod, accompanied by a letter in which he stated his own agreement with its decision, to Elipandus, and the other Spanish bishops.

Alcuin was absent in England when the French church first took a part in this controversy. But, on his return to France, occupying as he did the first place among the theologians of that country, the emperor naturally sought to oppose the obnoxious system by his means. At first, Alcuin employed the acquaintance which he had formed at an early period with Felix,<sup>1</sup> and addressed him in a letter breathing the very spirit of Christian affection. He besought him not to mar the many good and true things which appeared in his writings by a single word, nor to sacrifice thereby the labours of a pious life. Opposing to the party of Felix the authority of the whole church, he reminded him that the controversy respected but one word. But this was a superficial statement, contradicted by the very fact that Alcuin himself ascribed such vast importance to its introduction. As he prayed Felix, in this letter, to endeavour to deliver Elipandus

1 See his short epistle to Felix, in which he testifies his esteem and love for him, and asks for his prayers.

from his error, so he also himself wrote to the latter, in a friendly and respectful style, and begged him, in a similar manner, to use his influence with Felix to the same end. He next drew up a writing against the theory of adoption, and which he addressed to the clergy and monks of the French provinces bordering on Spain,<sup>1</sup> for the purpose of defending them against the effects of the errors spreading from the latter country.

But Felix was not surprised by the passages which Alcuin urged against him from the ancient fathers; and he defended his doctrine at length, in a work devoted to the subject. As Alcuin had asserted in his letter the agreement of the whole church, in opposition to the little party which supported the theory of adoption, Felix was led to develop, in this treatise, his idea of the church; and we may discover, in the views which he expresses, a strong tendency to differ from the ecclesiastical system of Rome. "We believe and confess," he says, "a holy catholic church, extended through the whole world by the preaching of the Apostles, and founded upon the Lord Christ, as on a firm rock (not on Peter,<sup>2</sup> therefore, as the rock), but the church may sometimes consist of a few."<sup>3</sup> Elipandus afterwards answered Alcuin in a writing full of pride and bitterness. He accused him on the subject of his riches, and asserted that he had twenty thousand slaves.<sup>4</sup> In answer to the argument of catholicity, he urged, that where two or three are gathered together in the name of the Lord, there is Christ in the midst of them, according to his promise.<sup>5</sup> The broad way, he added, which the many sought, was that which led to destruction; but the narrow, found by the

<sup>1</sup> In Gothia.

<sup>2</sup> In Christo Domino velut solida petra fundatam.

<sup>3</sup> Aliquando vero ecclesia in exiguis est. See c. Felicem l. i. p. 791.

<sup>4</sup> In relation to the former of these accusations, Alcuin says, in his letter to the three spiritual ambassadors of the Emperor, Opp. t. i. p. ii p. 860. In the possession of worldly goods much depends upon the disposition of the possessor: quo animo quis habeat seculum, aliud est habere seculum, aliud est haberi a seculo. Est qui habet divitias et non habet. In relation to the second: Hominem vero ad meum nunquam comparavi servitium, sed magis devota caritate omnibus Christi Dei mei famulis servire desiderans.

<sup>5</sup> The statements of Elipandus, in his letter to Migetius, quoted above, agrees with what is here said. Against the interchanged predicates, attributed to the Roman Church, Elipandus says, l. c. p. 534: Haec omnia amens ille spiritus te ita intelligere docuit. Nos vero e contrario non de sola Roma Dominum Petro dixisse credimus: Tu es Petrus; scilicet, firmitas fidei, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, sed de

few, leads to life eternal. God has not chosen the rich, but the poor.<sup>1</sup>

The work of Felix against Alcuin having been sent to the emperor, he desired Alcuin to prepare a reply. The latter, however, requested that so important a labour might not be intrusted to him alone; but that the work of Felix should be sent to the Pope, to Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, to Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, and to Richbon, bishop of Treves. He wished that all these might be employed in preparing the answer. If the sentiments of each agreed with those of the rest, this itself would be an argument for their truth: if the contrary should be the case, then that portion of their reply should be employed which agreed most with the witness of Holy Scripture, and the ancient fathers of the church.<sup>2</sup> Hence it appears, that he attributed to the Pope no *deciding voice in matters of faith*.

Alcuin's proposal was well received by the emperor. He desired that his treatise should be read before him;<sup>3</sup> and he listened to the work with such careful attention, that he marked the passages which seemed to need correction, and was able to send to Alcuin a list of the errors which he had discovered.<sup>4</sup>

But the doctrine of adoption having found a ready acceptance with many of the clergy, monks, and laity, in the French pro-

universali ecclesia catholica, per universam orbem in pace diffusa. He asks how it agreed with the assertion, that the Romish Church is the *ecclesia sine macula et ruga*, that the Romish bishop, Liberius, was condemned among the heretics? Elipandus, there is little doubt, was in many respects superior to the popes of this period in freedom of thought. In the above quoted letter, he insists that nothing simply internal, and coming from without, can defile a man. But such principles startled Pope Hadrian. At Rome, the apostolic decree, Acts xv., the temporary nature of which was acknowledged in the time of Augustine, was now regarded as of permanent authority. The representatives of the Pope in Spain had to contend with those who, like Elipandus, contended, *qui non ederit pecudum aut suillum sanguinem et suffocatum rudis est, aut ineruditus*. But the Pope pronounced an anathema on those who taught thus. See *España Sagrada*, t. v. l. c. p. 514. He declared himself also against those who, according also to the principles Elipandus, did not think themselves defiled by conversing or eating with Jews and Saracens.

<sup>1</sup> We may discover in such expressions, perhaps, the archbishop of a suffering church.

<sup>2</sup> See Epis. lxi.

<sup>3</sup> That is, his seven books against Felix, which, as they contain many fragments from the writings of Felix himself, are the most important source of information which we possess on the subject of the controversy.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. lxxxv. to the emperor. *Gratias agimus, quod libellum auribus sapientie vestrae recitari fecistis, et quod notari jussistis errata illius et remisistis ad corrigendum.*

vinces bordering on Spain, the emperor considered it necessary to send a deputation of clergymen to oppose the progress of the obnoxious party. For this purpose, he selected Benedict, abbot of Aniana in Languedoc; Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons; and Nefrid, bishop of Narbonne. These dignitaries were to hold a meeting with Felix himself in the city of Urgell. They here promised, that if he would come into the French territory, he should suffer no violence, but that they would tranquilly examine the grounds upon which the controversy had arisen. According to this promise, he appeared before a synod held at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 799, in the presence of the emperor himself. The promise made him was kept. Alcuin disputed with him at considerable length. At last he declared himself convinced; and Alcuin supposed that, by divine grace, the authorities of the ancient church quoted against him, had produced a real conviction in his mind.<sup>1</sup> Some doubts, however, still seem to have existed respecting the sincerity of Felix.<sup>2</sup> But Alcuin, in his work against Elipandus, testifies, in the spirit of true Christian love, his joy at the supposed conversion. The manner in which, mild and pious as he was, he had received Felix, had no doubt made a deep impression upon the heart of the latter, who expressed his affection for him, at a subsequent period, with convincing earnestness<sup>3</sup>

But although it is possible that the authority of the assembly, and the representation of the dangerous conclusions which would follow from his principles, may have made a momentary impression on his feelings, and impelled him to retract, it is yet scarcely probable in itself, that a man, so superior in theological dialectics to his opponents, should have been led, by a single disputation, really to renounce the system of doctrine so deeply seated in his mind. Such was the doubt entertained of his sincerity or firmness, that he was not allowed to return to his diocese, but was committed to the charge of Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons. He himself dictated a form of retractation for the best of his early

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxxvi. Divina clementia visitante cor illius novissime falsa opinione se seductum confessus est.

<sup>2</sup> Nos vero cordis illius secreta nescientes occultorum judicii causam dimisimus.

<sup>3</sup> Alcuin, ep. xcii. Multum amat me; totumque odium, quod habuit in me, versum est in caritatis dulcedinem.

followers. In this instrument, he rejected the expression of an adoption, but endeavoured to keep the predicates of the two natures pointedly asunder.

The deputies before employed were again sent into the same province, in the year 800, and, according to Alcuin's report,<sup>1</sup> with the happiest consequences. Ten thousand persons were induced to recant. Felix himself lived at Lyons till the year 816; and it appears from many certain indications, that he continued to hold unchanged the fundamental doctrine of his christology. This was in close connection with the *agnoëtismus* of the Saviour. He endeavoured, in his conversation, to lead many to confess, that the Redeemer's knowledge, according to his humanity, and during his earthly life, was by no means unlimited. This he sought to confirm by the words of Christ himself. When Agobard, who succeeded Leidrad, as Archbishop of Lyons, heard of these remarks of Felix, and asked him if such were really his notions, Felix replied in the affirmative. But on Agobard's giving him a collection of sayings selected from the ancient fathers, and which were opposed to his views, he promised that he would use his best endeavours to acquire more correct knowledge.<sup>2</sup> By these words he must have intended it to be understood, that he could not at once confess any change of opinion; and it is highly probable that he only sought to escape from the dispute. After his death, a paper, in his hand-writing, was found, containing questions and answers, and in which the doctrine of adoption was very distinctly expressed.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. IN THE GREEK CHURCH.

A far more erudite species of cultivation had prevailed in the Greek than in the Latin Church. But political and spiritual despotism had alike served to suppress the religious growth of the community. The free, living, creative spirit was wanting: that which alone could have quickened the dead mass of the rude mate-

<sup>1</sup> See ep. xcii.

<sup>2</sup> Promisit se omnis emendationis diligentiam sibimet adhibiturum.

<sup>3</sup> See the writing of Agobard, the last in this controversy, against the doctrine of Felix.

rial. In the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, the chief object was to collect passages from the old church fathers, and then to arrange them according to the single books of the Bible. From these collections were afterwards formed the so-called catenae (*σειραι*) on the Scriptures. The Monophysite controversies had, at length, aroused the dialectic spirit, which derived new nourishment from its connection with the Aristotelian philosophy, and had occasion for exercise in the prolonged dispute with the Monophysites. By this means, an abstract, dialectic development of doctrine, and of particular dogmatic notions, was promoted. This was closely connected with the doctrine of the Trinity, and with that of the two natures in Christ, and but little with the practical interests of the faith. A mere formal orthodoxy was extravagantly valued to the injury of real Christianity. An external righteousness, to be sought by works; or a piety dependent upon the performance of certain rites, and closely connected with superstition, and consequent immorality, followed in its train. This love of dialectics, which appropriated to itself the results of controversy, as it prepared and directed it, produced, in the eighth century, the most important dogmatic book known in the Greek church. We refer to the *ἀκριβῆς ἐκδοσις τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως* planned by the monk, John of Damascus, at the beginning of the eighth century. The greater part of the dogmatic statements in this work are given in the expressions of the old church fathers, especially in those of the three great Cappadocian doctors. But there was too little of the peculiar, of the free, spiritual development of life in the Greek church, to admit of so remarkable a result, from the union of the ecclesiastical and dialectic principle, as was the case with the scholastic theology in the Western church.

Monasticism had still continued to exercise its peculiar influence in the Greek church, and in a manner altogether different from its operation in that of the West. In the former, it had preserved throughout its prevailing, contemplative character, and the Greek monasteries had hence become the favourite seats of a mystic theology. The writings which, as remarked in the history of the former period, had been introduced under the name of Dionysius, the Areopagite, also exercised considerable influence on these institutions. It is worthy of observation, that the writ-

ings referred to were first circulated by the opponents of the ruling church; and it was well known in this what were the grounds for objecting to their genuineness. The Severians, a party of the Monophysites, in a conference with the theologians of the Catholic church, held at Constantinople in the year 533, appealed to these writings, among others, in support of their views. But their opponents refused to admit them as genuine; asserting, that they were altogether unknown to the ancients; that neither Cyril in his disputes with Nestorius, nor Athanasius in his controversy with Arius, had used them; and that this might be taken as a proof that they were not so old as was alleged.<sup>1</sup> A presbyter, Theodorus, in the seventh century, composed a work in defence of the genuineness of these Dionysian writings.<sup>2</sup> We learn, from the account given us of the contents of this book, that the genuineness of the writings referred to was disputed on proper grounds. They were these four: namely, that none of the later fathers of the church quoted any thing from them; that Eusebius, in his catalogue of the writings of the ancient fathers, makes no mention of them; that they are occupied with the explanation of church traditions, which grew up only by degrees, in the course of a long period, and were increased by many additions; and that they cite the letters of Ignatius, who lived after the time of Dionysius.

But there was too little of the pure historical and critical feeling in this age, and too much of the symbolizing, mystical-contemplative spirit, to allow fair scope to criticism. By means of these writings, the elements of the new Platonism, and partly those of the older Alexandrian theology, were introduced into the later Greek church; as out of the same element, at an earlier period, a certain religious idealism had been created, which spiritualized the rigid form of Judaism, and the sensual worship of the heathen. The Greek church might exhibit a renewal of the phenomenon. A theology which delighted itself in spiritualized interpretations, could easily admit all the superstitious practices of saint and image-worship; and give them a still firmer foundation. The people who understood

<sup>1</sup> See the Acta of the Collatio Constantinopolitana of the year 533. Harduin. Concil. ii. 1163.

<sup>2</sup> The contents of this work are given by Photius, Bibliothec. p. 1. It is only to be regretted that Photius did not quote what Theodore opposed to the weighty arguments on the other side.

nothing whatever of such a contemplative theology, naturally received all that was proposed to them in the grossest sense. By the distinction between two fundamental points—between a system concerning itself wholly with symbols, and one renouncing symbols, and striving continually after the pure idea; between a system conforming itself wholly to human feeling, and another wholly denying it; between a positive and a negative system, a *θεολογία καταφατική* and *ἀποφατική*—by this distinction it was possible for any one to blend with the idealism of which we have spoken the entire system of church principles and church usages. The continual reference to these writings, moreover, led to the use of exaggerated and inflated language, highly prejudicial to evangelical simplicity. But a peculiar connection also was formed between dialectic and mystical theology. By this means dogmatic notions were more thoroughly imbued with the element of religious contemplation, and the more inward feelings of the soul. The monk Maximus, distinguished by his acute and profound intellect, appeared in the seventh century, as the representative of this dialectic contemplative disposition. He enjoyed an honourable office in the imperial court,<sup>1</sup> as first imperial secretary, and he might have arisen to higher dignity; but in order to be able to remain true to the convictions which he had received during the progress of the Monothelite controversy, he embraced the monastic state, and was made an abbot. It appears from his works, that the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, and of the pseudo-Dionysius, had exercised great influence on his theological views. We may trace the main lineaments of a connected system in his writings. They also contain many fruitful and richly spiritual ideas, which, if he could have unfolded and developed them under more favourable circumstances, might have served to lead both him and others to a peculiar rule of Christian faith and morals. His zeal for the promotion of a living intelligent Christianity,<sup>2</sup> in opposition to a dead faith, and the *opus operatum*, was another of his characteristics. The inward tendencies of this man induce

<sup>1</sup> Πρώτος ὑπογραφεὺς τῶν βασιλικῶν ὑπομνημάτων.

<sup>2</sup> We would here also mention the agreement of Maximus with the other teachers of the church in their protest against slavery. He finds in the system which permitted slavery the destruction, arising from sin, of the original unity of human nature; the denial of the original dignity of that nature, created after the image of God, and the original relation of which Christianity strives to restore. Thus he says of slavery:



us to linger longer with him, and to consider more closely the middle point of his theology.

Christianity, as seen in the doctrine of the Trinity, seemed to him to form the right medium between the too contracted view of the idea of God in Judaism, and the too diffuse notion exhibited in the nature-deifying system of Heathenism.<sup>1</sup> He considered the highest aim of the whole creation to be the inward union, into which God enters with it through Christ; whilst, without injury to his unchangeableness, He brings humanity into personal union with himself in order to deify man; whence God becomes man, without change of essence; and human nature is taken into union with him without losing aught of its peculiar character. To be able to keep a firm hold of these opinions, it was of importance to him to possess distinct notions on the union of the two natures, still retaining their particular properties unaltered.<sup>2</sup> The object of redemption is not only to purify human nature from sin, but to exalt it to a higher state than that which it originally enjoyed—to an unchangeable and divine life.<sup>3</sup>

Thus the history of creation becomes divided into two great parts: the one exhibiting the preparation for the assumption of human nature by God; the other, the progressively developed deification of man's nature, commencing with that act, and carried on in those who are fitted for it by a right will, till the end is attained in their perfect salvation. Hence he often speaks of a continued humanizing of the Logos in believers, in so far as the human life is taken into communion with Christ, and is imbued with his own divine principle of life;<sup>4</sup> and he regards the soul of him who is the source of so divine a life as a *θεοτοκος*.<sup>5</sup> "Thus while the Logos, as God, was the Creator of her whom he, from love to man, in relation to his bodily birth, as man, allowed

<sup>1</sup> The opposition between the *διαστολή* and the *συστολή τῆς θεότητος*; on the one side, the *καταμερίζειν τὴν μίαν ἀρχήν*, on the other the *μία ἀρχή*, but *σπενή και ατελής*. See the exposition of "Our Father," Maximi Opera ed. Courbesis, t. i., f. 355.

<sup>2</sup> Quæst. in Scripturam, p. 45, and s. 299. *Θεοῦ αφράστως ὑπεράγαθος βουλή* to the perfecting of which all things else are but tributary; *ἀτρέπτως ἐγκραθῆναι τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀληθοῦς, ἐνώσεως, ἐαντιῶ δὲ τὴν φύσιν ἀναλοιώτως ἐνώσαι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην*.

<sup>3</sup> *Τῇ θεώσει πλεονεκτοῦσαν τὴν πρώτην διάπλασιν*. Quæst. in Script. f. 157.

<sup>4</sup> *Ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τῶν σωζομένων σαρκούμενος*.

<sup>5</sup> In the exposition of the "Lord's Prayer," s. 354.

to be his mother, so is the Logos in us at first the creator of faith, whilst through the virtues which are born of faith, he incorporates himself in the Christian's conduct."<sup>1</sup> As now the human nature was so constituted by God, that it might be the organ of a divine life raised far above the limits of a finite state; the recipient of a higher principle, with which it should be penetrated without the loss of the peculiar nature which it received at its creation—so we find in this system an harmonious agreement between creation and redemption, nature and grace, the natural and the supernatural, reason and revelation; and we may consider the remarks made on this connection as the bright points in the system of Maximus. "The power of inquiring after the divine<sup>2</sup> is implanted in human nature by the Creator; but the revelation of the divine is only made to it through the imparted strength of the Holy Ghost. Since, moreover, this original ability has been, through sin, rendered subject to a prevailing sensuality, so the grace of the Holy Spirit must be had to restore freedom to this original faculty, and purify it. It is not proper to say, that grace by itself alone imparts the knowledge of mysteries to the saints, without the natural power of learning;<sup>3</sup> otherwise we should be obliged to suppose that the prophets did not themselves understand the revelations made to them by the Holy Spirit. As little ought we to suppose, that they attained true knowledge by inquiry, assisted only by natural ability, since, were this the case, the aid of the Holy Spirit would have been superfluous. When Paul says: "There is one spirit which worketh all in all, imparting to every man severally as he will," we are to understand him as signifying, that the Holy Spirit wills that which is proper for every one, and fitted to enable those who seek holiness to attain the end after which they strive.<sup>4</sup> Thus the Holy Ghost imparts no wisdom to the saints without their having a spirit susceptible of the gift; no knowledge without the power of the

<sup>1</sup> Κατὰ τὴν πράξιν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς σωματούμενος.

<sup>2</sup> Ἄνευ τῆς κατὰ νοῦν καὶ λόγον τῶν μελλόντων καὶ πᾶσι τείως ἀδήλων πληροφορίας.

<sup>3</sup> Χωρὶς τῆς ἐκάστου δεκτικῆς ἕξεώς τε καὶ δυνάμεως.

<sup>4</sup> Ἡ χάρις ὀυδαμῶς τῆς φύσεως καταργεῖ τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καταργηθεῖσαν παλὶν τῇ χρήσει τῶν παρὰ φύσιν τρόπων ἐνεργὸν ποιεῖ πάλιν τῇ χρήσει τῶν κατὰ φύσιν πρὸς τὴν τῶν θείων κατανόησιν ἐισάγουσα.

understanding to receive it; no faith without a rational conviction in reference to the future and the invisible;<sup>1</sup> no miraculous gifts of healing without natural charity; and, in a word, no gift without the proper preparation for its reception.<sup>2</sup> The grace of the Spirit destroys none of the natural powers; but, on the contrary, it makes those which had been rendered useless by unnatural violence again profitable by turning them to proper objects; by making them instruments of religion.”<sup>3</sup>

Again, he describes the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, as answering to the connection between the divine and the human in believers. “As the Logos without the rational, soul-quickened body, could not have fulfilled in a God-worthy manner the natural works of the body, so also the Holy Spirit works in the souls of the saints the knowledge of mysteries, not without their possessing the ability to seek knowledge in a natural manner.” All Christian consideration and conduct is so carried on in believers, that God works in them as his organs, and man contributes nothing thereto but the wish to do good. According to this relation between the natural and the supernatural, and a revelation proportioned to the susceptibility of men, Maximus assumed a progressive development of the divine revelations, corresponding to the position of those who were to be instructed; and hence, in the Old Testament, God’s revelations and operations were exhibited under sensible forms, in order gradually to lead men from the sensual to the spiritual.<sup>4</sup> Proceeding from the idea of a communion with the divine fountain of life, imparting itself to man, and which man is enabled to receive by means of the unfolded organ originally implanted in his nature, and now restored to freedom, Maximus embraces the notion of faith as the inward reality, the fact of such an appropriation. It is from faith that the divine life must develope itself, penetrating the sensual nature of man; incorporating itself in his actions; exercising its might in the form of love; and with love, as identical with the divine, appearing in the life of contemplation. This was the pe-

1 Ἄι ζητητικὰ καὶ ἐρευνητικὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀνάμεισι.

2 Χωρὶς τῶν τῆς γνώσεως δεκτικῶν κατὰ φύσιν δυνάμεων.

3 Βούλεται τὸ ἐκάστῳ δηλονότι συμφέρον εἰς πληροφορίαν τῆς ἀπαθοῦς τῶν ἐπιζήτων τὰ θεῖα ἐφέσεως.

4 The divine wisdom in respect to the ἀναλογία τῶν προνοουμένων. Quæst. 31, p. 74.

cular feature of the Gnostic system; and it was the most important in that of Maximus; one which he regarded not as theoretical merely, but as exhibiting the sublimest glory of Christianity in the unity of life and knowledge. "Faith," he says, "is a certain relation of the soul to the supernatural, to the divine,<sup>1</sup> an immediate union of the spirit with God, so that the being of God in man is thereby established, the kingdom of God, and faith in God, being only different expressions of the same idea. Faith is the kingdom of God not having yet acquired a definite form; the kingdom of God is faith which has acquired a definite form, in a manner answering to the divine life.<sup>2</sup> Faith, when it is active in the observance of the divine commands, is the kingdom of God, which can be known only to those who have it; and the kingdom of God is nothing else but an operative faith."

In speaking against those who treat of the gifts of grace, as of something imparted only singly and from without, he says,<sup>3</sup> "He who has a genuine faith in Christ, has all graces therewith. But because, through our sluggishness, we are so far from that active love to him, from that love which reveals to us the divine treasures which we bear in ourselves, so do we rightly believe that divine gifts come from without. Since, however, according to the Apostle Paul, Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, so, because in him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, those same treasures then become hidden in our hearts also; but are revealed to us according to the progress of our purification through obedience to the commandments." Of love, treating it as the perfection of the Christian life,<sup>4</sup> he says, "What kind of good does not love possess? Does it not possess faith, which affords to him who has it a more confident assurance of divine, than the natural sight of the eye can afford of visible objects? Does it not possess hope, which represents to itself the truest good, and holds it more firmly than the hand can hold that which it perceives by its touch? Does it not afford the enjoyment of

1 The *πίστις δύναμις σχετική τῆς ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἀμέσου τοῦ πιστεύοντος πρὸς τὸν πιστευόμενον θεὸν τελείας ἐνώσεως*. *Quaest.* 33, in *Script.* t. i. p. 76.

2 *L. c.* ἡ μὲν πίστις ἀνείδεος θεοῦ, βασιλεία ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ βασιλεία, πίστις θεοειδῶς εἰδοπεποιημένη.

3 In his thoughts on charity, l. f. 453.

4 In a letter, t. ii. p. 220.

that which is believed and hoped, possessing by the peculiar action of the mind, the future as the present."<sup>1</sup>

In relation to the oneness of the theoretical and the practical, he says, that they who exhibit knowledge incorporated in action, and action vivified by knowledge, have discovered the right and true method of divine labour. Whereas they who separate the one of these things from the other, either convert knowledge into an unreal notion, or action into a lifeless image.<sup>2</sup> As, moreover, the whole life of a Christian ought to be a prayer, so Maximus observes, "Continual prayer consists in this, that the mind is constantly affected with true piety, and a holy longing after God; that the entire life is rooted in the hope of him; that in whatever is done or suffered he alone is regarded."<sup>3</sup> Maximus carefully avoided the error, common to other mystics, of confounding the view of eternal life with that of our earthly being. He made this distinction. There is the relative knowledge and comprehension of the divine, consisting in an effort to acquire communion with the object of our knowledge, not perfectly attainable in this life; and there is the absolute or perfect view, in the immediate presence of the object, and which leaves the knowledge acquired by perception far behind.<sup>4</sup> The fundamental ideas of Maximus seem to lead to the notion of a final general restoration. This opinion is in close agreement with the system of Gregory of Nyssa, to which Maximus for the most part adhered. But he was too much under the control of the doctrines of the church to be able to argue distinctly on this subject.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Δι' ἐαυτῆς ὡς παρόντα τα μέλλοντα κατὰ διάθεσιν ἔχουσα.

<sup>2</sup> Ἡ τὴν γνῶσιν ἀνυπόστατον πεποίηκε φαντασίαν ἢ τὴν πρᾶξιν ἄψυχον κατέστησεν εἰδῶλον, this occurs among his separate reflections, which agree well with what is expressed in his other works, i. 606.

<sup>3</sup> See his Ἀσκητικός, i f. 378.

<sup>4</sup> Ἡ μὲν τῶν θεῶν γνῶσις σχετικὴ, ὡς ἐν μόνῳ λόγῳ κειμένη καὶ νοήμασι, ἡ δὲ κυρίως ἀληθὴς ἐν μόνῃ τῇ πείρᾳ κατ' ἐνέργειαν διχαλόγου καὶ νοημάτων ὄλην τοῦ γνωσθέντος κατὰ χάριν μεθέξει παρεχομένην τὴν αἴσθησιν, δι' ἧς κατὰ τὴν μελλουσαν λῆξιν τὴν ὑπὲρ φύσιν ὑποδεχόμεθα θεῶσιν ἀπαύστως ἐνεργουμένην. Quæst. Script. f. 210.

<sup>5</sup> In the collection of the aphorisms selected from the works of Maximus, the ἑκατοντάς τετάρτη, § 20. t. i. f. 288, the reunion of all intelligent beings with God is set forth as the end of all. Πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ πάντως πᾶσιν ἐνωθησομένου, κατὰ τὸ πέρασ τῶν αἰώνων. In his ἐρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις, c. 13. i. f. 304, he himself quotes the doctrine of Gregory respecting the general restoration, and agreeing with him, thus speaks: τὰς παρατραπείσας τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις τῇ παρατάσει τῶν αἰώνων

The first controversy in the Greek church at this period, of which we have to speak, sprung partly from internal and partly from outward influences. The former arose from an endeavour to follow out in all its consequences the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, which, viewed in their unaltered peculiarities, and united with each other in a personal unity, must necessarily lead to the notion of a mode of acting and willing, answering both to the one and the other. The outward cause of these controversies was, as the case had already often before been, the disposition of the emperors to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, and, especially, the effort, so frequently made, and with such little success, to reduce the dogmatic differences in the church, and conceal their existence by particular formularies. They were not merely religious, but political interests, which induced the Greek emperor Heraclius, whose arms had been crowned with success in recovering the provinces conquered by the Persians, to engage in these undertakings. It could not be otherwise than of vast importance to him to increase the strength of the Greek empire by the reunion of the influential party of the Monophysites with the dominant church. The conversations which he had held with the Monophysite bishops, whom he had met in his campaigns against the Persians in 622 and the following years, led him to believe, that a formulary descriptive of a divine and human operation, and willing, in Christ, would effect, what had been so long attempted in vain, not an agreement between the opinions of the Monophysite party, and the Catholic church, which adhered to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, but such a concealment of their differences as would enable them to unite without disgrace. The formulary expressive of such a mode of willing and working in

*ἀποβαλεῖν τὰς ἐντεθείσας αὐτῇ τῆς κακίας μῆνιμας· καὶ περάσασαν τοὺς πάντας αἰῶνας καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκουσαν στάσιμ εἰς τὸν θεόν ἐλλεῖν τὸν μὴ ἔχοντα πέρας.* He adds, however, *καὶ οὕτως τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, οὐ τῇ μετέξει τῶν αγαθῶν ἀπολαβεῖν τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀποκατασταθῆναι καὶ δειχθῆναι τὸν δημιουργὸν ἀναίτιον τῆς ἀμαρτίας.* Thus God shall be glorified at the last by the annihilation of all evil. But it is easy to perceive how, according to his own peculiar ideas, he could not clearly distinguish the knowledge of the highest good, in which all should share, from an actual participation of that good. According to the exposition of the passage, Col. ii. 15, from various points of view, Quæst. Script. 21. (t. i. f. 44), he probably conceived the idea of a final deliverance of fallen spirits: thus he says that there is still a *λόγος μυστικώτερος καὶ ὑψηλότερος*; that we may not however confide in the *ἀποβρόχότερα τῶν θείων δογμάτων* of Scripture.

Christ, seemed capable of being rendered so much the less offensive, since in the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which were equally venerated by both parties, the remarkable predicate of Christ is, an *ἐνέργεια θεανδρική*.<sup>1</sup> Heraclius had no intention to make this formulary universal in the church. His anxiety had much more of a political than religious character; and without troubling himself further about controversy, or seeking to gain any greater influence in determining questions of doctrine, he limited his design to the introduction of this formulary into those provinces where, as in the Alexandrian dioceses, the Monophysite party was especially numerous and powerful, and where he hoped it might be a means of union. Having asked the opinion of Sergius the patriarch, and finding him unoffended in any wise by the proposed formulary, Heraclius was still more strengthened in his resolution.<sup>2</sup> The use which he made of the formulary would, perhaps, have given no occasion to strife, if he had not actually accomplished by this means his design among the Monophysites in the Alexandrian church.

Among the bishops with whom he conversed on this subject, was Cyrus of Phasis, in the country of the Lazii, in Colchis. Having formed a dislike to the formulary, Cyrus applied to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who endeavoured, in his replies, to

<sup>1</sup> It cannot indeed be proved that the emperor, when he first conceived the idea of this formulary, had actually in view the design of which we have spoken. There is a possibility that some such expression may have occurred in his conversation with the Monophysite bishops; and not knowing how to determine its meaning, he may have asked the opinion of his patriarch at Constantinople. Or the Monophysite bishops may have objected to the ruling church in the course of conversation, that as it asserted two natures in Christ, so it must also believe in two modes of willing and working, and the emperor may have thereby been led to ask the patriarch, whether one will and operation might not be allowed. It is also possible that the bishop Cyrus, when he first spoke with the emperor on the subject of the formulary, and questioned Sergius respecting the same point, had no intention of using this formulary as the means of pursuing a higher object. It is possible that his translation to the patriarchate of Alexandria might be altogether unconnected with this affair, and that he was only induced by that very circumstance to make the use which he did of the formulary. We often err, when we explain the views of men by that which follows from the concurrence of many different circumstances. But the zealous participation of the emperor in promoting the formulary, makes it probable that it seemed to him from the beginning important for the object designed; and a comparison of it with similar efforts to accomplish a union with the Monophysites, as in the case of the Trisagion and the condemnation of the Three Chapters, tends to prove this view.

<sup>2</sup> That the emperor had consulted the patriarch appears from the letter of Bishop Cyrus to him, Harduin Concil. t. iii. 1338.

change his views on the subject.<sup>1</sup> But the patriarch expressed himself in language loose and vacillating, and manifested an utter want of independent theological judgment. He stated that this subject had never been discussed in an œcumenical council, and that, consequently, nothing had been determined respecting it. Many venerable teachers of the church, he added, had spoken of one mode of operation; but he had hitherto met with none who spoke of two. If, however, any such teacher could be found, it would be right to follow his authority, since we ought not to satisfy ourselves by a mere agreement with the doctrine of the fathers; but should adopt their very words, and avoid all novelties.<sup>2</sup> To such a degree was that slavish dependence on words carried, which set the expressions of individuals in the place of particular dogmatic proof.<sup>3</sup> But Cyrus was sufficiently satisfied with the decision of the patriarch; and he had probably to thank his complacency in respect to the formulary, and his expressed readiness to enter into union with the Monophysites, for his advancement in the year 600 to the patriarchate of Alexandria. He actually succeeded in bringing back thousands of the Monophysites in Egypt and the surrounding provinces into union with the dominant church. This he accomplished by means of an agreement instituted upon nine dogmatic points, and according to which the peculiar definitions of Monophysitism were brought into immediate connection with those of the Council of Chalcedon, so that each might aid in explaining the other.<sup>4</sup> In the seventh article of this agreement, it was deduced as an inference from the idea of the real<sup>5</sup> union of the two natures, that the one Christ and Son

<sup>1</sup> See the letter, f. 1509.

<sup>2</sup> Πᾶσα γὰρ ἀνάγκη, μὴ μόνον κατ' ἔννοιαν τοῖς πᾶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἔπεσθαι δόγμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐκείνοις κεχρηῆσθαι φωναῖς καὶ μηδὲν τὸ παράπαν καινοτομεῖν.

<sup>3</sup> It is worthy of remark that Sergius took no notice in his answer to Cyrus of his own earlier declaration, and to which Cyrus appealed. We might infer therefrom, though not certainly, that Sergius had allowed himself to be induced by the wishes of the emperor to speak decidedly in favour of the formulary, but which he would now very willingly forget.

<sup>4</sup> Namely, on the one side, εἰς χριστὸς ἐκ δύο φύσεων, on the other, ἕνα χριστὸν ἐν διὰ θεωρεῖσθαι ταῖς φύσεσιν, are connected by the expression, μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σαρκαρωμένη and μία ὑπόστασις σύνθετος, ἕνωσις φυσικὴ and ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

<sup>5</sup> Not merely φαντασία ψευδεῖ καὶ διακένους νοῦ διαπλάσμασι.



of God wrought both the divine and the human, by a mode of operation human and divine.<sup>1</sup>

But this instrument<sup>2</sup> had the same fate as others of an earlier date; that is, the union which it effected soon ceased, and was succeeded by fresh schisms. A celebrated monk from Palestine, Sophronius<sup>3</sup> by name, was at that time in Alexandria. Undertaking to defend logically the doctrine of the two natures, he was not inclined to sacrifice the dogmatic conclusion to the policy of the church. To him, the doctrine of one mode of working and willing seemed necessarily to lead to Monophysitism, and an economy (*οἰκονομία*), as it was called, which was only introduced, at the expense of truth, to further the peace of the church, ought not, he argued, to be allowed. It was agreed, however, on both sides, to appeal to the patriarch Sergius, and Sophronius himself journeyed to see him. Sergius at once perceived the consequences which would follow the discussion of this subject, and he endeavoured to suppress the controversy in its origin. He himself allowed the expression descriptive of one will and operation; but he did not suppose that any one would venture to frame a law or dogma for the church, out of an expression used only occasionally and accidentally by some few ecclesiastical teachers. On the contrary, its employment was rather to be avoided in the ordinary language of the church, as likely to give offence to many, and as leading to the erroneous notion that the doctrine of the one nature would follow from its admission. But he spoke still more distinctly against the expression of a twofold manner of willing and operation, not simply on account of its possible misuse, but because it seemed to him to involve something false in itself. He feared that it would lead to the notion of two wills opposed to each other, that of the Logos, and that of the humanity of Christ, whence the true unity of the person of

<sup>1</sup> Τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα χριστὸν καὶ υἷον ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπή καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μὴ θεανδρική ἐνεργεία. See the formulary of union in the 13th Actio of the sixth œcumenical Council. Harduin. iii., 1342.

<sup>2</sup> It was called by the Greeks, on account of its so speedily falling into neglect, the *ἔνωσις ὑδροβαφής*.

<sup>3</sup> Sophronius was known in his younger years, and before he became a monk, as a scholar and teacher, by the title of Sophist, if, as is probably the case, he is the same to whom Johannes Moschus dedicated his monkish history (*Λειμὸν πνευματικός*), and of whose intention to forsake a worldly life mention is made in this history, c. 110.

Christ would be lost, it being impossible to imagine the existence of two wills in the same substance. It would, therefore, be the safest course to employ only the formulary hitherto in use ; this was sufficient to satisfy the interests of Christian faith. In conformity with these sentiments, he advised the patriarch Cyrus to make no change in the agreement at Alexandria, so important for the peace of the church, and not to be altered without danger to its tranquillity. But he further advised, that when the object for which it had been proposed was gained, no further mention should be made of either a single or a twofold will and operation, but that it should be firmly held, that the one same Christ, the true God, works both the divine and human, and that all divine and human operations proceed alike and entire from the same incarnate Logos, and refer to him. Sophronius, in the end, promised the patriarch to refrain from the use of either expression, and from all controversy on the subject.<sup>1</sup> Much, however, depends upon the form in which Sophronius gave this promise, if we are to form any judgment of his truth and honesty. But for this we have only the account given by Sergius, who was of the same party, and whose testimony, therefore, is of no avail. At all events, Sophronius considered himself bound by his pledge only as long as he might continue in the subordinate condition of a monk. From this low degree he was raised to one of the first places in the government of the church, being consecrated in the year 634 patriarch of Jerusalem.

Sergius now, fearing probably the zeal of Sophronius, who had gained vast influence through his elevation, sought, as a counterpoise, the aid of the Roman bishop Honorius. He informed the pontiff what had lately occurred,<sup>2</sup> and asked his judgment. Honorius replied in two letters, expressive of his entire agreement with Sergius. He wrote in the same manner to Cyrus and Sophronius. It was with great alarm that he contemplated the application of dialectics to subjects of this character. According to his views, it was absolutely necessary<sup>3</sup> to adopt the belief of

1 We refer to the 12th act of the sixth Œcumenical Council, Harduin. Concil. iii. f. 1315, as the source of these statements, which, as it seems, report the truth in respect to the correspondence between Sergius and the bishop of Rome.

2 See the letter of Sergius referred to above.

3 See *l. c.* f. 1319.

one will in Christ, since there could be no conflict between the human and divine will in him, on account of sin, as in the case of the world.<sup>1</sup> He favoured, indeed, the *οἰκονομία* by which the patriarch Cyrus strove to effect the reunion of the Monophysites with the Catholic church; but as no ecclesiastical decision had as yet been pronounced respecting a single or twofold operation in Christ, it appeared to him the safest course to avoid such expressions in future, since, while the one inclined to Nestorianism, the other no less seemed to favour Eutychianism. The whole question was reckoned by him among the useless refinements which are so injurious to the interests of piety. It was sufficient, he argued, for a man to adhere firmly to the commonly received doctrine of the church,—namely, that the one and the same Christ works according to the two natures, both that which is divine and that which is human.<sup>2</sup> Questions such as those disputed ought to be left to grammarians and the schools. Even in believers, as members of Christ, the Holy Spirit, according to Paul, works in various ways: how much more must this be the case in the head himself.

Sophronius, in the meantime, on entering upon his office, had issued, according to ancient custom, a circular epistle containing a confession of his faith.<sup>3</sup> In this document he represents the doctrine of two modes of operation, answering to the two natures in Christ, as necessarily springing from the latter. He in no wise rejected the expression descriptive of an *ἐνέργειαν θεανδρικήν*, but he contended that this is not opposed to the statement of two modes of operation, corresponding to the two peculiar natures: it refers to somewhat different—to that which is not

1 Nam lex alia in membris aut voluntas diversa non fuit vel contraria salvatori, quia super legem natus est humane conditionis. The champions of Honorius might, indeed, from the point of view taken by the church, refer to passages like this, in order to prove that he did not oppose the doctrine of two wills in Christ, in itself, but only the assertion of a contrast between the divine and human will. But this defence cannot avail for a moment, since it appeared to him, as well as to Sergius, that a twofold will, even without opposition, could not exist in one subject.

2 In the second letter, f. 1354, unus operator Christus in utrisque naturis, duae naturae in una persona inconfuse, indivise, inconvertibiliter propria operantes: although in that which he here says the notion of a twofold operation lies at the foundation of the thought, he still avoids expressing it.

3 His *γράμματα ἐθνοριστικά* in the 11th act of the sixth Œcumenical Council, Harl. iii. f. 1258.

said of one of the two natures in particular, but of the action of both in connection with each other; that is of the collective energy of Christ's person.

Not long after the publication of this epistle, Palestine was cut off, by the victories of the Saracens, from its connection with the rest of the Christian world. But the dispute must have already spread far and wide. The Emperor Heraclius considered it necessary to employ especial means for allaying the controversy, but he thereby rendered the evil worse. Thus in the year 638, he published a dogmatic edict called the Ecthesis. This no doubt was the work of Sergius,<sup>1</sup> being framed according to the principles which he had always professed. The doctrine of the one person of Christ in two natures was exhibited agreeably to the church doctrine. Thus he asserted that the one and the same Christ operated both as to the divine and human; but the expression referring to one *ἐνέργεια* or two *ἐνεργεῖαι* ought to be avoided; the former because, although it had been used by some of the fathers, many persons were disturbed by its introduction, thinking that it led to the denial of the twofold nature; the second because it had been employed by none of the approved teachers of the church, and gave offence to many.<sup>2</sup> Its employment, moreover, would in all probability lead to the adoption of a belief in the existence of two wills in Christ contradicting each other, which Nestorius himself would not have ventured to defend. According to the doctrine of the fathers, it was much safer to assert the existence of one will in Christ, since the rational soul of the humanity could never resolve on any thing from its own will in opposition to the will of the Logos with which it is united, but must always will as the Logos.<sup>3</sup>

This edict spoke too indulgently of one will and operation to quiet the opponents of that doctrine. Nor were the champions of a twofold will to be contented with mere toleration. The opinion which they advocated seemed to them inseparably con-

1 Ἐκθέσις τῆς πίστεως.

2 It is easy to perceive that severer things were said against the second expression than against the first.

3 Ως ἐν μηδενὶ καιρῷ τῆς νοερῶς ἐψυχωμένης αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς κεχωρισμένως καὶ ἐξ οὐκείας ὁρμῆς ἐναντίως τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ ἠνωμένου αὐτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ λόγου τὴν φυσικὴν αἰτῆς ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν, ἀλλ' ὅποτε καὶ οἶαν καὶ ὅσην αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ἠβούλετο. Harduin iii. 796.

nected with the true notion of the Redeemer, and redemption, and essential, therefore, to the general belief of the church. The greater number of the Greek bishops were, indeed, accustomed to allow themselves to be led by the prevailing sentiments of the court. It was no difficult matter for the patriarch Sergius to assemble a Synod (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*), which might confirm the new edict; nor would it have been more difficult to constrain the majority of the other bishops of Asia to approve the measure. But the arm of the emperor was far less powerful in the provinces of Northern Africa and Italy, where the dogmatic views of the court were opposed by the independent spirit of the hierarchy. One man there was, especially calculated by his dialectic acuteness, his activity and steady, determined mind, to become the head of the party opposed to the Monothelites, and to unite all the forces which could be commanded for its support. This was Maximus, already named, and who had now retired into his cloister.

While this distinguished man was the chief representative of the advocates of a twofold will, Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, in Arabia, known, however, only by a few fragments of his writings still existing, became the equally conspicuous advocate and orator of the opposite party. The dogmatic interest of the latter, since the late determination of the controversy, was immediately connected with the prevailing mode of thinking and speaking, which blended the formulary referring to the one incarnate nature of the Logos, with that of the two natures; and which, it was supposed, might be adopted as representing, without harm to the doctrine of a twofold nature, the human and divine, in the one incarnate Logos, as a single personal subject. There was something, it seemed, especially important to religion in this idea. Thus it was considered necessary to say, that the human nature in Christ was not, in itself, dependent on, or subject to, the sensual affections, but that all which was human in him was as a free act; that, like the assumption of human nature itself, it all depended upon the one will, and the one operation of the Logos; nay, that the entire adoption of pure humanity was nothing more than a continuation of that one determination of the will and act, by means of which the Logos, from the beginning, assumed the nature of man. All the works and sufferings of Christ proceed from three agents. The original power is, in all cases, the divine will;

the divine activity is that which determines ; and it works by means of the intelligent soul, and by the body as its organ.<sup>1</sup> All that, also, which we call the humiliation and suffering of Christ must, correctly viewed, be regarded as comprehended in the one operation of the same Christ.<sup>2</sup> God is the Author of all : humanity is the instrument by which he works.<sup>3</sup>

In opposition to this, Maximus argued : for the complete redemption of human nature, it was necessary that Christ should assume it with the identity and totality of all its faculties, without sin, in order that he might purify it from sin in all its parts, and thoroughly imbue it with a divine principle of life. That, therefore, which was not made partaker of this communion was excluded from redemption. Especially was it necessary that the proper will of man's rational nature, as that through which sin is perfected, should be included in this communion, and be thereby sanctified<sup>4</sup> Neither human nature, nor any other nature, can exist without its proper faculties ; and hence humanity cannot exist without its peculiar *ἐνέργεια* and *θέλησις*. No true idea can be formed of the incarnation of the Logos, if we neglect this consideration ; by neglecting it, we shall necessarily fall into the error of the Docetæ.

In illustration of his argument, Maximus appeals to the various passages of evangelical history, which indicate a willing or acting on the part of Christ, of a limited and sensible character, as walking, eating, &c. Such things as these could not be ascribed to the infinite, omnipresent will, or to the infinite omnipresent activity of God. This also must lead to Docetism, if we deprive the humanity of Christ of its proper will and energy (*θέλησις* and

1 *Μία ἐνέργεια τοῦ λόγου, τοῦ νοῦ, τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ σώματος καὶ ὀργανικοῦ τὰ πάντα λεχθείη. Πάντα ὅσα τῆς σωτηριώδους οἰκονομίας εἶτε θεία εἶτε ἀνθρώπινα περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν χριστοῦ ἀνιστόρηται, ἀρχοειδῶς μὲν ἐκ' τοῦ θείου τῆν ἔνδοσιν καὶ τῆν αἰτίαν ἐλάμβανε, διὰ μέσης δὲ τῆς νοεράς καὶ λογικῆς ψυχῆς ὑπουργεῖτο παρὰ τοῦ σώματος.* See fragments of Theodore of Pharan, in the acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council. act. xiii. Harduin. Concil. t. iii. f. 1343.

2 *Ὁ σταυρὸς, ἡ νέκρωσις οἱ μῶλα πες, ἡ ὤτειλή καὶ καθήλωσις, τὰ ἐμπτύσματα, τὰ ῥαπίσματα πάντα ταῦτα ὀρθῶς ἂν καὶ δικαίως κληθεῖη μία καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἑνὸς χριστοῦ ἐνέργεια.*

3 *Μία ἐνέργεια, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεὸς, ὄργανον δὲ ἡ ἀνθρώπιότης.*

4 *Εἰ παραβάντες τὴν ἐντολὴν διὰ θελήσεως ἀλλ' οὐ δίχα θελήσεως παρεβημεν, ἰδεόμεθα τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν ἱατρείας, τῇ προσληψεί τοῦ ὁμοίου τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ σκενωθέντος Θεοῦ θεραπευόντος.* Orp. ed. Combessis, t. ii. f. 83.

ἐνέργεια.<sup>1</sup>) When the divine Logos became man, he assumed with human nature its peculiar inclinations and aversions, as they exist in its positive or negative impulses; and he gave signs of their existence in his life.<sup>2</sup> Thus, for example, Maximus says: "As the desire of self-preservation is implanted in every creature, so with this, which is positive, there is connected the negative,<sup>3</sup> the natural feeling, that is, which strives against the destruction of life. But as this principle belongs to the very being of human nature, it must also have existed in Christ, and we find, in fact, that it did, as is shown in the account of his sufferings. That conflict, however, between natural feeling and the understanding; the irrational opposition arising from sin; the fear of death resisting the call of duty; nothing of this kind could exist in Christ."<sup>4</sup> Maximus further deduced from the hypostatic union, as a necessary consequence, (and in this he agreed with the Monothelites), that the Logos, as the personal subject, operated in a peculiar manner; so that the form of the ἐνέργεια and θέλησις proper to humanity, manifested its own activity for the salvation of mankind. Hence mere natural necessity must be wholly excluded; all must be viewed as effected in a way different to that which is usual to human nature, that is, in a divine and supernatural, and

1 In fact, as Theodore of Pharan expresses it, there is much in Monothelitism which borders close upon Docetism; as it regards it as the specific peculiarity of all the corporeal affections of Christ, that he was not subject to them by a natural necessity as man; but that, at each moment, by the Divine will, which the bodily nature must obey, he exhibited these affections, that by means of the adoption through the Logos, the body of Christ might be, in a certain measure, deified and spiritualized, and thus be free or subject as he pleased to the wants and limitations of the corporeal nature. Hence the miracles, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέτερα ψυχὴ οὐ πέφυκε τοσαύτης δυνάμεως εἶναι, ἵνα, τὰς φυσικὰς του σωματος ιδιότητας ἐξ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἑαυτῆς ἀπελαύνη. As this was the case with Christ, therefore, the ἐπικρατῆσαι τῶν συμφυῶν τοῦ σώματος, ὄγκου, ῥοῆς καὶ χρώματος; therefore, that Christ ἀόγκως καὶ ὄϊον εἰπεῖν ἀσωμάτος ἀνευ\*διαστολῆς προῆλθεν ἐκ μήτρας καὶ μνήματος καὶ θυρῶν καὶ ὡς ἐπ' ἑδαφους τῆς θαλάσσης ἐπέξενσεν. In one point, indeed, Maximus agreed with him, for he asserted that Christ had become subject to suffering not by a natural necessity, but had yielded to it for the sake of man's salvation by an act of free will, κατ' οἰκονομίαν.

2 Τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τὴν ὄρμην καὶ ἀφορμὴν θέλων δι' ἐνεργείας ἔδειξ, τὴν μὲν ὄρμην, ἐν τῷ τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ ἀδιαβλήτοις τοσοῦτον χρῆσασθαι, ὡς καὶ μὴ, θεὸν τοῖς τοῖς ἀπίστοις νομίζεσθαι, τὴν δὲ ἀφορμὴν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ πάθους, ἐκουσίως τὴν πρὸς τὸν θάνατον συστολὴν ποιήσασθαι. Disputat. c. Pyrrho. l. c. f. 165.

3 The ἀφορμὴ as opposed to the ὄρμη.

4 Ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ παρὰ φύσιν δειλία καὶ κατὰ φύσιν μὲν δειλία ἐστὶ δόσιμος κατὰ συστολὴν τοῦ ὄντος ἀνθεκτικὴ, παρὰ φύσιν δὲ παράλογος συστολή.

yet, at the same time, in a human and natural manner.<sup>1</sup> Thus Maximus represented an *ἐνέργεια θεανδρική* as significant of the activity of the one subject, of the incarnate Logos, in the form of the divine and human nature, by means of the *τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως* in reference to the property of each.<sup>2</sup>

The question respecting the mutual relation of the divine and human will in Christ, was also remarkably connected with the inquiry into the relation of the divine and human will in the redeemed, when they attain perfection. Many among the Monothelites, at least, represented an entire absorbing of the human will in the will of God as the boundary of the perfect development of the divine life in believers. So that there are in all both a subjective and an objective identity; a notion which, in its proper connection, would lead to the Pantheistic doctrine of the resolution of all properties in the one original being. Maximus was well aware of this, and he contended strongly against such a conclusion. He asserted, that, in reference to the objective, the object of the will of God is the same for all, and in reference to the same active principle of divine grace, is but one will in all; whereas the subjective distinction must always continue; the distinction, that is, between the will of God which produces holiness, and that which receives it from him.<sup>3</sup> It may now be understood, how this doctrine of Maximus is connected with the principle, so important to him, of the revelation of the supernatural and divine, in the luminous form and properties of the natural, which the opposite idea so directly contradicts. As far as the appeal to the fathers is concerned, the difference in their interpretations is greater than that between the dogmas referred to. Not thinking of these con-

1 Οὐ προηγείται ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ καθάπερ ἐν ἡμῖν τῆς θελήσεως τὰ φυσικά, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ πεινάσας ἀληθῶς καὶ διψήσας οὐ τῷ τρόπῳ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπέτασεν καὶ ἐδίψησεν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, ἐκουσίως γὰρ, ὕψω καὶ δειλιάσας ἀληθῶς, οὐ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ἐδέλιασε καὶ καθόλου φάνα, πᾶν φυσικὸν ἐπὶ χριστὸν συνημμένον ἔχει τῷ κατ' αὐτὸ λόγῳ καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ φύσιν τρόπον, ἵνα καὶ ἡ φύσις διὰ τοῦ λόγου πιστωθῆ καὶ ἡ οἰκονομία διὰ τοῦ τροπῶν.

2 This was afterwards called a *communicatio idiomatum*.

3 Τῶν τε σωζομένων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ θεοῦ τοῦ σώζοντος κατὰ τὴν θελησιν γενήσεται συμβασίς ὅλου ἐν πᾶσι γενικῶς καὶ τὸ καθ' ἕναστος ἰδιῶς χωρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα πληροῦντος τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς χάριτος καὶ ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου μελῶν δικῆν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἐν ἐκάστῳ πίστεως, t. ii., f. 10, 11. In the discourse with Pyrrhus ii., f. 162, he makes some remarks on the obscurity resulting from the use of the same name to describe the *θέλημα* and the *θελητόν*.



troversial questions, they had expressed themselves with unre-served freedom.<sup>1</sup>

In Constantinople, the imperial edict still retained the force of law even after the death of Heraclius in the year 641. But the successors of the Roman bishop Honorius, who died soon after the commencement of the controversy, declared themselves strongly against the Monothelites, and in favour of the doctrine of the two wills, and modes of operation. These dogmatic views prevailed also in the north African church. Maximus visited the Western provinces, and still further inflamed by his influence the popular zeal for the prevailing opinions, while he employed, on the other hand, the authority of their churches, especially that of Rome, to oppose Monothelism. From Africa and Rome he addressed letters and other controversial writings to the monks of the East. In Africa, he found a firm supporter in the chief magistrate, Gregory, who formed the idea of opposing the imperial government, and of employing, it is probable, the excitement occasioned by the controversy to aid the accomplishment of his own designs. A public dispute, in which Maximus performed the chief part, created great disturbance. The patriarch Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, who had also hitherto acknowledged the authority of the Ecthesis, was induced by the outbreak of popular hatred against him, in the year 642, to resign his office. On his retirement, he proceeded to North Africa ; and a discussion took place between him and Maximus, in the presence of Gregory, and a numerous assembly of the people. Maximus defended his opinions with great acuteness, and was, doubtless, in this respect, superior to his opponent. But it is equally certain that it was interest rather than conviction, or the weight of the arguments advanced, which induced Pyrrhus to declare himself overcome. He was thereupon, however, solemnly restored to church communion by the Roman

<sup>1</sup> The exposition and reading of the passage in the fourth so-called epistle of Dionysius to Caius, where a *ἐνέργειαν θεανδρικήν* is ascribed to Christ, were of this kind. According to the connection of the passage, it seems probable, that the reading *μίαν* defended by the Monothelites is not the correct one, but *καινήν* supported by the opposite party. It was the design of the writer to shew that which was new in the appearance of a God-man, unless all the definitions pertaining to the word *θεανδρικήν* are here derived from the scholiasts. In every case, each party might interpret the term according to its own views.

bishop Theodore, but soon after allowed himself to be again attracted to the ranks of another party.

The continued distractions occasioned by these disputes, induced the emperor Constans, in the year 648, to abolish the *Ecthesis*, and publish a new religious edict under the name of the *Type*<sup>1</sup> Although this edict was drawn up under the eye of the patriarch Paulus, who, as it appears from his correspondence with the Roman bishops, was devoted to Monothelism, yet his dogmatic views did not appear in this formulary so prominently as those of Sergius in the *Ecthesis*. He knew how to distinguish between the duties of the preacher of the gospel and those of the magistrate; or he did not regard the dogmatic difference on the subject in question as of sufficient importance to allow it to disturb the peace of the church. Hence he was resolved not to engage state authority in effecting a compulsory establishment of Monothelism. The *Type* is evidently and essentially distinguished from the *Ecthesis*, by the inferior place which it gives to the dogmatic element, and by the desire which it displays, without any positive declaration in favour of either party, to restore peace to the church.<sup>2</sup> A statement having been given respecting the opposite systems, no sentence being passed on either, the *Type* directs that the doctrine of the church, as received before the commencement of the present controversy, should be carefully upheld, and that neither party should accuse the other of heresy. Such of the clergy as should violate this rule were to be degraded; monks guilty of the offence should be sent into exile; and officials, whether civil or military, breaking the law, were to be deprived of their places. People of wealth were to suffer the confiscation of their estates; and those of a lower rank corporal punishment and perpetual banishment.<sup>3</sup>

But although it was with the good design of suppressing the strife which prevailed, that these laws were passed, the end was

<sup>1</sup> Τύπος τῆς πίστεως.

<sup>2</sup> The imperial commissioners were probably right in saying, at the audience of Maximus in Constantinople, that the emperor had only permitted the publication of the *Type* διὰ τὴν εἰρήνην, οὐκ ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει τινὸς τῶν ἐπὶ χριστοῦ νοουμένων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' εἰρήνῃ τὴν σιωπὴν τῶν ποιουσῶν τὴν διάστασιν φωνῶν οἰκονομοῦντα. See *Acta Maximi* prefixed to his works. T. i., s. 8, f. 36.

<sup>3</sup> See the Acts of the Lateran Council. Act. iv., t. iii. Harduin., f. 824.

plainly not to be reached by such means. Religious conviction is not the work of tyranny. Those to whom the object of the controversy appeared of greatest importance were only the more excited to strife by this prohibition to engage in dispute. To them it could appear in no other light than the fruit of an unholy indifference, or a cunning artifice invented for the sake of stopping the free progress of truth. On the part of those who contended for the doctrine of a twofold will and operation, the Type was viewed as reducing Christ to a being without will and without action; to a likeness, that is, to the dumb, dead idols of the heathen.<sup>1</sup>

Martinus I., a zealous opponent of the Monothelites, who at an earlier period, when he filled the office of apocrisiarius of the Roman church at Constantinople, had engaged violently in the controversy, was now, as Pope, the firmest supporter of his party. In this character he received numerous complaints from the monks and clergy of various provinces, both of the East and West, respecting the suppression of the truth by the obnoxious edict, and which, though published under the name of the emperor, was properly the work of the patriarch of Constantinople. Martin, as the successor of the apostle Peter, believed himself called upon, and in this belief he was strengthened by the appeals made to him from different quarters, to stand forth as the champion of pure doctrine in the church at large. Without consulting the emperor on the subject, he assembled a council at Rome in the year 648, selecting for its place of meeting the Constantinian church, standing in the neighbourhood of the ancient Lateran palace, and thence called the *ecclesiae lateranensis*. By this council, denominated from the place of assembly, the Lateran Council, twenty canons were drawn up against the Monothelites. The doctrine of the twofold will and operation was clearly asserted; and sentence was pronounced on the opposite doctrine and its supporters, with especial reference to the patriarchs of Constantinople, since

<sup>1</sup> In a petition directed by the monk Maximus, and other Greek monks, to the Lateran Council, the following passage occurs in reference to the Type: *Εἰς δὲ ἀνεύρηγτον παντὴ καὶ ἀνεθέλητον, τουτέστιν ἄνου καὶ ἀψυχον καὶ ἀκίνητον αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς δόξης θεὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐδογματίσαν τοῖς τῶν ἰθῶν ἀψύχοις παραπλησίως εἰδώλοις*; and Ps. cxv. is then adduced, *τοιούτου γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ ἀνεύρηγτον πάντῃ καὶ ἀνεθέλητον*. Harduin. Concil. t. iii. f. 724.

the time of Sergius, and to the edicts, the Ecthesis and the Typus, issued at their desire.

Martinus published these canons throughout the Western church, and endeavoured to procure their general adoption. He also wrote in his own name, and in that of the synod, to the emperor Constans, sent him a report of the proceedings, and desired him to confirm them.

In the meantime, Olympius, the new exarch of Ravenna, had arrived in Rome. He was instructed, if he found his power sufficient, to publish the Type; to compel a general subscription to its articles; and to take the Pope prisoner if he should attempt to oppose this proceeding. But if he should not yet possess sufficient strength to accomplish such a plan, he was to collect around him a force which would enable him to execute it securely. Olympius, it seems, was not, at first, so confident in his own strength as to think it safe to proceed openly against the Pope, who had great influence with the people, ready at any moment to rise in his defence. Hence he judged it prudent to act towards him with apparent cordiality, and to prepare the net which was to entangle him while wearing the mask of friendship. When, however, he altogether changed his designs, and resolved on creating an insurrection against the emperor, his interests led him to seek a close alliance with the Pope, instead of opposing either him or his party. The decisions of the Lateran Council were, therefore, allowed to take their course.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As the design of an insurrection formed by Olympius was spoken of during the examination of Martin at Constantinople, as a well known fact, and was not denied by Martin, we cannot doubt but that Olympius had really the intention imputed to him. This explains why he did not prosecute measures against the Pope; and the manner in which he acted towards him might easily give rise to the suspicion that there was some secret understanding between them, or afford, at least, a colour of justice to such an accusation. But Anastasius, in the life of the pontiff, makes no mention of these circumstances, and the tenor of his narrative is opposed to the common idea. We should not be justified, however, in regarding him as altogether unfaithful to the truth, but should endeavour to see whether the two accounts may not be reconciled. He probably adopted some extravagant report, when he says, that Olympius intended to have Martinus murdered during the celebration of the sacrament. The origin of this may have been, that Olympius, at first, and before he planned the insurrection, had really intended to employ some artifice against the Pope. This is proved by a passage in an epistle of the latter, which indicates the opinion he had formed of Olympius, and proves how far he was from making common cause with him. In a letter to Theodorus, he repeats what he had stated to the exarch Calliopas. *Quod semper per complexionem et fallacem accusationem ince-*

On the death of the exarch Olympius, who fell in an expedition against the Saracens in Sicily, the emperor sent Calliopas, in the year 653, as exarch to Italy. The new exarch was instructed to adopt compulsory measures for establishing the Type, and to convey Pope Martin to Constantinople to be punished. Political interests were now regarded at the imperial court as of far greater importance than those of dogmatism. It was not as a heretic,<sup>1</sup> but as a traitor, that Martin had exposed himself to punishment. His proceedings against the imperial edict appeared in the eyes of the Byzantine despot as a *crimen majestatis*. Technically, indeed, it could not be otherwise. The Type had been published as an imperial edict; and it was argued, on the side of the court, that it was rather political than religious; that nothing new of a dogmatic kind was proposed; that all it did was to prohibit controversy on particular points; and that no conscience could properly be offended by a law so simply negative. If, again, Martin should say that this edict proceeded not so much from the emperor as from the patriarch Paul, this would not avail as an apology for his conduct; for were such an argument to be admitted, every law might be broken, on the plea that it was not the work of the sovereign, but of his advisers, who directed him wrong.

Martin might have defended himself on far better grounds, as the representative of the power and interests of the church. But reasoning of this kind would not have been admitted by the Byzantine politicians, who regarded the claims of the hierarchy as

derent adversum nos et cum in adventu infamis Olympii vani cujusdam hominis cum armis me hunc potiusse repellere faterentur. From the introduction of the word *faterentur* and not *dicerent*, I can understand these expressions in no other way than as proving the falsity of the suspicion that he designed to defend himself by violence. They must show, that, since Olympius, when he first arrived, gathered no armed force together, the Pope, through his influence, had power to prevent his entrance into Rome with armed followers. But that Martin did not use the power which he possessed, although expecting hostile proceedings on the part of Olympius, should be taken to prove, how little he wished to defend himself by force.

<sup>1</sup> It was only once, when an effort was made to defend the violence of the edicts introduced into Rome against Martin, that he was charged with dogmatic crime. Harduin. t. iii., f. 675, ep. 14, ad Theodorum. The accusation then brought against him was, that he did not acknowledge Mary as *θεοτόκος*, according to the principle of the Monothelites, the opposite view tending to Nestorianism. But this charge was carried no further; and it was not according to the principles and opinions of those from whom the Typus proceeded.

ever subject to those of the state. Still the pontiff could have argued, that the latter passed the proper limits of its authority, when it pretended to define what is real and what is unreal in doctrine, and that it cannot be forbidden the church to propound or defend what it regards as necessary to the full development of the Christian faith. In so far, moreover, as he viewed things in connexion with the belief that he was the successor of the apostle Peter, and charged with the supreme government of the church, he might consider himself bound to contend for the perfect exhibition of divine truth, and the free action of the church, against what he believed to be the heretical tendencies of the civil government. There is little doubt, however, that Martin would willingly have used the power of the state as an instrument in supporting the doctrine which he regarded as orthodox; and there is as little doubt that he would have warmly praised the emperor, had he, submitting himself to the decrees of the Lateran Council, published a decree in favour, not of Monotheletism, but of Duothelitism.

As soon as Martin appeared at the imperial court, in the character of a political criminal, he was suspected of having been guilty of innumerable offences. This arose partly from the disposition of the people of Constantinople to rejoice in the marvellous in such cases, and partly from the desire of finding means to justify persecution. Thus he was sometimes represented as having been in league with the Saracens,<sup>1</sup> and sometimes as the chief ally of Olympius.

Calliopas came to Rome on the fifteenth of June 653; but, as in the case of his predecessor, he feared that if he took open or immediate measures against the Pope, he might be opposed by the people. Martin, who had been ill for several months, lay stretched on his bed, near the altar, in the church of the Lateran, surrounded by his clergy. Calliopas arrived on the Saturday.

<sup>1</sup> See ep. ad Theodorum. He is here represented as having carried on a correspondence with the Saracens; as having sent them supplies of money, and a confession of faith. If the latter circumstance were true, it would be to his honour; and we must conclude therefrom, that he was anxious for the conversion of the Saracens. But such an experiment as that referred to would rather have hindered than promoted a political confederacy. Martinus, however, denied the whole, except that he had sent some money to certain Christians who were living among the Saracens (probably in Sicily), and by the hands of some of the number who had visited Rome.

The Sunday he allowed to pass over, dreading the multitude which had assembled to attend the services of the church. Excusing himself, on the plea of weariness, for not appearing on that day, he informed the pontiff that he would visit him the next. Early on the Monday morning, but still full of anxiety, he sent some of his followers to the Pope, and desired them to express his apprehensions that armed men were concealed in the church, and that stones were collected to be used in its defence. All this was unnecessary, and the pontiff ought not to allow it.

To dispel the suspicions which it was thus said were entertained, Martin ordered the servants of Calliopas to be led round every part of the church, that they might learn with their own eyes how utterly groundless their apprehensions were. Calliopas being now convinced that he had nothing to fear, pressed into the church with an armed band of followers, and having read the orders of the emperor, acquainted Martin that he was deposed; that he had obtained the bishopric unlawfully;<sup>1</sup> and that he was to be immediately conveyed to Constantinople.

Many of the clergy exhorted the Pope to employ force in his defence, depending, as he might, at least for the present, on the zeal of the people. But Martin replied, that he would rather die ten times than let the blood of a single man be shed on his account. He surrendered himself, therefore, immediately into the hands of Calliopas, who ordered him to be conducted to his palace. As permission had been given, at first, to all the clergy who wished it to attend the Pope, a number, both of priests and laymen, appeared the next day, and expressed their resolution to accompany him on his journey. But Calliopas seems only to have been anxious to avoid exciting a popular tumult. About midnight he suddenly ordered the Pope to be taken from the palace. Attended only by a few servants, he was immediately conveyed to the harbour; and the gates of Rome were kept closed till his departure. He had a wearisome and very difficult journey

<sup>1</sup> Quod irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum subripuissem. This may, perhaps, refer to the circumstance, that Martin had not sought or received, according to custom, the confirmation of his election from the emperor. It may be questioned whether he believed himself justified in neglecting to seek this confirmation, on account of the divisions which existed; or whether he was prevented from doing it by some other cause.

before him. During a whole year he was left on the island of Naxos; and throughout the entire journey, the sick old man was treated with the most insulting severity. No accommodation was allowed him, and he was denied the common necessaries which his bodily infirmities rendered so much the more essential to his support. When the clergy and people of the places through which he passed sent him such things as they thought might minister to his comfort, his guards seized the presents, and dismissed those who brought them with the most insulting abuse, remarking, that those who exhibited love towards the enemies of the emperor, were themselves his enemies.<sup>1</sup>

The few letters which the unfortunate pontiff wrote to his friend Theodore, in the midst of these sufferings, show a truly resigned and Christian spirit. In the earliest of these epistles, he said, "By the help of your prayers, and those of all the faithful who are with you, I shall be able both living and dying to defend the faith on which our salvation rests, and, as Paul teaches, 'to live is Christ, and to die is gain.'" And when, on his departure from the island of Naxos, he wrote to inform his friend of his sufferings, he concludes with these words, "I confide in the power of God, who sees all, that when I am freed from the present life, all my persecutors will be so punished, that, being led thereby to repentance, they may be converted from their wickedness."

On the 17th of September 654, he arrived in the harbour of Constantinople. He was left, however, to pass the night on his sick bed in the ship, and was exposed to fresh distresses. The next day he was conveyed to the chief prison. There he remained ninety three days, unvisited by any one. At the end of this period, he was carried on his couch before the tribunal appointed to judge him. Weak as he was, and unable to support himself, he was yet desired to stand during his examination. The president of the court said to him, "Speak, wretch! what harm has the emperor done you?" Martinus was silent. The president then said, "You are silent. See, then, your accusers shall appear," and a number of witnesses came forward, ready to state the part which he was said to have taken in the conspiracy of Olympius. On its being proposed that they should be sworn, the

<sup>1</sup> See the letter of Martinus to Theodore, and the account of his sufferings written by a friend. Harduin. iii., f. 677.



Pope intreated that this might not take place. They could do, he said; what they wished with him; but why should they allow those people to destroy their souls? When he expressed his desire to relate the whole affair of Olympius, and began with the words, "When the Type was drawn up, and sent by the emperor to Rome," he was immediately interrupted. It was feared that he might touch upon doctrinal subjects, for the discussion of which no permission had been received. One of the assembly accordingly exclaimed, "Let us have no mention of what concerns belief. You are here accused of high treason: we are Christians, and orthodox believers." Martin replied, "Would that ye were so! But in this respect also I shall appear against you at the dreadful day of judgment." With dignity and courage he defended himself against many of the things which the judges suggested in aid of his accusers. At length he said to them, "I conjure you, by the Lord! do quickly that which you intend to do with me; for God knows, death is the greatest boon which you can bestow upon me."

The emperor having been informed of the proceedings, Martin was stripped, with many insulting circumstances, of his priestly robes, and then sent fettered to another prison. It seems that the original design was to condemn him to capital punishment as a traitor; but the patriarch Paulus, then on his death-bed, being informed of the trial, expressed his distress, notwithstanding the injuries which he had suffered from the popes, that a bishop should be so treated; and the emperor promised the dying patriarch that Martin should not be executed.

After having languished eighty-five days in the second prison, the unhappy pontiff was informed that he was to leave it, and pass some time under the care of one of the imperial secretaries, in whose house he was to remain till preparations were made for conveying him to his place of banishment. Where that might be he was not informed. On his departure, he embraced those who had dwelt with him, and, praising God, bade them a joyful farewell. When they wept and lamented, he besought them not to do so, but rather to rejoice with him, and to thank the Lord, that he had counted him worthy to suffer for his name's sake. The city of Cherson, on the peninsular of Krim, in the midst of the Barbarians, was the place appointed for his exile. He set out from Constantinople on the 20th of March 655, and arrived

at Cherson on the 15th of May. Great were the privations which he had to endure among the unfeeling barbarians. He could obtain no bread in the place, and was destitute of money to purchase it from the foreign ships which entered the port. At length a vessel arrived from Constantinople; and he hoped that this might have brought him the means sent for his support from Rome. But his hopes were deceived; and, on mentioning this circumstance to a friend, he said, "I have praised my God even for this also; for it is he who orders our sufferings." He wrote, however, to state, that if means were not supplied him, he could not support existence. "For, as you know," he added, "though the spirit be willing, the flesh is weak." It distressed him that, up to the month of September, he had received nothing from Rome; no sign even of sympathy; which might, perhaps, be accounted for by the fear entertained of the emperor. "I wonder, and must wonder still," he wrote in September, "at the want of sympathy on the part of my friends and relations, and at their entire forgetfulness of my misfortunes. They have not, I find, cared once to inquire whether I am still upon the earth." That, however, which most surprised him was the fact, that the clergy of the Roman church had ceased to trouble themselves about him, and had not even taken care to provide him with daily sustenance. "Though the church of Saint Peter," he said, may possess no gold, "still it has corn and wine, and all things proper, by God's grace, for the support of life." "What fear is that," he writes, "which has fallen upon men, so as to prevent them from fulfilling the commands of God: fear where nothing to fear exists? Or do I really appear in the light of an enemy to the whole church? But may God, who will that all men should be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth, establish their hearts, by the mediation of the holy Peter, in the right faith, and preserve them safe against all the influence of the heretics; and especially may he so uphold their pastors, that they, departing not, in the slightest degree, from that which they have subscribed in the sight of God and his holy angels, may receive with me the crown of righteousness from the hands of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. As to my weak body, I leave it to the Lord to do with it as it may please him, whether to subject it to unceasing suffering, or to allow it some cessation from pain. For the Lord

is near, and what should disturb me? I hope in his mercy, that He will soon bring me to the end of the course which he has appointed." The wish which Martin thus expressed was fulfilled. He died on the sixteenth of September.

But the aged Maximus, the head of the Duothelites in the East, the soul of all that which had been done both in the East and West against the imperial decrees, was still living; and though seventy-five years old, was still able, by the influence which his character, his firmness, and consistency inspired, to offer a powerful resistance to the opposite party. He was, therefore, apprehended, with his scholar Anastasius; conveyed to Constantinople, and cast into prison. The master and his pupil, who had lived constantly together for more than thirty years, were now purposely separated from each other. Accusations of a political character, and without any reference to religious questions, were brought against Maximus. On comparing some of these accusations with what Maximus said in his defence, we discover a marked difference between the Byzantine and the Roman principles of church government. Thus, for example, the scholar of Maximus was accused of refusing to recognize the emperor as a priest; and he supported his opinion by referring to the general usage of the church, according to which the sovereign belonged to the laity, and had no spiritual power. Melchizedec, who was cited as an example by the other party, was only priest and king, as a type of Jesus Christ.

The early proceedings, however, against Maximus were not so severe as those against Martin. Reverence for the aged man, who was regarded as the pattern of monastic excellence, and pity for his years, led many to wish he might be spared; and when efforts were made to induce him to yield, a hope was entertained that all resistance to the Type would be at once brought to an end. Threats, flatteries, and all the arts of persuasion were employed to accomplish this object. It was represented to Maximus, that he was not called upon to renounce any part whatever of his dogmatic system, but merely to acknowledge the authority of a treaty of peace between the two parties. A new formulary of agreement even was placed before him, in which he might insert, if he pleased, his dogmatic notion, "that in relation to the distinction

<sup>1</sup> See Acta Maximi, §. 20, t. i. p. 30.

between the two natures, two *ἐνέργειαι* and *θειότητες* ought to be acknowledged; but in relation to the union of the two, only one." Maximus, however, persevered in asserting what he believed to be the necessary consequence of his system, and he firmly refused to conceal by any double meaning the distinctions which seemed essential to the integrity of his views.

In the meantime, Martin was far removed from the public stage. Eugenius,<sup>1</sup> who had been elevated in his stead by Calliopas, readily accorded church communion to the new patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, who had been formerly driven into exile. The Roman apocrisarii also at Constantinople had allowed themselves to be induced to subscribe the formulary above mentioned; and this was made use of as an argument to induce Maximus, who had always held the Roman church in high esteem, to desist from his opposition. But his own deeply seated convictions had greater weight with him than his reverence for a single bishop; and he declared, that, though the bishop of Rome had deserted the truth, yet, according to Paul, an angel from heaven could preach no other gospel than that which had been preached. All efforts to induce him to comply with the wishes of the court having proved vain, he was banished to Thrace, where he was kept a prisoner, apart from his scholar Anastasius, in the Castle of Bizya. But when still further attempts were made, and with equally ill success, the rage of his persecutors exceeded all bounds, and, in the year 662, the aged man was carried back to Constantinople. There he was publicly scourged; his tongue was cut out, and his right hand chopped off. Thus mutilated, he was banished to the country of the Lazii, where he soon (August 13) died, worn out with suffering.

By these means the emperor at length succeeded in compelling the entire Eastern church to acknowledge the Type; and, with the adoption of this formulary, the bishops of the principal cities combined the advocacy of Monothelitism. The rest of the clergy, taking no interest in the controversy, and not caring to examine the question for themselves, readily followed the example of their superiors. In the Romish church, on the contrary, zeal for the opposite doctrine was continually increasing; and hence a schism between the two churches was to be looked for, notwithstanding

<sup>1</sup> Calliopas would not have named him, had he not beforehand promised compliance.

the unwillingness of the two immediate successors of Martin, Eugenius and Vitalianus, to excite the anger of the emperor by appearing in open opposition to the patriarch of Constantinople. But, under Pope Adeodatus, in the year 677, plainer indications were given of the approaching schism. All intercourse between the two patriarchs ceased. In the Romish church those of Constantinople were no longer regarded as members of the church catholic; no epistles were received from them; while at Constantinople, on the other hand, the names of the Romish bishops were erased from the church books, or Diptycha, and omitted in the public prayers. The patriarchs Theodorus of Constantinople, and Macarius of Antioch, were especially anxious to expunge the name of Vitalianus from the church books. They considered that the Romish patriarchs were orthodox only up to the time of Honorius, but should be mentioned in the Diptycha till then; because it was since that period that the dogmatic difference, which had now to be settled, between the two churches, had arisen. But the ruling emperor, Constantinus Pogonatus, would not suffer this. The division between the churches greatly disturbed him, and it was his earnest wish to bring them again into union. As a layman he would pronounce no judgment upon the controversy itself; but endeavoured to arrive at a safe conclusion by appealing to the bishops themselves, between whom the dispute was carried on. Hence, in the year 678, he addressed an epistle to Domnus, bishop of Rome, desiring him to send ambassadors to Constantinople, for the purpose of consulting with the patriarchs and bishops of the East as to the means of effecting a reconciliation. The language employed by the emperor in this letter is remarkably different, in its expression of respect for a free dogmatic enquiry, from the ordinary style of Byzantine despotism when treating of such subjects. He solemnly asserts, and with an appeal to God, that he would allow equal freedom to both parties, and like honour to their representatives.<sup>1</sup> It would delight him greatly, he adds, if both parties would consent to re-establish peace; but, if no union could be effected, he would still send back the papal representatives with all honour to Rome. Agatho, the successor of Domnus, who died soon after the dispatch of the

<sup>1</sup> His words are *ὄχι ἔστι παρ' ἡμῶν ἑτερομύρησις οὐαδήποτε, ἀλλ' ἰσότητα τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις φυλλάξομεν.*

emperor's letter, obeyed the imperial command, and, in the year 680, the sixth Œcumenical Council was assembled at Constantinople for the purpose of investigating the controversy. This was the third of the general councils convened in Constantinople; and, from the vaulted chamber in which it held its meetings,<sup>1</sup> it received the name of the Council in Trullo. The emperor himself attended its deliberations. No direct or extended statement was made in this assembly of the points at issue; but the proceedings were conducted in a more becoming manner, and suffered less disturbance from foreign influence than was the case with some former councils. According to the prevailing rule of dogmatic tradition, the settlement of the dispute was made to depend mainly upon the mode of expression employed by the early fathers, and as they seemed to agree with the one or the other system. But, as it has been already observed, the fathers wrote before the question now debated formed a subject of dispute in the church. Their language, consequently, in this respect, is often loose and indefinite; and their words, interpreted by different readers, frequently present a different meaning. Hence the one party accused the other of perverting the sentiments of the fathers, or of taking their statements apart from their proper connection. Thus nothing could be determined by an appeal to their authority, and the subject had again to be referred to the rules of logical discussion. This is plainly shewn by the mode in which the question was argued in the eighth session, with Macarius, patriarch of Antioch.

The Roman representatives came provided with a letter from Pope Agatho. This epistle contained a lengthened statement and defence of Duothelitism. Arguments in its support were selected from the ancient fathers, and a paper was especially referred to, which Agatho had drawn up in the name of a numerous synod held at Rome. In the fourth session, both these writings were read before the whole assembly. On the thirteenth of February, when the seventh session was held, another collection of passages from the fathers was brought forth, and its authority was alleged in support of the views adopted by the Romans. Georgius of Constantinople, and Macarius of Antioch,

<sup>1</sup> Σεκρετὸν τοῦ θείου παλατίου τὸ οὕτως ἐπιλεγόμενον τροῦλος. Vita Stephani ed Muratori, p. 482, ὁ τρολλος, ὅπερ ἡμεῖς ὡάτου καλοῦμεν.

with the bishops of their party, were now asked whether they would admit the truth of the doctrine approved by the Pope? The dignitaries above named requested that they might be allowed to defer their answer till the following session. They would, in the meantime, consider the passages adduced from the fathers, and the connection in which they stood to the text. Accordingly, at the next session, which took place on the seventeenth of March, the patriarch Georgius declared, that he was convinced, by the enquiry which he had made, of the truth of the Duothelite system, and that he therefore should accept it, in conformity with the views exhibited in the writing of Agatho. But as it is certain that nothing was contained in the papers brought by the Roman envoys which had not been already advanced in the controversy, it must be concluded that Georgius had either blindly patronised Monothelitism, according to the fashion of the day, or that the sudden change which had taken place in his opinions was the effect rather of wordly considerations, than of sincere conviction. Macarius, however, persevered in his Monothelitism, and laid a full statement of his faith before the synod, supported by numerous quotations from the fathers. While recognising only one will and mode of operation in Christ, it is evident that that which he really intended was to deduce, according to pure Christian doctrine, all the determinations of Christ's will, and his power of operation, from the divine essence existing in him, and determining his actions; in the same manner as Adam, before the fall, acknowledged the divine will as the only moving power, the *σαρκικὰ θελήματα* and *ἀνθρωπίνους λογισμούς* being viewed as the consequence of the fall. The agreement of the parties in Christian consciousness may be readily acknowledged; the theoretical distinction between them may be as easily discerned.

To what extravagances a fanatical zeal could carry the partisans of this system, appears from a remarkable occurrence which happened in the fifteenth session of the Council. A monk named Polychronius, from Heraclea, in Thrace, presented himself before the assembly. He declared that a band of men, clothed in white garments, had appeared to him, and that in their midst was a man invested with indescribable glory: probably Christ was intended. This wonderful personage said to him, that those who did not confess the *ἐν θέλημα* and the *θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*, were no Chris-

tians. He also commanded him to seek the emperor, and to exhort him to refrain from making or admitting any new doctrines. The monk then offered to prove the truth of the principles which he advocated by a miracle, and to restore a dead man to life by means of a confession of faith embodying the Monothelite belief. It was considered necessary to accept his proposal, in order to prevent his imposing on the credulity of the people. The entire synod, and the highest officers of state appeared, surrounded by a multitude of people, in an open place, into which a dead body was brought upon a bier decorated with silver ornaments. Polychronius laid his confession upon the corpse; and continued, for several hours, to whisper something into its ear. At length he was obliged to acknowledge that he could not awake the dead. Loud were the clamours which burst forth from the people against this new Simon Magus. But no such clamours could weaken the conviction formed in the depths of his mind, and Polychronius remained firmly devoted to his error. By means of this Council, the doctrine of two wills, and two modes of operation in Christ, obtained a victory throughout the Eastern church. It was now made part of a new confession, and was carefully defended against the conclusions which the Monothelites endeavoured to draw from its principles. "Two wills, and two natural modes of operation, united with each other, without opposition and without confusion or change, so that no antagonism can be found to exist between them, but a constant subjection of the human will to the divine," this was the foundation of the creed. An anathema was also pronounced upon the champions of Monothelitism, upon the patriarchs of Constantinople, and on Honorius, to defend whom some attempt had been made by a skilful interpretation of his words.<sup>1</sup>

But possessing, as Monothelitism did, so many supporters among the clergy and monks, it was not possible that the publication of an anathema should at once humble the party. Instead of its being rooted out, it was transplanted from place to place, and exhibited many signs of its hostility to the state, as it had since the reign of Justinian, that is, from the year 685. In opposition

<sup>1</sup> See 18th sess. Harduin. iii. 1398. The patriarch Georgius and several bishops of his province had prayed: *ἵνα εἰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστίν, μὴ ἀναθεματισθῶσι τὰ πρόσωπα εἰς τὰς ἐκβολήσεις*, that is, the patriarchs since Sergius, *εἰ οἰκονομίαν τινὰ*, but it was impossible to resist the majority of votes. Act 16, l. c. 1386.



to these attempts, the decrees of the sixth Œcumenical Council, in reference to the disputed doctrine, were published anew by the second Council in Trullo, in the year 691 or 692, and the proceedings of which were intended to complete the work of the two preceding general Councils, the fifth and the sixth.<sup>1</sup> But in the year 711, a zealous champion of the Monothelite party succeeded in gaining possession of the imperial throne. This was Bardanes, or, as he called himself in his regal state, Philippicus.<sup>2</sup> He gained the crown by the overthrow of Justinian II., who had rendered himself hateful by his horrible despotism. The new sovereign, before he would enter the imperial palace, commanded that the image of the sixth general Council, which had been set up among the images of the other general Councils, should be immediately removed. In the same manner, he ordered the instant re-insertion of the names of Sergius and Honorius in the Diptycha, among those of the orthodox patriarchs, and the re-erection of their images. He also deposed the present patriarch of Constantinople, and nominated in his place a deacon, Johannes, who allowed himself to be used as his instrument in the promotion of Monothelitism. Under his presidency, a Council was held at Constantinople which overthrew the decisions of the sixth general Council, and proposed a new symbol of faith in favour of the Monothelite doctrine. The few of the clergy who would not submit to the will of the emperor were deprived of their office. In Italy, on the contrary, his arm was not sufficiently powerful to compel obedience, and his efforts to introduce the new symbol into the Romish church, led to a popular insurrection against his government. The success, indeed, of the Monothelite party ceased with the brief reign of Bardanes, who enjoyed the crown only two years. Anas-

<sup>1</sup> Hence the name *σύνοδος πενθεκτη*, concilium quiniseximum. As these two Councils were employed entirely about doctrine, and passed no canons in reference to church discipline or morals, the Council now held was to supply that defect. It accordingly framed 102 canons in reference to the above named subjects. Many of these are important, inasmuch as they contributed to confirm the opposition between the Greek and Latin churches, and to separate them, as we shall see hereafter, farther and farther from each other.

<sup>2</sup> The account given by Combesis, deacon and archivarius (*χαρτοφύλαξ*) of the church of Constantinople, is highly useful for a knowledge of these circumstances. He added it to an abstract which he made of the acts of the sixth general Council. Harduin. Concil. iii. f. 1835. From this document we learn, that Philippicus had received his religious instruction from that abbot Stephen, who, as the scholar of Macarius, patriarch of Antioch, defended Monothelitism at the Council referred to.

tasius II., by whom he was dethroned, overthrew every thing which had been done in respect to religion during his sovereignty. The patriarch Johannes immediately changed his conduct, and appeared as a zealous defender of Duothelitism. Whatever might be his real views of doctrine; whether he was then playing the hypocrite, or had played it before, in every case he seems to have been one of those unprincipled court priests who are ready to employ every species of falsehood, and to sacrifice all the highest interests of religion, if they can thereby serve their worldly ambition. Thus he dictated an address to the Roman bishop Constantinus, whom he sought to win by the most flattering expressions of reverence. He even addressed him as the head of the church, a title which the patriarchs of Constantinople could not be easily induced to bestow on the bishop of Rome; and praying him to forget the past, entreated him to recognize him as his Christian brother. Expressing himself throughout as a devoted believer in the doctrine of the Duothelites,<sup>1</sup> he declared that he had been compelled to accept the patriarchate, in order to avoid a worse evil; that is, that the former sovereign might not make a layman patriarch, and employ him as a tool in the establishment of Monothelitism. Hence he endeavoured to defend his whole conduct under the late government as a so-called *οἰκονομία*, the object of which was to uphold the cause of pure doctrine against more violent attacks. "The Pope himself, he thought, must know from his own experience, that in such circumstances it is impossible effectually to resist power without some degree of art and cunning;"<sup>2</sup> that even the prophet Nathan, in order to inflict punishment on King David for his offences, availed himself of a species of concealment."<sup>3</sup>

Johannes Damascenus exhibited the results of this controversy, with dialectic exactness, in his work on the doctrines of the faith. He had also written a treatise especially devoted to this subject, and thus promoted the polemic opposition to Monothelitism throughout the Greek church.

As was the case with Nestorianism and Monophysitism, which, when driven out of the Roman church could find refuge only

<sup>1</sup> This paper is found in Harduin iii. f. 1838, as first published by Cambesis.

<sup>2</sup> Ὡς οὐ λίαν ἀντιτύπως καὶ σκληρῶς ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀνάγκην ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ἄνευ τινὸς τέχνης καὶ περινοίας καθέστηκεν εὐμαρῆς.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐλεγχος οὐκ ἀπερικάλυπτος.

among the few little states which still preserved their independence; so was it with Monothelitism, which now retreated to the distant province of Libanon and Antilibanon, where, probably, it was established by the preaching of the abbot Marun. From him the whole population received the name of Maronites. The heads of the monastery of Marun, which occupied a conspicuous place in the district, were regarded by the people with profound reverence. The government of their affairs; the conduct of all their undertakings, was submitted to these abbots. Protected by their mountainous situation, the Maronites separated with impunity from the Greek church, and were subsequently enabled to preserve their independence against the Saracens.

We now pass to the history of a series of controversies, which regarded not the definition of dogmatic principles, as those above described, but the very essence of Christian worship—we refer to the disputes concerning the worship of images. These controversies, from their very nature, could not fail to excite a far more general interest than those of an earlier date. The object to which they referred did not belong to theologians immediately: it was not necessary, in order to excite popular attention to the matter, that the teachers of religion should make a formal display of arguments and deductions. The subject could be understood by the laity as well as by the clergy, and it required no effort, therefore, to engage them in the dispute. The question, whether the Christian worship of God must necessarily reject all outward or sensible representations, or whether such things are indispensable to the excitement of devotional feeling, is an enquiry which must be answered by every one according to the particular nature of his religious sentiments. One of the most zealous advocates of image worship, and of whom we shall speak more fully hereafter, was Theodorus Studita. This theologian described the distinction between these controversies, and those which preceded them, as, for example, that of the two natures, or twofold will in Christ, as consisting herein: namely, that the one referred to a difference of ideas or opinions; while the other was connected with what is sensual and outward; palpable, that is, to all.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐν χριστῷ φύσεων ἢ θελημάτων καὶ ὅσα πρὸς τούτοις ἀμφισβητούμενα, ὧν ἡ διαμάρτησις κατὰ τὰ νοήματα οὐσα, οὐδὲν αἰσθητῶς περιεῖχε τὴν ἀπόδειξιν· νῦν δὲ σὺν τοῖς νοήμασι καὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς τὸ ἀμφισβητούμενον ἦτο ἀσεβοῦμενον. Theodori Epistolæ l. ii. ep. cxi. in Sirmond. Opp. t. v. f. 331.

And since the devotion of the multitude has generally a sensual tendency, this controversy was likely to interest them more than any other. But further: this contrast did not depend upon certain dialectic notions merely. There were general differences of religious feeling which were now brought into collision, and the victory of the one or the other, must, by the consequences to which it would lead, entirely determine the future development of Christian, ecclesiastical, and dogmatic principles.

In order to explain the origin of these controversies, we must briefly revert to what has been already said respecting the mode of discussing and treating the subject to which they referred.

We have shewn, that the opposition which Christianity at first exhibited to the æsthetic religions of the heathen, led immediately to a stern refusal to admit of any connection between religion and art. But this hostility gradually subsided, and art, especially painting, was allowed to consecrate itself to the service of devotion. This was but in accordance with the real spirit of Christianity, which rejects nothing purely human, but rather appropriates it to itself, and imbues and clarifies it with its own grace. Although the rude multitude in the Western church were now soon led to give a sensual character to their worship, and to transfer the honour due to the object represented to the image under which it appeared; and although this error of Christian feeling was excused on the plea furnished by the neglect of popular instruction; still, the distinction between the right use of images for the excitement of pious emotions, or the edification of the unlearned, and the superstitious worship of images, was carefully kept in view by the teachers of the church; and while the one was commended, the other was as severely censured. We have seen that there was a tendency of this kind in the feelings of the Roman bishop, with whom we began the history of this period. Thus Gregory, having been requested by a hermit to send him an image of Christ, and some other figures of a similar kind, the pontiff gave him the image of the Saviour, and images also of Mary, and of the apostles Peter and Paul; and explained, in a letter which accompanied them, what was the right use of images, and how they might be made serviceable to religion.<sup>1</sup> He also testified his pleasure at the wish expressed by the re-

<sup>1</sup> L. ix., ep. lii.

cluse ; since, as he stated, it proved that he was seeking with his whole heart the being whose image he desired to have before his eyes, so that, by contemplating it continually, the flame of love might burn more ardently in his soul. It was a principle of our nature, he said, to desire to represent the invisible by the visible.<sup>1</sup> Hence he considered it important to add a warning against the error into which a superstitious reverence for images might lead the mind, which though piously was not spiritually instructed. "I know, indeed," he wrote to the hermit, "that you do not wish for the image of our Saviour to worship it as a God ; but to inflame your love for him. So also with ourselves, we do not fall before the image as before a Deity ; but we pray to him, whom the image represents<sup>2</sup> as a child, as suffering or sitting upon a throne ; and the feelings which thence arise in our hearts are joyful or sorrowful accordingly."

The intercourse between Gregory and Serenus, bishop of Marseilles (Massilia), is especially interesting in this respect. When the latter became aware that the worship of images was continually on the increase among the rude Franks of his diocese, he ordered the images to be dashed in pieces and flung out of the churches. The Pope, on being made acquainted with these proceedings, praised the zeal of Serenus against the worship of images, but blamed him for breaking them,<sup>3</sup> such images being placed in churches for the sake of those who were unable to gain instruction by the study of the Holy Scriptures, and who by means of these representations might become familiar with the facts which they contain.<sup>4</sup>

1 Sic homo, qui alium ardentem videre desiderat, aut sponsam amans videre conatur, si contigerit eam ad balneum aut ad ecclesiam ire, statim per viam incendenti se præparat, ut de visione ejus hilaris recedat.

2 Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam (imaginem) prosternimur : sed illum adoramus, quem per imaginem aut natum aut passum seu in throno sedentem recordamur. It is not necessary to conclude from these words, that Gregory objected to the practice of kneeling before the image (the *προσκύνησις*), since the words may be understood as simply conveying a warning against the abuse of the prevailing custom, and of the symbolic act which he himself encouraged. Still it is difficult to believe that he could have supposed the hermit capable of committing such an error as to pray to the image instead of to Christ alone.

3 Zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse laudavimus. As Gregory here expresses himself so decidedly against the *adoratio imaginum*, we may conclude that he disapproved of every kind of outward sign and act which had an appearance of idolatry, as well as of the disposition in which it originated. This will explain his meaning in the last cited letter.

L. ix. ep. cv.

Serenus was not inclined to submit his zeal to these limits ; and whether it was that his critical judgment was paralyzed by his pious ardour, or that he only sought a pretence to proceed in the destruction of images, without an apparent contempt of the papal authority, he stated that the letter of the Pope had miscarried, and therefore felt himself justified in taking no notice of what might possibly be its contents. One consequence of his well meant, but not well or wisely considered proceedings, was a general feeling of dislike to him on the part of the barbarians. They beheld in him the destroyer of that which they regarded as holy, and the greater number of them refused any longer to hold communion with him. When the Pope heard of this,<sup>1</sup> he blamed Serenus for not having distinguished between the right and the wrong use of images ; and repeating what he had said on the subject in his former letter, he expressed his opinion that the use of images, under certain restrictions, might be of great use to a people lately converted from heathenism.<sup>2</sup> “If he had carefully considered this,” observed the pontiff to Serenus, “he might have avoided the evil consequences which had followed his intemperate zeal, and have more readily gained his end.”<sup>3</sup> Gregory further admonished him to use his best efforts to heal the breach which he had made, and to win back, by fatherly gentleness, the minds which he had alienated. The advice which he gave him as to his future conduct was as follows : “He should call the members of the community together, and prove to them from the Holy Scriptures, that no worship must be rendered to anything made by men’s hands ; and he should then state, that his zeal had been directed only against such a use of images in the churches as contradicted the end for which they had been originally introduced, and not against their employment for the purpose of religious instruction, in which, he acknowledged, they might prove valuable aids.

But these judicious views, the fruit of a genuine Christian spirit, on the subject of images, did not long prevail in the Roman church ; for, as it appears from the manner in which they en-

1 L. xi. ep. xiii.

2 But which use might so easily become an abuse.

3 Si zelum discretione condiisses, sine dubio et ea, quæ intendebas, salubriter obtinere et collectum gregem non dispergere, sed potius dispersum poteris congregare.

gaged in the controversy on this subject in the Greek church, the Popes were, at the beginning of the eighth century, zealous defenders of image-worship. And this must have resulted from the then fully developed and established principle which lay at the foundation of the entire catholicism of the middle ages; a principle which, not having sufficient force to keep distinct what was divine itself, and what was employed to signify it, was ever tending to transfer to the one what belonged to the other.

In the Greek church, however, the worship of images, as we have before observed, had made a far more extensive progress, and had become associated not merely with the customs of the church, but with those of social and domestic life. Not only were the churches and church-books ornamented with images of Christ, of Mary, and the saints, but the same images were employed to decorate the palaces of the emperor, the walls of private houses, furniture, and even clothes. The artists, many of whom were monks, emulated each other in framing these images, sometimes of the most costly materials, and at other times of wax.<sup>1</sup> The reverence for images was closely connected with the excessive veneration entertained for Mary and the saints. That which relics were in the Western church, images were in the Eastern. On various occasions of necessity, people threw themselves prostrate before the figures of saints, and many images were celebrated for effecting miraculous cures. It being believed that the saints were themselves present in their images, these latter were often employed as witnesses to baptisms, and children were called after their names.<sup>2</sup> In that uninquiring age, many popular sayings were allowed, without further proof, to be taken as sufficient evidence of the honour due to images. There were some to which epithets were applied signifying that they were not made with hands (*ἀχειροποίητα*), and which were regarded as especially de-

<sup>1</sup> The *κηρόχυτα*.

<sup>2</sup> Theodorus Studita writes to a captain of the imperial guard (*Protospatharios*), of whom he had heard that he had brought the image of Saint Demetrius as *ἀνάδοχος* at the baptism of his child; and he compares the faith with which he did this to the faith of the centurion, Matt. viii. As, then, Christ, though not visibly present, wrought the miracle by his invisible present power, so here *συνῆν ὁ μεγαλόμαρτος πνεύματι τῆ οἰκεία ἐικόνη τὸ βρέφος δεχόμενος. ὁ μάρτυς ἦν διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἐικόνης τὸ βρέφος εἰσοδεχόμενος, ἐφ' ὅσον οὕτω πεπίστευκας.* Lib. i. ep. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Accounts of these images are found in Theophylactus Simokatta, Theophanes, Johannes Kantakuzenns.

erving of respect, and most valuable as amulets. Of these, some derived their supposed worth from the belief that they had been miraculously made by Christ himself; others were treasured because their origin was utterly unknown. Thus the city Edessa had its famous Ancilla in the image of Christ, which, it was said, the Saviour himself had sent to King Abgarus; one was an *ἀχειροποίητος εἰκὼν τῆς θεοτόκου*, and another was the likeness of himself, which Christ had impressed on the napkin given him by Veronica.

The excesses to which this superstitious veneration for images led, were calculated of themselves to produce a reaction of Christian consciousness even among the laity. But the probability that this would be the case was greatly increased by the circumstance that both the Jews and Muhamedans accused the Christians of violating the divine law; and many persons were led by these accusations to consider more carefully the requirements of their religion on the subject. The clergy, indeed, might acquire, by the reading of the Scriptures, a still clearer understanding of the subject; and some became convinced that the prevailing veneration for images was altogether at variance with the principles of the primitive church, and the teaching of the apostles; and that, without separating the Old Testament wholly from the New, the law against image-worship, so plainly set down in the former, could not be considered as abrogated.

But, while such was the reaction against images, it became every day more difficult to keep the passionate feeling thus excited within its proper bounds. As one excess easily produces another, so the superstitious reverence for images was found to create a corresponding degree of fanatical abhorrence of art and its productions. Thus the violence of polemic passion failed to effect its purpose. It opposed the true indiscriminately with the false; and sacrificed much which was intimately combined with Christian feelings and interests. To add to the evil, this reaction commenced with those who were neither called to the task, nor qualified to effect conviction by learning or ability. It began with the possessors of worldly power; and in a kingdom of despotism, where it was the custom to accomplish all those things by arbitrary commands, by threats and violence, which can only properly be effected by an unforced conviction; and where men were



almost entire strangers to that tenderness and consideration so eminently required for the successful promotion of religion. The spirit which arbitrary power would compel to acknowledge some dogma opposed to the principles of its nature will resist the attempt in proportion to the violence employed to constrain it. Thus it will even harden itself in error ; for truth itself, if not exhibited to the conscience in a manner proper to its character, but, by means foreign to the understanding, will be converted into a lie. But the subjective consciousness of truth was, in the present case, where there was a mixture, on both sides, of true and false, compelled to oppose itself to force.

The first to undertake this war against images was the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian. At the very beginning of his reign, he manifested his anxiety for the extension of the church and its doctrines, and refused to recognize the limits which were properly, in this respect, set to his power. Hence he compelled the Jews to allow themselves to be baptized ; and constrained the Montanists to return to communion with the ruling church. The consequence was, that the Jews not only persevered in retaining their own belief, but made a mockery of the holy rites in which they were forced to take a part ; while the Montanists were excited to such a height of fanaticism that they burnt themselves with their churches.

But these early attempts of the emperor gave plain indications of what might be expected from him, when he became convinced that it was his duty to free the church from what he called the idolatry of image-worship. Jews, Muhamedans, and heretics had alike charged the church with encouraging idolatry. Leo might well appeal to this reproach as furnishing a justification for his connecting his proceedings against images with his measures for extending the church and its belief. There were some, though a very few only, of the clergy who had been led, by the study of Scripture and of the Fathers, to regard the introduction of images into the churches as an unchristian novelty, opposed to the divine law. It was probably by men of this class, at the head of whom stood Constantinus, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, that the emperor was induced to form the resolution to persevere in the design of banishing images from the churches.<sup>1</sup> The appeal to the Old

1 In the account given by the presbyter Johannes, the representative of the Oriental

Testament command against images ; to the absence of any mention of images in the New Testament ; to the passages connected with the subject in the ancient Fathers,—all this must have made a deep impression on the emperor ; while the misfortunes suffered by his kingdom through the attacks of the barbarians and infidels might be easily regarded as punishments inflicted for the idolatry practised in the church.

Thus he believed himself to be called, both as a priest and a monarch, to follow the example of Hezekiah, and to suppress the idolatrous practices which had been now so long in existence. Knowing, however, as he did, what opposition he would have to encounter, he proceeded with caution and foresight ; not because he doubted the extent of his power as sovereign, but simply because it was prudent to consider the means which would be employed to resist his measures. It seems to have been the usual custom for the Greek emperors to consult the patriarchs of Constantinople, in the first instance, before undertaking any design connected with the church, and through them as primates of the East, to influence the rest of the clergy. But Leo, in the present instance, could not avail himself of this aid. The patriarch Germanus,<sup>1</sup> now ninety years old, belonged to the most zealous defenders of image worship, and was greatly skilled in the use of all the arguments employed in its support. He had allowed himself, indeed, to become a mere instrument in the hands of a former emperor ;<sup>2</sup> but the defence of images was far more closely

patriarchs, in the fifth session of the Council against image worship in 787, Harduin, iv. f. 319, this Constantine is spoken of as the head of the party whence the whole dispute arose ; and it appears, from his intercourse with the patriarch Germanus of Constantinople, that this is not without foundation. It was natural for the advocates of image worship, to which party the Byzantine historians belonged, to be glad at the discovery of any circumstance which enabled them to impute the opposition to images to Muhamedans and Jews. Thus little credit can be given to their story, so like a pure invention, respecting the prophecy according to which the Jews promised him the sovereignty ; or to the report that some magical influence had been exercised on the emperor by a renegade, and that this was the first cause of his war against images. Although it be true that a Caliph Ized preceded the emperor, and was the first to banish images from the churches of the Christians in his territory, yet it does not follow therefrom that there was any original connection between these proceedings of the Caliph and the measures of Leo, which, however, the opposite party would have been glad to prove.

1 We may form a proper idea of his mental character from his discourse in honour of Mary, and from his anxiety to free Gregory of Nyssa from the charge of Origenism. See B. ii. s. 947, a. 2.

2 As bishop of Cyzikus, he had adopted the formulary in favour of Monothelism,

connected with his religious interests, than a controversy which concerned only the dialectic definition of a dogma. As Leo, therefore, could not expect the assistance of the patriarch, he considered that his proceedings must be conducted with so much the greater caution. Accordingly, the first order which he issued, and which appeared in the year 726, the tenth of his reign, was not against every kind of respect shown to images, but against that only which savoured of idolatry, as prostrations and genuflexions. But since that which the emperor regarded as idolatrous was not viewed in that light by the clergy, but was defended by them as a pure expression of Christian feeling, he soon found it impossible to avoid a controversy with them and his patriarch; and practised as the latter was in the dispute, he saw that, as a layman, he could himself depend but little upon the use of argument.

The fragmentary account which historians have left of the conference between the emperor and the patriarch, is not worthy in itself of much consideration. No witness was present; but that which they are reported to have said, agrees well in spirit with the letters of the emperor on the subject;<sup>1</sup> and we may, therefore, with this help, form some notion of the remarks which actually passed between them. Thus, when the emperor referred to the Mosaic law against image worship, and against the offering up of prayer to any created being, the patriarch replied, that every thing depended upon the relations and circumstances under which it was said or done. The Mosaic law was given with especial regard to the Jews, who had just come out of Egypt where they had been accustomed to the worship of idols. It was otherwise with Christians, among whom, through the Redeemer, the worship of God in spirit and in truth was deeply grounded in the heart. And even Moses had not altogether forbidden the use of images, as was evident from the cherubim over the mercy-seat, and other images in the temple. He himself, the patriarch added, was far indeed from worshipping images in the manner in which the Triune God alone ought to be adored. But every kind of

published by the emperor Philippicus. It is possible, however, that he was before this inclined to Monothelism. The disposition which made him a champion of image worship might also render him favourable to that creed.

<sup>1</sup> In the 4th Session of the second Nicene Council.

*προσκύνησις* did not imply such adoration. In the Old Testament worship was spoken of as a mere outward sign of veneration. In this sense it may be rendered to man ; and is actually given to the emperors, to their statues and edicts, and without ever bringing on those who render it the charge of idolatry. Of the invisible essence of God, it was plain that no image could be made, and the attempt, therefore, according to the Old Testament, must be forbidden. But since God has become manifest in human nature, and has taken it into union with himself, so ought we now, agreeably to our faith in the true humanity of the Son of God, to make images of the God-man. The representation of Christ in such images may be made not less edifying than a verbal description of that great mystery of the incarnation, and is an actual rejection of Docetism. It is not the earthly material of which the image is made, which receives the honour, but the Incarnate Deity which it represents.<sup>1</sup> Neither to the mother of God, however, nor to the saints, in reference to their persons, ought any kind of adoration *λατρεία* to be offered. This belongs to God alone ; but to the mother of God, as to her through whom the Most High became a partaker of humanity, to her who was thereby exalted in rank above all other creatures, proportionable honour and love are due. In the saints, moreover, that only is revered which the grace of God has wrought in human nature, and the honour and love which they receive by means of their images, they receive as highly distinguished fellow-servants and fellow-soldiers. It is not upon the saints that we call, but upon the God of the saints, when we stand before the image.<sup>2</sup> How important this theory of images must have been to the aged patriarch appears from the fact, that working it out as he had done, it was intimately connected with an acknowledgment of the actual incarnation of the Son of God. Thus he declared, that he would willingly die for the sake of his image who, in order to restore the lost image of God in man, had rendered up his life upon the cross.

Leo was constrained to acknowledge, that he could not pretend to confute the patriarch, who had entrenched himself so firmly in his system, and by arguments so scientifically constructed. Both

Α προσκύνησις σχετική.

<sup>2</sup> The words of Germanus, in his letter to Thomas, Bishop of Claudiopolis are, *προσβλέπων γάρ τις μετ' ἐπιστήμης εἰκόνι τινας τῶν ἁγίων ὡς τὸ εἰκὸς, δόξα σοι ὁ θεὸς λέγει τοῦ ἁγίου τὸ ὄνομα προστιθεῖς*. Harduin iv. f. 258.

agreed in this, that no kind of idolatrous worship ought to be rendered to images, but each took his own view of the meaning to be attached to the terms employed. The emperor declared, that he had no dislike to images in themselves; but that he simply desired to withdraw them from the rude approaches of the multitude. It was evidently his design to deceive the aged patriarch, and to prepare his plans without exposing them to his interference. The bishops who were leagued with the emperor proceeded, in the meantime, to remove the images from the churches in their dioceses; and as the people, and the greater part of the clergy, were devoted to the worship of images, these acts created no slight disturbance. The patriarch was soon informed of the excitement which had been caused, and he complained to the emperor on the subject.<sup>1</sup> Leo readily allowed petitions to be presented to him against the obnoxious bishops. The head of the party, Constantinus, Bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, who, with his metropolitan, Johannes, Bishop of Synnada, had plunged deep into the controversy, came in person to Constantinople. He assured the patriarch that it was far from his intention to show aught of disrespect to Christ, or the saints, in their images: that his only wish was to suppress the worship which was idolatrous. In this the patriarch agreed with him; and took pains to show how far the legitimate veneration for images was from such a kind of adoration. The bishop knowing well that a controversy on this point would be useless, seemed to be satisfied with the patriarch's statement, and promised to do all in his power to avoid agitating or offending the people. Germanus gave him a letter addressed to the metropolitan Johannes, and in which he informed that prelate of the happy termination of the conference. But the bishop did not allow the letter intended for his metropolitan to reach its destination, and he appears to have troubled himself no further respecting what had passed between him and the patriarch of Constantinople.

But the latter continued to receive intelligence, similar to that which had already created him so much distress, from other provinces. This was especially the case in regard to Paphlagonia, where Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, had endeavoured to prevent

<sup>1</sup> The words of the patriarch Germanus are, *πολεις ἔλαι καὶ τὰ πλῆθη τῶν λαῶν οὐκ ἐν ὀλίγῳ περὶ τούτου θορόβῳ τυγχάνουσιν*, iv. f. 359.

the continuance of image worship. The patriarch addressed a letter to this prelate, and defended at considerable length the veneration paid to images according to that long-standing custom.<sup>1</sup> He appealed to the miracles wrought by the means of images; especially to the cure of the sick, which he had himself seen. And to prove that these cures were not merely accidental, he reminded the bishop that they only took place in presence of the images of Christ and his apostles, and not before those of a different kind.<sup>2</sup> He referred especially to the miraculous painted hand of the Virgin Mary at Sozopolis in Pisidia, out of which balsam streamed. This wonder, he acknowledged, was no more to be seen, but witnesses of the fact were still alive; and if any one doubted the truth of what was related, he might as well question the veracity of the Acts of the Apostles, because such miracles as are there recorded no longer occur. So, also, he continued to view the images of the apostles and prophets before the imperial palace as a proof of the piety of the sovereign.

These first half concealed attacks upon image worship created so great an excitement, that the news of their effect upon the people passed beyond the boundaries of the then Roman empire, till it reached Palestine, now in the hands of the Saracens, and where it filled with alarm and horror the zealous defenders of the old church doctrine. There was then living at Damascus the acute and earnest champion of orthodoxy Johannes,<sup>3</sup> already mentioned, and who having for some time enjoyed an important office under the ruling Caliphs of the province, at length entered the monas-

<sup>1</sup> Germanus also defended in this writing the custom of lighting candles and burning incense before the images of saints. This his opponents appear to have regarded as a heathen custom. In answer to them he appealed to the pseudo-Dionysian writings, and the symbolic usages established since their circulation. *Σύμβολον μὲν τὰ αἰσθητὰ φῶτα τῆς ἀλλοῦ καὶ θείας φωτοδοσίας ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀρωμάτων ἀναθυμίασις τῆς ἀκραιφνοῦς καὶ ὕλης τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος περιποιίας τε καὶ πληρώσεως.*

<sup>2</sup> But this might be easily explained, since the consideration of other images might not produce the same subjective impressions.

<sup>3</sup> Sergius, his father, called by the Saracens Mansur, had been appointed by the Caliphs to an important office in the government. If we may give credit to the memoir of John of Damascus, written two centuries later, and mixed up with fables, he received a most careful literary education. Among the numerous Christians whom the Arabs led as prisoners to the shores of the Mediterranean was a learned monk, of Grecian descent, probably from Calabria, and whose name was Kosmas. The father of John procured him his freedom, took him to his home, and charged him with the education of his own son, and also of his adopted son. The latter was afterwards known as a celebrated composer of songs, *Κοσμάς ὁ μελωδός*, bishop of Majuma in Palestine.

tery of St Saba in Jerusalem as a monk. This distinguished man imagined that he saw, in the opposition to images, a spirit inimical to Christianity itself; and he felt called upon to address a discourse on the subject to the patriarch and people of Constantinople in defence of image worship.<sup>1</sup> This was done at a time when some hope was still entertained that the emperor, finding himself so opposed, might cease to prosecute his plans. On this account the acute controversialist, though he had nothing himself to fear, refrained from every expression which might tend to irritate the emperor. He only reminded him that the earthly ruler was subject to a higher ruler, and that the laws were superior to princes. He discovered in that dread of idolatry which had given rise to the controversy, something unworthy of Christian growth and perfection; a falling back, as it were, into the childhood of Judaism. To those who had constantly in their mouths the Old Testament command against making any image of God, he replied in the words of Paul, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." "Christians," said he, "who have attained to maturity in the faith, possess the means of distinguishing between what can be represented, and what is far exalted above the power of representation. Under the old covenant it was impossible that God, as an incorporeal being and without form, should be represented by any image. But now that God has appeared in the flesh, and has conversed with men upon earth, I may represent him ac-

<sup>1</sup> This is not contradicted by the circumstance that Johannes, with whom, as we see, the worship of images, as he himself regarded it, was in close agreement with the peculiarities of Christianity, and who defended it as a spiritual thinking man, rejected notwithstanding the popular superstitions respecting dragons, &c. (*στρυγγαι, γελοῦδες*), as is seen from fragments of a book of his preserved by Le Quien. T. i. opp. f. 471. We see no sufficient reason why the zealous defender of images should not stand forth as an opponent of such superstitions. Both were connected in his mind with the interests of religion. The worship of images appeared to him, according to the process of reasoning described in the text, as in a certain degree answering to the spirit of Christianity and agreeable to reason; while the tales of which we have spoken appeared to him in a totally contrary light. He attributed the diffusion of those superstitious notions to the want of Scripture knowledge among the people. Hence he wished that the laity of all ranks, soldiers and peasants included, might be taught to read the Bible: *μέγιστα γὰρ βλαπτόμεθα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἀναγινώσκειν τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους καὶ ἐρευνᾶν αὐτὰς κατὰ τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λόγον. Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν στρατιώτης λεγεί, ὅτι στρατιώτης εἰμι καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχω ἀναγνώσεως, ὁ δὲ γεωργός τὴν γεωργικὴν προφασίζεσθαι*. Such regard for Scripture might rather seem to contradict the traditional feeling of the defender of images; but neither is this opposition of a kind incompatible with the reasoning of such men.

ording to his visible appearance. I pray not to the earthly material, but to the Creator thereof, who for my sake sanctified it, deigning to make it his dwelling, and by its means to work out my salvation. Nor will I cease to honour the earthly material through which the work of my salvation has been thus accomplished. Joshua commanded the Jews to take twelve stones out of Jordan, and gave this reason for the command : ‘ When your children ask their fathers, in time to come, saying, what mean ye by these stones ? then ye shall answer them, that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord ; when it passed over Jordan, the waters of Jordan were cut off, and all the people went through.’ How then can we refuse to represent by images those sufferings by which the salvation of the world was effected, or the miracles wrought by Christ, so that when my son asks me, ‘ What is this ? ’ I may be able to say, God became man, and through him not Israel merely passed over Jordan, but the whole human race has been restored to a state of salvation : through him it has been raised from the depths of the earth, and exalted above all powers, and even to the throne of the Father himself. But if no objection be made to the images of Christ and Mary, and the whole controversy be directed against the images of the saints, the objection does not so much regard the images themselves, as the veneration paid them. You are willing to allow images of Christ, as the glorified one, but not those of the saints, because they are not glorified. Thus you fail to recognize the dignity which has been conferred upon human nature by the Son of God, who has glorified it, and admitted it into communion with Deity. But did not images of animals and plants form part of the decorations of the Temple ? and is it not far more glorious that all the walls of the house of God should be adorned with images of those who were themselves living temples of God, full of the Holy Ghost ? Why should not the saints, who have been partakers of Christ’s sufferings, not share in his glory upon earth ? He calls them not servants, but friends.”

In speaking of the commemoration of the saints, John of Damascus points out a fundamental distinction between the Christian and the Jew. “ During the time of the old covenant, no temple was dedicated after the name of a man. The death



of the righteous was lamented, not celebrated. To touch the dead was to contract uncleanness. But it has not been so since human nature, by the appearance of the Son of God in that nature itself, and by his sufferings for it, has been delivered from the bondage of sin and death, and admitted to sonship with God, and to a participation of the divine life. You must, therefore, either go farther, and abolish the commemorative festivals which are contrary to the old law, or you must suffer the images of the saints, which you say are contrary to that law, still to remain." Johannes, in fact, regarded the opponents of images as infected with Jewish, or even Manichean, dispositions, and as endeavouring to re-establish the distinction, abolished by the blood of Christ, between the divine and the human and earthly, and thus to set aside the realism of the gospel. If it appeared to such persons as a desecration of holy things to represent them by earthly materials, so, on the other hand, the earthly material was regarded by Johannes as worthy of honour, because it was made the medium of man's salvation; and an instrument of divine power and grace. "Is not the wood of the cross earthly?" He then names the various holy stations; the body and blood of the Lord. "Despise not that which is earthly: nothing which God has created can be in itself an object of scorn: to say that it can is a Manichean error: sin only can render a thing base."

While these controversies were attended in many provinces with popular commotions, the occurrence of natural phenomena, especially of an earthquake, was regarded by the timorous and discontented as signs of the divine displeasure against the enemies of image-worship. The inhabitants of the Cyclades formed an insurrection under the leadership of one Stephanus. But the emperor, by means of the Greek fire, destroyed the fleet of the insurgents; and as he regarded this victory as a proof that God viewed his proceedings with favour, he was strengthened in his hatred to image-worship. In vain, however, did he seek to win the aged patriarch to his side. The old man remained firm to his profession, and declared, that no alteration could legally take place in the church without the consent of a general Council.

Having, therefore, conferred with his temporal advisers merely,

Leo, disregarding the patriarch, published an order in the year 730, prohibiting the use of any image whatsoever in the service of religion. Germanus, resolved not to do violence to his conscience, readily laid down his office, and retired into solitude, leaving his dignity to be obtained by his secretary,<sup>1</sup> Anastasius, who allowed himself to be made an instrument for executing the emperor's plans. According to the usual custom, the bishops who refused to forward the sovereign's will were deprived of their sees.<sup>2</sup> When the report of these proceedings reached Syria and Palestine, John of Damascus composed a second treatise in defence of images, and explained more at full the principles stated in his previous paper.<sup>3</sup> He here, however, uses much severer language against the emperor: "It is not the office of the prince to give laws to the church. The apostle Paul enumerates the offices required for the edification of the people of God; but he makes no mention of the office of princes; 1 Cor. xii. It was not given to princes to teach the gospel, but apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers were especially appointed to publish the divine word. The emperors had to labour for the good of the state; the affairs of the church were to be managed by its pastors and teachers.<sup>4</sup> He speaks of a new gospel invented by Leo; but although he had nothing to fear from the emperor, he uttered no anathema against him; but referring to the words of Paul, Gal. i. 8, he said, "Although an angel—although an emperor—should declare to you anything different to what you have received, close your ears, since I should tremble, hoping, as I do, his improvement, to say with the apostle, let him be accursed."

In the third discourse, he endeavours to shew that the necessity for such representations is grounded in the principles of human nature and Christian consciousness. "The Lord called his disciples happy, because their eyes had seen and their ears heard such things. The apostles saw with bodily eyes Christ, his sufferings, his miracles; and they heard his words. We also long to

<sup>1</sup> Σύγκελλος: a man always of great influence with the patriarch.

<sup>2</sup> See Joh. Damasc. Orat. ii. s. 12.

<sup>3</sup> He himself says that he was excited to do this, διὰ τὸ μὴ πάνυ εὐδιαγνωστὸν τοῖς πολλοῖς τὸν πρῶτον λόγον εἶναι.

<sup>4</sup> Βασιλέων ἐστὶν ἡ πολιτικὴ εὐπραξία, ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ κατάστασις ποιμένων καὶ διδασκάλων.

see and hear such things, and so to be accounted happy. But as he is not now bodily present, and we hear his word by books, and venerate those books,<sup>1</sup> so we also, by means of images, behold the representation of his bodily form, of his miracles and sufferings; and we are thereby sanctified, and filled with confidence and delight. But while we behold the bodily form, we reflect as much as possible on the glory of his Godhead. Since, moreover, our nature is twofold,—not spirit merely, but body and spirit,—we cannot attain to the spiritual without sensible aids; and thus as we now hear with the ears, and by means of sensible words learn to think of what is spiritual, so by sensible representations we attain to the view of what is spiritual. Thus, too, Christ assumed a body and a soul, because man consists of both; and baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and prayer, song, lights, incense, all, in short, are twofold, and are, at the sametime, corporeal and spiritual.”

When the opponents of image-worship argue that no mention is made of such a practice in the New Testament, John of Damascus could reply, that many things had been deduced from Scripture, as the doctrine of the Trinity, the essential equality of the Three Persons, the two natures of Christ, which are not verbally contained therein; and he could appeal to tradition as the source from which the opponents of image worship drew many arguments not supported by the Bible.

In these discourses, the author pronounced no anathema upon the emperor. A hope was still entertained that he might alter his course, and yield to the prevailing spirit of the church. But when he began violently to execute the edict which he had published, anathemas were pronounced against the enemies of image worship in all those churches to which the arm of Byzantine authority could not reach; they were declared unworthy of communion with the faithful; and the churches which thus opposed the emperor became the chief refuge of the persecuted and exiled devotees.

<sup>1</sup> Προσκυνοῦμεν, τιμῶντες τὰς βίβλους, δι' ὧν ἀκούομεν τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ. The image-worshippers frequently allude to the circumstance, that people rendered such a species of worship (προσκύνησις) to the gospels when read in the churches, to the emblems of the body and blood of Christ, and to the sign of the cross. Why, then, it was asked, should not a similar homage be given to images?

These churches consisted not of those only which, being situated in the provinces of the East, where Muhamedanism prevailed, could resist the imperial rule with impunity. The Roman church was in a similar position. The popes, indeed, still recognized the Eastern emperors as their superiors; and their political interests naturally inclined them to acknowledge a distant sovereign, rather than the authority of the neighbouring Lombards. But the state of affairs at this period enabled them safely to despise the threats of the emperor. While Boniface was striving so successfully to uphold the power of the Papacy; while so many barbarous tribes, no less than Christian nations, were ready to acknowledge its might; Gregory II.,<sup>1</sup> fully conscious of his increasing influence among the people of the West, had the courage to answer the emperor in language so haughty and insulting, that, did we not know the circumstances of the age, we should regard his having sent such a reply as incredible. Thus he writes: "Make but the experiment: go into the schools, where children are taught to read and write, and tell them that you are a persecutor of images, and they will instantly fling their tablets at your head, and the simple will compel you to learn what you would not learn from the wise." The emperor had said, in his letter to the Pope, "As Uz-ziah,<sup>2</sup> after eight hundred years, banished the brazen serpent from the temple, so have I, after eight hundred years, banished idols from the church."<sup>3</sup> The Pope replied (confusing Uz-ziah with

1 In, or after the year 730.

2 That is, Hezekiah. The emperor may have, at first, confounded Uz-ziah with Hezekiah; or this confusion may have originated with the Pope only.

3 These words may tend, as some other curious things in this epistle, which otherwise answers closely to the character of the age and of the Pope, to create some doubt respecting its genuineness, or entire genuineness. An error may have crept into the statement respecting the number of the years, which does not correspond with the period intervening between the setting up of the brazen serpent and the time of Hezekiah, or Uz-ziah; for how could Leo intend to say, that he banished images from the churches after eight hundred years? If he reckoned so badly, or expressed himself so extravagantly, it would still follow therefrom that the superstition of image worship began in the age of the apostles. To say anything false in this respect would certainly not have been the interest of those who were opposed to images. It must, on the contrary, have been important to them to prove that the worship of images was of very late origin; and we know that their opponents did actually use this argument against them, and quote many passages from the Fathers in its support. Leo, therefore, could certainly not have expressed himself as is said. But the author of this letter may fairly be suspected of having perverted the statement of the emperor. It is possible that the emperor may have said, in his epistle against those who defended the worship of images by an appeal to tradition,

Hezekiah, either through his own error or that of the monarch), “ Yes, indeed : Uzziah was your brother ; and he proceeded against the priests of that age in the same tyrannical manner as you act towards those of the present.” In continuation, he told the emperor that, as the successor of the apostle Peter, he had received authority to pronounce his condemnation, if he had not already pronounced it upon himself. “ And better were it,” he said, “ that the emperor should at once become a heathen, an acknowledged heretic, than a persecutor and destroyer of images ; since those who fall into occasional errors of faith may find some excuse in the obscurity of the subject. But you have subjects to consider which are as obvious as the light : and these you treat with open contempt, and rob the church of God of its ornaments.”

Gregory then proceeds to defend the worshippers of images from the charge of idolatry. “ Far be it from you,” he says, “ to place your hope upon images. If it be an image of the Lord, we say : ‘ Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, help and deliver us.’ If it be an image of the Holy Mother, we say, ‘ Holy Mother of God, beseech thy Son, our true God, to deliver our souls.’ If it be the image of a martyr, of Stephen, for example, we say : holy Stephen, thou who hast poured out thy blood for the sake of Christ ; thou who, as the first martyr, hast such confidence, pray for us !” He next intimates to the emperor that he had no dread of his fleet ; that he had only to go twenty-four stadia from Rome and trouble himself no more about the power of the emperor. When the latter wrote, in defence of his conduct, that he was both king and priest, Gregory answered him in a second letter, “ that his predecessors, Constantine and Justinian, who had protected the priests in their defence of the true faith, might have urged their right to this title by many arguments ;” but he shews how great a distinction existed between the sovereignty and the priesthood. “ When a man has committed any offence against the king, his goods are confiscated, he is condemned to death, or banished from his country. Very different is the case in which the priest is concerned. When a man confesses his sins before him, he only banishes him to a place where he may perform penance ; he con-

“ Although images may have been found in churches for eight hundred years, still they may be rightly considered as idols, and ought to be banished from the church, as Hezekiah broke in pieces the brazen serpent.”

strains him to fast, to watch, to pray; and when all this has been rightly done, he gives him the body and blood of the Lord, and regards him as again pure and guiltless."

The emperor had appealed, in his epistle, to the fact that none of the six general Councils had made mention of images. To this the Pope replied, that neither had they said ought respecting bread and water, eating and not eating, because such matters were connected with the whole life of man. Thus, although nothing was said with regard to images, the bishops themselves had brought them to the Councils, no pious man, in those times, having made a journey without them. "Men expend their property in obtaining pictures of subjects described in Scripture; parents take their children in their arms; others lead the young, and those lately converted from heathenism, to shew them the histories thus exhibited, that, being edified thereby, they may raise their hearts and souls to God. But you oppose yourself to this improvement of the poor people, and rather tempt them to delight in the sound of fiddles and pipes, in revelry and drunkenness."<sup>1</sup>

No effort was spared by the emperor to bring his edict against images into operation. But they existed in such great numbers, and were so generally introduced into all the usages of domestic life, as well as into the ceremonies of the church, that, little as Byzantine despotism regarded individual rights, it could not easily effect its present design. All which it dare at first attempt was to order the images to be removed from the churches and public places. In conformity with this command, the earliest attack was naturally directed against those images which were held in highest veneration, and which were reputed to possess miraculous virtues; and the sight of which was, therefore, calculated to keep up and promote the general reverence for such objects. But their removal could not fail to excite commotions among the people. Thus there existed a beautiful brazen image of Christ placed over the gate of the emperor's palace,<sup>2</sup> and which had long

<sup>1</sup> Hence known by the name of the *ἀγία χαλκή*.

<sup>2</sup> This image of Christ was called *χριστός ὁ ἀντιφωνήτης* = *ἔγγυος*, or the Bail. It may easily be supposed that it derived this name from some remarkable circumstance. According, then, to an old legend, a rich merchant of Constantinople, Theodorus, who was also a great shipholder, had been reduced by an unfortunate wreck to a state of bankruptcy. He in vain endeavoured to raise a new capital. At length he resolved to apply to Abraham, a wealthy Jew. The latter offered to lend him a considerable sum of

been viewed by the multitude with sentiments of devotion. Suddenly a soldier of the imperial guard presented himself, and placing a ladder against it, prepared to hurl the precious object from its stand. Instantly a crowd of women were on the spot, and loud were the cries with which they prayed the soldier to spare the image. But, instead of attending to their intreaties and clamours, the soldier dashed the face of the image in twain, and thus excited the feelings of the spectators to a still more ungovernable degree of fury. Mad with rage, they pulled the ladder from under the soldier, and seizing him as he fell, sacrificed him to their fanatical indignation. The emperor now sent several other soldiers to the spot; the tumult was suppressed by force, and the image was torn down.<sup>1</sup> In its place a cross was erected, bearing an inscription, drawn up by Stephanus, one of the emperor's partizans, and strikingly indicative of the hatred which they entertained of all things connected with images, and the arts which produced them. "Since the emperor could not endure that a dumb and lifeless form should be represented as Christ by means of coloured earth, he has here set up the noble sign of the cross, the glory of the gates of believing princes."<sup>2</sup>

But this inscription involved, as did the entire proceeding of

money, if he could find any one to become security for him. But no one was willing to assist Theodore in this extremity. He turned, however, to the image of Christ, before which he had so often offered up his devotions. He now pointed confidently to the image as his security; and the Jew allowed himself to be so far moved by compassion for Theodore, and by the earnestness of his faith, to grant him the desired boon. After Theodore had again twice suffered heavy losses by shipwrecks, he prospered so well, that he again became wealthy, and found himself in a condition to pay all that he had borrowed of Abraham. This circumstance, with others of a similar wonderful character, made so deep an impression on the mind of the Jew, that he and his whole family desired to be baptized. He himself became a presbyter, and Theodore, according to the resolution which he had taken immediately after his first shipwreck, assumed the monastic habit. This story, which may be traced to the times of the Emperor Heraclius, is related in a panegyric on this image given by Combesis, in his *Hist. Monothelet.*, or *Auct. Bibl. Patr. Paris*, t. ii. 1648.

1 See the narrative of this occurrence in the memoir of the image worshipper Stephanus, as given in the *Analecta Græca*, edited by the Benedictines, t. i. p. 415. A still more lively account is found in the writings of Gregory II., quoted above. Gregory derived his information from various people of the West who had just returned from Constantinople, and had been eye-witnesses of the proceeding. See *Harduin, Concil. iv.* f. 11.

2 *Αφωνον εἶδος, καὶ πνοῆς ἐξηρημενον,  
Χριστὸν γράφεσθαι μὴ φέρων ὁ δεσπότης*

the party, a logical inconsequence and contradiction.<sup>1</sup> The same principle, according to which no earthly material could be considered worthy of being employed to represent the person of Christ, might be advanced against the sign of the cross; and the principle which justified the notion that the worship (*προσκύνησις*) of images is idolatrous, would avail equally as an objection to the homage rendered the cross, and against which nothing had as yet been said. Supposing, however, the former reasoning to be just, the cross ought to be removed to prevent its becoming a support to all the practices which it was desired to abolish. The answer to this was, that the crosses set up were not like images, works of art; and the opponents of the latter were not yet thoroughly conscious of the nature of the principle which gave life and soul to their argument. As this knowledge of the real tendency of their system could only be acquired by habit and traditional information, they could not for some time to come avoid betraying many inconsistencies.

Twelve years did not suffice to enable the emperor Leo to overcome the deeply-rooted religious feelings of his people. After his death a violent reaction took place, and produced some important political consequences. His son and successor, Constantinus Copronymus, who ascended the throne in 741, was as zealous an opponent of image-worship as his father. His brother-in-law, Artabasdu, took advantage of his consequent unpopularity to create an insurrection. The plan succeeded, and the usurper immediately restored the worship of images. But Constantinus recovered sufficient power to hurl him from the throne, which he reascended himself in the year 744. He was still resolved to banish images altogether from the empire, and thus fulfil his father's design. But the defeat which he had suffered at the beginning of his reign had partly taught him how necessary it was to proceed with caution; and in this feeling he was further strengthened by untoward circumstances of a later date. An earthquake, and the ravages of a fearful pestilence, had caused a

Υλη γενηῶ, ταῖς γραφαῖς πατουμένη  
 Λέων συν νιῶ τῷ νέῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ  
 Σταυροῦ χαράττει τὸν τρισόλβιον τύπον,  
 Καύχημα πιστῶν ἐν πόλεις ἀνακτόρων.

Banduri, f. 115, and Theod. Studit. opp. ed. Sirmond, f. 136.

<sup>1</sup> This is urged by Theodor Studita in his answer to the epigram of the image-laters.



new excitement in the minds of the people, and rendered them more than ever open to the representations of the image-worshippers. The disturbances which had followed his first attempts to suppress the obnoxious practice, convinced him of the necessity of paying more attention to the actual state of the popular mind. After mature deliberation, therefore, with his ministers, he found that his safest method would be to summon a general Council, a council which should strictly resemble those of former times, and finally confirm by its authority the principles on which he and his party acted. The proposed Council assembled at Constantinople in the year 754. It was composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops. Of these, it is probable, only a few were opposed to image-worship from the influence of an enlightened zeal. Foremost among them was Theodosius, bishop of Ephesus. The rest allowed themselves to be led by these chiefs of the party, and might, therefore, be turned by any superior influence in a contrary direction, being, as was well known, always disposed to attach themselves to the party of the court.

To the fanatical zeal of the image-worshippers the Council opposed a not less fanatical hatred of images and art: the bad logic of the one was not worse than the false reasoning of the other. In its unjust severity, the Council declared that the image-worshippers were employed in restoring the idolatry which Christianity had banished. Under the appearance of devotion, it was said, Satan had secretly introduced this corruption; had taught his servants to honour a mere painted creature with the name of Christ; and all this though the image-worshippers had done their utmost to guard themselves against such accusations. Thus it was asserted, in the spirit fostered by the Byzantine mode of confounding the spiritual with the political, that as Christ formerly endowed his apostles with the power of the Holy Spirit to banish idolatry, so had he now raised the emperor, rivalling the apostles in his zeal, to enlarge and edify the church,<sup>1</sup> and destroy the works of Satan.

On the other hand, the image-worshippers accused their opponents of denying, by their rejection of images, the reality of Christ's incarnation. The Council met this charge by a similar sophistry. "It," it was said, "they could believe it possible to

<sup>1</sup> Πρὸς καταρτισμὸν ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκαλίαν: thus spoke the bishops of the emperor.

frame an image of Christ, they must also suppose, since the God-head could not be represented in a contracted form, that from the union of the divine and human natures a third had arisen, which might be displayed by means of art." The consequence of such a notion would be Eutychianism,—or they must suppose that the manhood of Christ had an independent being, and so might be represented; and this belief would lead directly to Nestorianism. "What an irrational beginning for the unhappy artist," exclaims the Council, "to paint with profane hand that which is believed with the heart and confessed with the mouth! There is but one true image: it is that which Christ himself gave of his incarnation, just before his sufferings, when he appointed bread and wine to represent his body and blood. Here the consecration of the priest is the medium by which the earthly elements are exalted to that higher dignity. This true image of Christ answers to the natural body of Christ, as the latter became the bearer of the divine essence. (Thus bread and wine, being imbued by means of consecration with the divine life flowing from Christ, became vehicles for imparting it to those who partake of them, and for conferring holiness.) On the contrary, the so-called images were neither introduced on the authority of any tradition derived from Christ, the Apostles, or the Fathers; nor were they consecrated by prayer, converting them from profane to holy uses; but they remained as profane as they were when they came out of the artist's hands, and were never raised to any higher worth."

According to this argument, directed, in the first instance, only against the images of Christ, those of the saints, and of Mary, are altogether rejected, as utterly inconsistent with Christianity; as belonging solely to heathenism, which, being destitute of the hope of the resurrection, invented this absurd mode of endeavouring to exhibit that which is not present as present.<sup>1</sup> Far be it from the church of Christ to admit such inventions of men, animated by wicked spirits. He who pretends to represent the saints, who dwell for ever with God, by the dead forms and horrible arts of the heathen, is guilty of a great offence against those holy beings. The art of the painter is here spoken of as some-

<sup>1</sup> Ἐλπίδα γὰρ ἀναστάσεως μὴ ἔχων (ὁ ἑλληνισμὸς) ἄξιον ἑαυτοῦ παίγνιον συνεσκόπησεν, ἵνα τὰ μὴ παρόντα ὡς παρόντα διὰ τῆς χλεύης παραστήσῃ.

<sup>2</sup> Δαιμονιοφόρων ἀνδρῶν εὕρημα.

thing altogether heathenish. Christians, therefore, cannot lawfully employ it as furnishing a testimony to their faith, any more than Christ himself would accept the witness of demons, but compelled them to silence. The worship of God in spirit and in truth is utterly opposed to the use of images. Paul also says : " If we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more thus," 2 Cor. v. 16 ; and of the same kind is that which he says respecting the distinction between faith and sight, 1 Cor. xiii.

Several expressions were quoted from the ancient Fathers against images. Such testimonies could scarcely be wanting to the early times of Christianity. But much of that which was written altogether in the style of those who were hostile to image-worship, may have been interpolated or changed so as to suit the purposes of controversy. A deception of this kind may have been regarded as lawful in that age, when zeal for the honour of God and the truth might be supposed to justify the practice.<sup>1</sup> According, however, to the conclusions thus drawn, it was determined that all images, of whatever material they might be, prepared by the profane art of the painter, should be banished from the churches.<sup>2</sup> It was also decreed that no one should hereafter practise so wicked an art. Whoever should venture to make any image for religious purposes, or who should set one up, or conceal one, either in a private house, or in a church, should, if a clergyman, be deposed ; or, if a monk or layman, be excommunicated, and punished according to the imperial laws.

The synod had probably learnt that their zeal against image-wor-

1 Several bishops who were present at this Council, and who appealed to the second Nicene Council, here declared, that they had been deceived by the passages taken from the Fathers, in a mutilated and falsified form. It is evident that single leaves only of the writings of the Fathers, and not their works, had been laid before the Council. The statement of two of the bishops : *ἐκεῖ βίβλος οὐκ ἐφάνη, ἀλλὰ διὰ ψευδοπιπτακίων ἐξηπάτων ἡμᾶς.* Council. Nic. act. v. Harduin. iv. 300. In this manner, a spurious or interpolated letter of Nilus was brought forward. A bishop said, *ἡ ἐπιστολὴ αὐτῆ ἢ ἀναγνωσθεῖσα, πρῶν φασευθεῖσα ἀπώλεσε καὶ ἐπλάνησεν ἡμᾶς.* Act. iv. f. 187. The deceit thus practised must have been a very gross one ; and in the case of such men as these bishops were, we may credit the lie through which they sought to justify themselves.

2 Ἀποβλητὸν εἶναι καὶ ἄλλοτρίαν καὶ ἐβδελυγμένην ἐκ τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν ἐκκλησίας πᾶσαν εἰκόνα ἐκ παντοίας ὕλης καὶ χρωματουργικῆς τῶν ζωγράφων κακοτεχνίας πεποιημένην.

ship had led many to destroy the furniture of the churches, which had been adorned with representations of religious objects, and even to injure the churches themselves, the love of plunder being, in many cases, the real motive for the violence. It was not denied, in fact, by the synod that such things had occurred.<sup>1</sup> Hence we may believe the statement, although its credibility is somewhat lessened by its proceeding from a declared champion of image-worship, that a bishop was accused in this Council of having stamped a sacramental plate under his feet, because it was ornamented with images of Christ and Mary.<sup>2</sup> That also may be true which the same account states, namely, that the bishop's violent conduct was pardoned, arising as it did from his zeal for the honour of God, while his accusers were excommunicated as idolaters.<sup>3</sup> Such occurrences, however, could hardly fail to render the opponents of image-worship hateful in the sight of the people. It was, therefore, so much the more necessary for the Council to take measures against any violent outbreaks of zeal in the future. Hence it directed, that no one, without the especial permission of the patriarch and the emperor, should attempt to make any alteration in church utensils, curtains, and such things, under the pretence that they were adorned with images.

Following the example of the general Councils in early times, the present synod closed its proceedings with a particular confession of faith. This formulary contained a statement of the received orthodox doctrine, with anathemas against the opposite principles; and the belief respecting the person of Christ was so expressed that it might be quoted against the image-worshippers. Thus: "Christ was not, indeed, glorified in his humanity incorporeally, but he was raised too high above all the bonds and imperfections of earthly nature, to leave it possible for human art to represent him by the medium of any earthly material, or according to the analogy of other human forms."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Nic. ii. Act. vi. f. 422. Καθώς τριαῦτα ὑπό τινων ἀτάκτως φερομένων προέγγονεν.

<sup>2</sup> The account is given in the memoir of St Stephen, in the *Analecta Graeca*, edited by the Benedictines, t. i. p. 480.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐκδιηταὶ εἰδώλων.

<sup>4</sup> Οὐκέτι μὲν σάρκα, οὐκ ἀσώματον δὲ, οἷς αὐτὸς οἶδε λόγους θεοειδιστίρου σώματος, ἵνα καὶ ὀφθῆ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκεντησάντων καὶ μείνη θεὸς ἕξω παχύτητος. Concil. Nic. ii. act. vi. Harduin, iv. f. 423.

We discover here the different manner in which the opponents and favourers of image-worship were accustomed to view the subject. The latter regarded the representation of Christ by means of images as an actual confession of his humanity, and of the manifestation of the divine life in a real human form. To oppose this appeared to them in the light of a denial of the incarnation of the Logos, or of his true human nature. The former, on the contrary, saw in the image of Christ, as framed by man's ingenuity, a degradation of the glorified Redeemer; a denial of his super-terrestrial grandeur. Hence proceeded the anathema against those who desired to exhibit the divine form of the Logos, in reference to his incarnation, by sensible colours, instead of adoring with the whole heart, and contemplating with the spiritual eye, that exalted being who sits at the right hand of God on the throne of glory. An anathema is also pronounced upon those who design, by the help of earthly colours, lifeless and foolish images, which can serve no useful purpose whatever; while the imitation of their virtues, as described in history, would afford a real and living image of their character.

But it is worthy of especial observation that the Council considered it necessary to publish an express anathema against those who refused to acknowledge Mary as the mother of God, exalted above all the visible and invisible creation, or who would not regard her as a mediator, or ardently seek her intercession. A similar curse was also pronounced upon those who despised the saints, or lightly regarded their prayers. We may easily conclude from this, that the party which was so opposed to image-worship must have found some particular cause, in the circumstances of the times, for publishing such rules; and we are led to suspect that this party was accused by its opponents of refusing the honour due to Mary and the saints. Certain traces may be discovered of such accusations brought by the image-worshippers against their enemies. It is related, for example, of the Emperor Constantine, that, in a dispute respecting the worship of Mary, he held up a purse full of gold, and asked how much it was worth; and that being answered, it was of great worth, he emptied it, and repeated the question. Having received, in this case, an answer which was the reverse of the former, he said, "And thus too it was with the worth of Mary, before and after the

birth of Jesus. When that event had taken place, she had nothing to render her superior to other women."<sup>1</sup> He seems also to have rejected the mediation of Mary, and of the saints;<sup>2</sup> to have pronounced it improper to give the name of "holy" to a mere man; and to have treated relics with contempt. It seems, moreover, to have been particularly the custom of this party, to avoid using the common expression, "We are going to St James' or St John's, meaning this or that church." Instead of speaking thus, they said, for example, "we are going to the church of Theodorus," or of some martyr or apostle.<sup>3</sup> These statements cannot indeed be taken as a guarantee of the truth, those from whom they are derived having allowed themselves the utmost liberty in villifying their adversaries;<sup>4</sup> but the spirit which gave birth to the struggle against image-worship, had probably inward motives for proceeding farther on its course.

It was in this Council that the monk Constantine, hitherto bishop of Syleum, in Phrygia, was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople. For this he had no doubt to thank his zealous opposition to images. The emperor himself introduced him publicly to the people, while, at the same time, he made known the decrees of the Council, and pronounced the anathema against the obnoxious party. He was anxious to enforce obedience to the decrees of the Council. It was his wish not merely to remove all images from

1 See, besides the Byzantine historians, the life of St Nicetas at the beginning of the first volume of the Act. Sanct. Bolland. April, § 28.

2 Constantine gave, at least, some cause for the remark, that he did not begin, or end his speech, as was usual, by invoking Mary and the saints. Hence the credit allowed to his accusers. The monk, Theosteriktos, the scholar of Nicetas, says in his memoir, that he had read thirteen speeches of the emperor, in which this invocation was wanting, Act. Sanct. M. April, t. i., appendix, f. 28, § 29, *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνέγνων τριακαίδεκα λογίδια, ἅπερ παρέδωκεν ταῖς δυνάμειν ἐβδομάδαις, πρὸς βίβλιν μὴ ἔχοντα*. The author also of the angry speech against this emperor, and against the opponents of image worship, in the works of Joh. Damas. t. i., f. 613, who probably wrote in the times of Constantine, says of him, that he had opposed the worship of Mary, of the saints, and martyrs, and had asserted that the latter had profitted themselves only by their sufferings. This writer considered it his especial duty to defend the honour of the saints against such attacks. L. c. f. 626.

3 See the life of Saint Stephen, in the Analecta, page 481, *οὐχὶ ἐκ πάντων αγίων δικαίων, αποστόλων καὶ μαρτύρων, τὸ ἅγιον ὑμεῖς ἐξεποιήσατε καὶ εδογματίσατε, λεγούτες: ποῦ πορεύῃ; εἰς τοὺς ἀποστόλους. Πόθεν ἦκει; ἐκ τῶν τεσσαράκοντα μαρτύρων. Ποῦ δὲ καὶ εἰς; εἰς τὸν μάρτυρα θεόδωρον*.

4 There is a contradiction, if, according to the memoir of Nicetas, Constantine was ready to call Mary the Θεοτόκος, but not the saint.

the churches, but to have all punished who concealed any image, or endeavoured to make others worship it. All traces of the objects of worship were to be erased from the church books;<sup>1</sup> and the walls of the churches so adorned were to be replastered. The governors of the provinces, and other officers, sought by their zeal against images to obtain the favour of the emperor. Thus a row of pictures which ornamented the aisles of a church, and described the history of Christ from his birth to his ascension, and the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, was utterly destroyed. Instead of decorations of this kind, it was argued, that fruit-trees, all kinds of animals, hunting-scenes, and such like, could be more safely employed in pictures intended for churches.<sup>2</sup>

But, as it was natural to expect, there were many from whom it was impossible to snatch the images which they had secreted as their dearest treasures, and which they regarded as indispensable to the furtherance of their devotion. This was especially the case with women; and the affection with which they guarded their hidden wealth; the danger to which they thereby exposed themselves,—all tended to increase the enthusiasm by which they were animated.<sup>3</sup>

Most of the bishops subscribed the resolutions of the pretended

<sup>1</sup> Leo, bishop of Phocæa, stated at the second Nicæne Council, that in the city in which he dwelt, above three hundred books had been burnt, on account of the figures on them. The deacon Demetrius, of Constantinople, declared, that when the oversight of the church furniture was intrusted to him (his office was that of *σκευοφύλαξ*) he discovered from the inventory, that two books with silver images were missing; and when he inquired for them, he was told, that they had been burnt by the iconoclasts. Act. Concil. Nic. ii., Act. v. Harduin. iv., f. 310.

<sup>2</sup> See the life of Stephen, l. c., p. 446. The author of this work says of the alterations which the emperor made in a church at Constantinople, dedicated to Mary, and in which were the pictures mentioned above: *Ὁπωροφυλάκιον καὶ ορνεοσκοπεῖον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐποίησεν*, l. c. 454.

<sup>3</sup> When the Monk Stephen, of whom we shall speak more fully hereafter, was thrown into prison at Constantinople, on account of his zeal for images, the wife of the goaler came secretly to him. She honoured him as a martyr, and besought him to allow her to attend upon him in the prison, and to supply him with food. The monk would not suffer this, for he believed that she belonged to the party of his enemies. The woman, however, declared herself ready to give an ocular proof of her sincerity, if he would promise not to communicate the circumstance to her husband, or the other prisoners. She accordingly brought from her chamber a locked chest, in which she had concealed an image of Mary with the infant Christ in her arms; and images of Peter and Paul. Having prostrated herself before them, and offered up her devotions, she gave them to Stephen, that he might also worship before them, and remember her. See the Memoir, p. 503. Similar things probably occurred with many pious women of those times.

general Council; but the emperor experienced by so much the greater resistance from the monks, men who exercised a most powerful influence among the people, and many of whom were regarded as saints. At their head stood the monk Stephen, who had fixed his abode in the celebrated grotto of Auxentius, on a high mountain on the shores of Bythinia. Troops of monks flocked to this sacred spot. The zeal of Stephen inspired most of them with fresh enthusiasm; while he cautiously counselled the rest, if they did not feel themselves prepared for persecution, to flee into some province, whether of the East or West, to which the authority of the emperor did not extend.

Constantine at first endeavoured to move the recluse, by marks of favour and honour, to sign the decrees of the Council. He well knew how vast an influence the consent of such a man, so generally revered, would exercise upon the rest of the monks, and the great mass of the people. To accomplish this purpose, he despatched a man of high rank to Stephen, and sent him, at the same time, a present of figs and dates, and such other provisions as formed the usual nourishment of monks. But Stephen declared that he would not deny his faith at any price; that he was prepared to surrender his life for the image of Christ; and that he would not accept of a present at the hands of heretics.<sup>1</sup>

It was in vain that the emperor banished the monks, or cast them into prison. They shewed no signs of wavering; but full of indignation against their adversaries, they sedulously circulated their tales of the miracles which had been wrought by means of the rejected images. Still an effort was made to compel them to yield; and they were exposed to the most barbarous treatment. Those who persevered in refusing to subscribe the decrees, were publicly scourged, after which their nose, ears, hands, were cut off, and their eyes pulled out. Three hundred and forty-two monks, from various provinces, were confined in one prison in Constantinople, after having been subjected to these cruel punishments.<sup>2</sup> The insulting expressions which the monks used in reference to the emperor, whom they called an apostate, may have apparently justified these proceedings against them; and given some colour to the pretext, that they were not condemned for

<sup>1</sup> See the Life of Stephanus, p. 457.

<sup>2</sup> Life of Stephanus, p. 500.



their religious opinions, but for sedition. Thus the venerable monk Andreas, who had received the name of the Calabyte from the grotto in which he lived, was actually scourged to death, because he had described the emperor as another Julian, or Valens.<sup>1</sup> Stephen himself was obliged to appear before the sovereign. While standing in the presence of the monarch, he drew from his cowl a piece of money, and said, "What punishment should I receive, if I threw down this coin, which bears the image of the emperor, and trod it under foot? You may hence learn what is done to those, who by means of their images, treat Christ and his mother with contempt." Having said this, he flung the money on the ground, and trampled it with his feet. The emperor immediately ordered him to prison, as one of those who had ventured to treat his image with disrespect.<sup>2</sup>

It is easy to understand how vast an influence the example of these venerable monks must have exercised on the minds of the people, who beheld them enduring every species of suffering rather than deny their faith. The numerous worldly-minded bishops, on the contrary, could not conceal it from the world, that the interests of religion were the least object of their care, and that they were wholly under the direction of the court. A writer of this age, who composed an oration in defence of image-worship, draws a picture of the bishops, which was probably taken from life.<sup>3</sup> To the objection, that images ought not to be allowed, because they were now regarded with idolatrous feelings by the multitude, he answers, "If such errors prevail among the people, it is the fault of the clergy; who are appointed for the especial purpose of teaching the ignorant how to pray, and what to believe. But the bishops of this age trouble themselves about nothing but their houses, their sheep, and their fields, or how they may sell their corn, their wine, their oil, their wool, their silk, at the best price. Their people they utterly neglect; and when they care for them at all, it is rather for their bodies than their souls." Such men were but poor instruments for working on the religious convictions of a nation.

The Emperor Constantine, however, obeying the impulse which

<sup>1</sup> Theophanes Chronograph. p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> Life of Stephen, p. 499.

<sup>3</sup> Orat. adv. Constantin. Cabalir, in the works of Job. Damas. i. p. 632.

had first led him to oppose image-worship, easily allowed himself to be carried farther and farther in his conflict with the ruling spirit of the times. He saw in the monks the most powerful promoters of idolatry and secrecy. Hence he denominated them children of darkness ;<sup>1</sup> and he would willingly have annihilated at a single stroke the entire body.<sup>2</sup> But finding that martyrdom only served to increase the veneration with which the people regarded the monks, he determined to render them, if possible, objects of ridicule, by subjecting them to degrading punishments.<sup>3</sup> Nothing could more provoke his anger, than the report that men or women of rank had taken the monastic vows. When this was the case, he pursued both those who had assumed the religious garb, and those who had persuaded them to adopt it, with the most violent indignation ; while his satisfaction was proportionally great, whenever he could induce a monk to renounce his vows and re-enter the world. Such a change was described as a passing from darkness into light,<sup>4</sup> and those who took this course were sure of being placed in some profitable and honourable position.

That species of religious enthusiasm which had been fostered by an extravagant fondness for relics ; by the accounts given of the wonders wrought through their influence ; and by the hope of seeing such miracles repeated, was the same as that which had created so fervent a veneration of images. When the devotional feelings of the people, therefore, were occupied with the relics of St Euphemia, and these relics were exhibited as having in a wonderful manner distilled balsam, it was altogether natural for Constantine to order the chest which contained them to be seized, and cast into the sea.<sup>5</sup> But the deeply-rooted popular belief in wonders, like those reported, was not to be eradicated by acts of

1 σκοτίας ἐνδύματα, σκοτενδύτους.

2 He called the monks, people of whom no one should think : τοὺς ἀμνημονεύτους.

3 Thus he obliged some of them to appear in the public circus with women in their arms. Theophan. p. 293.

4 We quote the expression of one (by name Stephen, but evidently not the saint above-mentioned), who had thus renounced his calling, and was afterwards cherished by the emperor at his court; he says, σήμερον, δέσποτα, τοῦ σατανικοῦ φάραγγος διὰ σου ἀφαρπαχθεὶς τὸ φῶς ἐνδέδυμαι. The Life of Stephen. p. 486.

5 Theophanes. p. 294.

arbitrary power. It was now said that the emperor had ordered the relics to be put away, to destroy the evidence which they afforded of the miraculous power of the saints, and of their right to be worshipped. Soon afterwards it was generally reported that a vision had been seen by which it was made known that it had come to shore on the island of Lemnos.

As the worship of images closely agreed with the prevailing character of religion, the most pious of the people were, on the whole, zealously devoted to the persecuted party. Hence the emperor could shew little attachment to those who otherwise might have received the greatest praise for their piety. That which the image-worshippers reported of him, hating him as they did, and anxious as they were to represent him as a heretic, can only be received with considerable doubt. Much which they said bears evident marks of exaggeration; but still some portion of it may be received as true. Thus he who when he fell, or suffered any pain, exclaimed as usual, "Help me, mother of God! who took part in the vigils of the church, or who attended many of the week-day services, was accounted and punished, it is said, as an enemy of the emperor, and as one who loved darkness."<sup>1</sup> Constantine was opposed altogether to these religious tendencies of the age, and to whatever bore any semblance to idolatry. It was natural, therefore, that he should regard with dislike the designation of Mary as the mother of God. But he was well aware how dangerous it would be to risk the interests of orthodoxy by seeming to throw dishonour upon her name. He ventured, therefore, to make only slight experiments towards effecting what he wished. Thus he one day asked the patriarch, in a confidential discourse, in which he showed but little acquaintance with the Nestorian controversy, what harm there could be in calling Mary *χριστοτόκος* (mother of Christ) instead of *θεοτόκος* (mother of God)? But the patriarch embracing him, exclaimed "God forbid, sire, that thou shouldst think in this wise. Seest thou not how Nestorius was condemned by the whole church?"

The emperor on hearing this immediately retreated, and said, that he had only made the inquiry in order to obtain instruction, and that the patriarch might rest assured that such was the case.<sup>2</sup> But the patriarch was not to be so easily silenced. Either from

<sup>1</sup> Theophanes, p. 236.

<sup>2</sup> Theophanes, p. 291.

carelessness, or evil design, he communicated what he had heard to others ; and this was, probably, the first occasion of the emperor's dislike to him, and of those ignominious sufferings which only ended with his death upon the scaffold. We learn, however, from this occurrence, how cautiously Constantine avoided public judgment as to his orthodoxy ; and it may be concluded, that however inclined he was to think of Mary and the saints as was reported of him, he nevertheless had no desire to make his opinions in this respect known to the world. Nor ought it to be doubted but that the discovery of his views would have been eminently calculated to increase the popular excitement. Pursuing, however, his despotic policy during a reign of more than thirty years (that is, till 775), he believed that he had accomplished his object, when all the citizens of Constantinople yielded to his desire, and took an oath, that they would never again worship an image.

During this long government, indeed, a new generation had sprung up, a portion of which, at least, had seen no images, and had been taught to regard them with horror. But with all his power, Constantine could not wholly prevent the secret worship of images in particular families. The religious character, which could not be at once changed by any outward power, continued to furnish a ready support for the revival of the exploded worship. It needed, therefore, only a change of government to bring back the party, adherents of which might be found in all classes, except the army, and who, compelled to retreat before the terrors of persecution, were ready at any moment to spring from their hiding-places with renewed zeal. Preparation was made for this event in the very palace of the sovereign, to whose will all had bowed. Constantine's son, Leo, had married an Athenian princess, Irene. She was descended from a family remarkable for its devotion to the worship of images, and the more unacquainted she was with the real nature of Christianity, so much the more inclined she was to place the whole of religion in outward things, while superstition gave a stimulus to her uneasy conscience, and a support to her immorality. Constantine had used his best caution, when giving her to his son for a wife, to guard against this danger. He had obliged her to take an oath, that she would utterly renounce the worship of images. But an oath could not bind Irene, in a case in which she believed the honour of God was concerned. It was

easy for her to find an excuse for perjury when the object contemplated was holy.

The Emperor Leo, who succeeded his father in the year 775, was devoted to the same views as the latter ; but, milder by nature, he had neither his force nor his despotic firmness. The cunning and ambitious Irene had already succeeded in effecting much which was preparatory to a change without being noticed by her consort. The monks who had been obliged to hide themselves under the former reign, now crept out of their retreats ; and those who were regarded as saints, but who had not been seen for many years in Constantinople, whence the monastic orders seemed especially to have vanished, now, once more, dared to shew themselves in public.<sup>1</sup> Great was the joy with which they were received in those families in which their memory had been cherished from father to son, or in which their old friends were still alive. The devout gathered around them, and they began again to exercise their wonted influence. This influence served indeed to restore the sensuous forms of devotion as image-worship ; but, far better than this, it contributed to awaken a new zeal for practical Christianity ; to restore the peace which had been destroyed ; and to lead back whole families from the paths of vice to those of religion.<sup>2</sup>

Irene was skilful enough to secure the elevation of several of the monks to important bishoprics. They were, in all probability, champions of image-worship, but they allowed themselves to have recourse for the moment to the so-called *οἰκονομία*, in order to accomplish with greater safety the purpose they had in view. The emperor, therefore, was treated as a friend of Mary and of the monks ; and it was expected that, as these things were closely allied, he would soon prove himself a supporter of image-worship. But those who entertained this hope were deceived. The empress Irene had formed a party, consisting of the chamberlains and other officers of the court, and the worship of images was again practised in the palace before the emperor had any suspi-

<sup>1</sup> Probably, according to the order of events, that which Theodore Studita says, in the life of the Abbot Plato, of the reappearance of venerable monks in Constantinople, ought to be assigned to this period. \**Ἄρτι ὡσπερ τινῶν φωστήρων ἐπιφανομένων μοναστῶν τοῖς ἐν ἄστει.* See Acta. Sanct. Mens. April. t. i. Append. f. 49. § 17.

<sup>2</sup> See the memoir above quoted, § 18: *ἀφ' οὗ ἐπεδήμησεν τοῖς ἐν ἄστει, ὅλους οἴκους μετέπλασεν καὶ μετεστοιχείωσεν εἰς βίον ἑναρετου.*

cion of its existence. Happening, however, to discover some images under his wife's pillow, he obtained a clue to the whole affair.<sup>1</sup> The members of the confederacy were seized, scourged, exposed to public scorn, and cast into prison. But Leo died in the year 780, and could, therefore, take no precaution against the plots laid by the surviving empress. He may, perhaps, have allowed himself to be pacified before his decease by her cunning and deceitful arts.

Constantine, Leo's son and successor, being still a youth, the government fell into the hands of Irene. Determined as she was to do all that might be possible for the restoring of image-worship, she was still constrained, by political considerations, to proceed with caution. Most of the bishoprics were still possessed by men who had signed the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, and many of them on this account were opposed to images. But there was a far greater obstacle to her success. The generality of the bishops were usually found ready to adopt the prevailing opinions of the court; but the army was for the most part devoted to the views of Constantine Copronymus, the victorious general. Irene had, therefore, to dread an armed opponent; and it became the more necessary for her to accomplish her object by art and cunning. In the same degree in which the monastic orders had been despised under Constantine Copronymus, were they now esteemed and honoured. The most dignified offices in the church were held by monks; and, in direct defiance of the rule of Constantine, persons of all ranks, from the lowest to the highest, were free to adopt the monastic profession, and those who exchanged the splendour of worldly greatness for the cloister became objects of especial distinction. Independent of all outward considerations, and merely from her peculiar religious tendencies, the empress was herself a devoted friend of monastic institutions. She placed the profoundest confidence in the blessings and intercessions of their members, while her zeal for the honour of images secured her their regard, and induced them to overlook many of her worst offences. It was no doubt her intention to employ them in the accomplishment of her favourite plans for the restoration of the suppressed worship. She had not miscalculated

<sup>1</sup> This is related by Cedrenus as occurring in the fifth year of Leo's reign. Stephanus only mentions the punishment of the courtiers on account of their worshipping images.

their readiness to assist her in her design. It was especially necessary, however, that the patriarchal dignity at Constantinople should be held by some one who would devote himself to her service. But she dare not, or she was too prudent to venture upon deposing the patriarch Paulus according to the usual method. Such a proceeding would have given fresh vigour to the still powerful party which she had to oppose; and the new patriarch would have appeared to many in the light of a usurper. Circumstances occurred which her cunning enabled her to employ so as to avoid all these consequences.

Paulus had been obliged, owing to a severe sickness, to leave his patriarchal palace in the year 784, and retire into a monastery. The empress now reproached him for this, and asked why he had endeavoured to divest himself of his dignity? He answered, that he had never been able to find any rest to his conscience since, out of fear to man, he had denied the truth: that it was this fear only which had induced him to take part with the enemies of image-worship against the ancient and universal tradition of the church, and that he had, therefore, sought the cloister to fulfil the duties of a penitent. Having made this confession, he earnestly prayed the empress to appoint in his place some orthodox man, through whom it was to be hoped the church of the capital might be reconciled with the other great churches of the empire, from which its unhappy heretical tendency had hitherto kept it apart.

Paulus recommended as his successor the chief imperial secretary, Tarasius.<sup>1</sup> But as this affair gave the first offensive indication of all that was about to be done for the restoration of image-worship, and as particular reference was made to that subject in the above statement, so we may suspect that the whole proceeding was a speculation of Irene and her associates to work upon the feelings of the people, and prepare the way for further operations. If, however, it be conjectured that the empress suggested to Paulus the wisdom of his retiring into a monastery under pretence of sickness, and his resignation of the patriarchate to save himself from a threatened deposition, it might be answered,

<sup>1</sup> See the notices on this subject in Theophanes Cedrenus, in the memoir of Tarasius by Ignatius, c. i., Act. Sanct., Latin translation, Mens. Feb. t. iii. f. 577, and in the imperial "Sacra" to the bishops of the second Nicene Council. Harduin. Concil. iv. f. 38.

that, as his death soon followed, there is no reason to suppose that his sickness was feigned. The most probable view of the circumstances is, that Paulus finding himself unwell, retired into a monastery, and assumed the cowl,—a course which, according to the religious notions of the Greek church, he would be likely to pursue. In the same manner it may be believed that this conduct of the patriarch, the result of his own choice, was employed by Irene as a pretence for reporting that it was repentance for his opposition to the truth which had induced him to forsake his position. Nor would it be difficult to prove that the feeling which sickness had excited in his mind was closely united with sorrow for his supposed offence. Such a revulsion of thought would be natural to a weak man like Paulus. He had been brought up in the practice of that image-worship which he had only learnt to oppose through a pusilanimous dread of the prevailing opinions of the court.<sup>1</sup> The new spirit of the times, and the return of the monks to power, worked strongly on his mind, and the influence of the sentiments thus excited became still more painful when mingled with the apprehension of approaching death.

It is easy to discern, from the characteristic weakness of this man, that although both parties had now enjoyed for some years an equal degree of freedom, he dare not acknowledge his fondness for images, or use his power in their behalf, while the party to which his feelings were opposed still enjoyed the support of the imperial guard. His recommendation of Tarasius as his successor might be in conformity with a preconcerted plan of the court, or the whole may have been a mere invention, framed in order gradually to accustom the people to the appointment of a man so far removed from any ecclesiastical degree. It was thought, perhaps, that by such means the violation of church rules which would be committed in an election of this kind would be less observed or reprobated. The Byzantine government was not, it is true, very precise in obeying the canons in this respect. Persons occupying high offices in the state were often transferred to the service of the church ; but, under all circumstances, some apology

<sup>1</sup> This is illustrated by the statement of Theophanes, that he had resisted the offer of the patriarchate in the reign of Leo, on account of the hostility to image-worship then existing, and had at last only yielded to compulsion. Such an account, however, was probably only invented to afford an apology for the previous conduct of Paulus.



was needed in a case like the present.<sup>1</sup> It was certainly a pre-concerted affair that Tarasius, on being offered the patriarchate, resolutely refused to accept it, so that force had to be used in order to compel him to appear and address the people. He said at first that he dreaded to pass from the midst of wordly business, with unwashed hands, into the sanctuary. But he felt obliged, he added, to obey the divine calling, which had come to him through the regent. That, however, which most terrified him, and which he could not pass by, was the idea of being placed at the head of a church which was burdened, as heretical, with the anathemas of all the rest. He could not endure to expose himself to such a condemnation; and he painted the consequences of it in terms which could scarcely fail to produce the most striking impression on the minds of the people. He declared, therefore, that he could only accept the office on the condition that all should unite with him in petitioning the regent to restore the union of the churches, and employ her efforts for the assembling of a general Council, which might finally establish concord on the subject of doctrine.

This speech was received by many with applause; but others, on the contrary, clearly perceiving the design with which it was delivered, and opposed to it from principle, declared that no new Council was required.<sup>2</sup> But Tarasius resumed, and said, that it was an emperor, Leo, who had banished images from the churches; that the Council of Constantinople had found them so banished; and that the subject was consequently still a matter for debate, the ancient tradition having been so wilfully despised. It was therefore concluded that a general Council must be summoned, with the consent of the other patriarchal churches.

A correspondence was now recommenced with Pope Hadrian I., and he was desired to send representatives to the Council to be held at Constantinople. Hadrian gave his assent to the confession of orthodoxy made by Tarasius, and expressed his ap-

<sup>1</sup> It is curious, as confirming the above statement, that in the "Sacra" directed to the second Nicene Council, no mention is made of this recommendation of Tarasius. It is only said, that the choice of the experienced men who had assembled to elect a worthy patriarch had fallen unanimously on him.

<sup>2</sup> See Vit. Taras. c. iii., and the address of Tarasius in the Acts of the second Nicene Council. Harduin. iv. f. 26, in the concluding passage it is said: *τῶν δὲ ὀλίγοι τῶν ἀφ' ὁρῶν ἀνεβέβηλοντο.*

probation of the zeal exhibited in favour of images. The consideration of this, and of the urgent necessities of the times, induced him to overlook the irregularity involved in the sudden elevation of Tarasius to the highest dignity in the church. He accordingly sent two ambassadors to represent him in the proposed Council. It was evidently desired that the synod should not merely be assembled under the presidency of the two chief patriarchs, but that nothing should be wanting to the completeness of the meeting as an Œcumenical Council; and that it might be regarded, in all respects, as superior to the preceding synod. To this end, all the five patriarchs were invited to take part in its proceedings. It happened, also, that at that time the orthodox Melchites, and not the Monophysites, had furnished the successful candidate for the patriarchate of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> No obstacle, therefore, to the intended movement was to be feared on this side. But the greatest of all existed still in the power which the Saracens possessed in Egypt and Syria. Political considerations taught them resolutely to forbid any intercourse between the churches under their dominion and those of the Roman empire. The patriarch Tarasius sent ambassadors with letters to the three other patriarchs. But they met, on the way, a company of monks, who declared to them that the object of their mission, under present circumstances, was utterly unattainable. They would not only, added the monks, uselessly expose themselves to the greatest danger, but, by exciting the suspicion of the Saracens, would involve the Christian communities of several provinces in new and multiplied perils.<sup>2</sup>

Thus prevented from fulfilling the main design of their journey, the messengers of the patriarch were obliged to content themselves with effecting what might best compensate them for their disappointment. The monks chose two of their number, Johannes and Thomas, who appear to have been suffragans of the patriarchs, and were well skilled in the knowledge of the doctrines prevailing in the orthodox churches of Syria and Egypt. And these men, little as they were properly authorized to take upon themselves such an office, were to appear in the Council as

<sup>1</sup> Compare Walch's *Geschichte*, t. x. s. 516.

<sup>2</sup> The writing of these monks, which explains the whole affair, but is falsely represented as proceeding from the patriarch himself, is found in Harduin. iv. f. 137.

the plenipotentiaries and representatives of the three absent patriarchs, so that the Council might seem to hold its sittings under the presidency of the whole five.<sup>1</sup>

The Council was opened at Constantinople in the year 786. But the plan of its proceedings was not yet properly arranged. The greater number of the bishops had obtained their dignity either under Constantine or his successor, Leo. They were, consequently, still opposed to image worship. Many of them were even distinguished for their zeal in this respect. They were members of families from which images had long been banished, and the worship of which they had, therefore, from childhood viewed with horror.<sup>2</sup> But the slavish spirit which then prevailed in the Greek church would not have allowed them vigorously to oppose the will of the court, had they not been able to reckon upon powerful support; the support, that is, of the army, and especially of the imperial body-guard, which, from a lively veneration for Leo's memory, adhered faithfully to his principles.

These bishops, united<sup>3</sup> with whom was an influential party of laymen,<sup>4</sup> held a secret meeting before the opening of the Council.

1 It is curious that Theodorus Studita, who, on account of the part which it took in restoring image-worship, must have held this Council in high esteem, and who sometimes calls it an Œcumenical Council, yet gives us to understand that it did not merit that title in the fullest sense. He even exposes the trick above described as only intended to give the synod an œcumenical character in the eyes of the people. Thus he says, l. i. ep. xxxviii.: οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ κεκαθικότες ἀντιπρόσωποι (their representatives) τῶν ἄλλων πατριαρχῶν, ψευδές. But he unfairly asserts that the papal legates came to Constantinople on account of other business, and not at all because of the Council; that they had allowed themselves to be forced into assuming the character of the Pope's representatives in the synod; and that they were, therefore, on their return to Rome, degraded from their ecclesiastical rank. He says of the other patriarchs: οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἐκ μὲν ἀνατολῆς, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνταῦθα προτραπέυτες καὶ ἐλχθέντες, οὐχ' ὑπὸ τῶν πατριαρχῶν ἀποσταλέντες, ὅτι μηδὲ ἐνόησαν, ἢ ὕστερον, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἔθνους δέος δηλοῦστί (the dread of the Saracens) τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν οἱ ἐνταῦθα, ἵνα τὸν αἰρετίζουσα λαὸν μᾶλλον πείσωσιν ὀρθοδοξεῖν ἐκ τοῦ εἰκουμενικῆν δῆθεν ἀθροισθῆναι σύνοδον. He states that this synod was considered in the Roman Church as only a σύνοδος τοπική. The severe Theodore had, indeed, cause to be discontented with this Council, on account of its lax proceedings in respect to the bishops, who had belonged to the opposite party, and those who had been guilty of simony.

2 Thus several bishops at the second Nicene Council, Act. i. Harduin. t. iv. f. 60, said: ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ αἰρέσει ἡμῶν γεννηθέντες ἀνετράφημεν καὶ ηὔξθημεν.

3 Ἐτύρειον μετὰ λαϊκῶν τιῶν πολλῶν τὸν ἀριθμόν. Harduin. iv. f. 25.

4 They were bishops from various provinces, but chiefly, it seems, from Phrygia, the original seat of this party, and still its stronghold. We find among the heads of those who were sworn to oppose image worship the following especially named: Leo, bishop of Iconium in Phrygia; Nicolaus, bishop of Hierapolis, in the same province; Hypatios, bishop of Nicea, in Bythynia; Gregorius, bishop of Pisinus, in Galatia; Georgios, bishop

Their object was to discover means for effectually opposing the plans of the patriarch Tarasius, and the assembling of a Council which they regarded as unnecessary. Tarasius, on learning this, reminded them that he was bishop of the metropolis, and that they would render themselves guilty of a breach of ecclesiastical discipline if they held assemblies without his permission. To this was added a warning, that if they continued their present course it would end by the forfeiture of their dignity. The bishops, on receiving this intimation, desisted from meeting as before, but they continued their secret operations.

In the meantime, the empress made her public entry into Constantinople, attended by the troops of the body-guard, which, however, as before stated, were much more devoted to the opposition party of the bishops than to the opinions of the court. On the evening of the 31st of July, the day before the opening of the Council, a turbulent detachment of these soldiers assembled in the baptistry of the church, where the Council was to be held. In the midst of their confused and tumultuous cries, one could be clearly heard; it signified that no council should be held. Irene, however, was not to be deterred by this outbreak from executing her plan. The Council was opened on the first of August. But at the moment when the ecclesiastical law was being read, which prohibited the holding of a general Council without the consent of the other patriarchs, and which it was intended to employ against the authority of the preceding Council, a body of soldiers gathered about the doors of the church, with wild and furious cries. The empress, on this occasion, judged it better to yield to the storm, and to conquer by stratagem. She accordingly sent one of her chamberlains to the Council, and directed him to say that it might suspend its proceedings, and submit, for the time, to the rage of the multitude. The Lord's will would afterwards be accomplished.<sup>1</sup>

of Pisidia; Leo, bishop of the island of Rhodes; and another Leo, bishop of the island of Carpathos (Scarpanto.) See Harduin. l. c. f. 47.

<sup>1</sup> Harduin. Concil. iv. f. 28. According to the words of Tarasius himself, at the opening of the second Nicene Council, l. c. f. 34, a few bishops only were decidedly in favour of image worship. He says of these occurrences, *ἐκινήθη πολυάνδρος ὄχλος θυμῷ καὶ πικρίας γέμων, χεῖρας ἡμῖν ἐπιβαλεῖν, ἐξ οὗ χειρὶ θεοῦ ἐρρύσθημεν, ἔχοντες εἰς συμμαχίαν καὶ τινὰς εὐαριθμήτους ἐπισκόπους.* Among the few who adhered to the resolute Tarasius, was the before-named venerable abbot Plato, whose life was written by Theodorus Studita. See Act. Sanct. t. i. April. Appendix, § 24, f. 50.

Pursuing this policy, Irene suffered the crowd, to which several of the bishops now joined themselves, to continue its furious exclamations, that no one should dare to assail the authority of the seventh general Council. The tumult lasted till the hour when hunger compelled the mass of the people to disperse. No sooner was this the case than the politic empress drew off the guards, under pretence that they were needed to take part in a military expedition. They were accordingly led out of the city, and disbanded; while a new regiment was formed to supply their place, and upon the loyalty of which the empress could better depend.

All necessary preparations having been made, the Council was assembled the next year (787), not, however, at Constantinople, where there was so much to fear from the opposing party, but at Nicea, where it would derive additional dignity from the recollection of the first memorable Council held in that city. The members of this synod amounted in number to about three hundred and fifty. Irene, in her proclamation, declared that every one present was expected to speak his opinions openly;<sup>1</sup> but she had previously received an assurance that the bishops who had before opposed the restoration of images would no longer resist her wishes. If all this had not been arranged, the six sittings between the 24th of September and the 6th of October would not have availed to complete the business of the synod, so that in the last, that is the seventh, session, held on October 13, its decisions were ready to be solemnly published, and to receive the signatures of all concerned. That which took place in the six sittings shews evidently that no further debate was necessary on the subject of images.

Numerous passages from the fathers were brought forth at this Council. Some of them were interpolations from earlier writers, some from later. Most of them were derived from wonderful histories of miracles wrought by images; and there were persons present who could venture to assert, that they themselves had been eye-witnesses of such things. A presbyter related, that on his return home from the Council held at Constantinople the preceding year, he had fallen sick, but had been cured by an image of Christ.<sup>2</sup> Individual bishops, and then numbers of them together, appeared, expressing their desire to renounce the error of

<sup>1</sup> L. c. Harduin. f. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Harduin. iv. f. 211.

which they had been guilty in opposing image-worship, and to be reconciled to the Catholic church. Some of these prelates pretended that they had arrived at conviction after a long and anxious inquiry; others, with an utter disregard to self-respect, threw the whole blame of their late opposition to image-worship on their own stupidity and ignorance.<sup>1</sup> Whole throngs of them exclaimed, "We have all sinned! we have all erred! we all implore forgiveness!" When one of those who were thus eager to express repentance, declared, that he was now convinced by the statement of Holy Scripture, and by the writings of the fathers, that the use of images was according to apostolic tradition, Tarasius asked him, how it had happened then, that he who had now been a bishop for eight or ten years, had only just arrived at the knowledge of the truth? To this inquiry the bishop did not shrink from replying, "That the evil referred to had been so long in existence, and had gained such influence, that it might be regarded as a punishment for sin, from which, however, it was to be hoped God would deliver them." Several others excused themselves on the plea, that they were born and brought up in the sect which they now wished to abandon; and it is easy to see, that those who had allowed themselves to be guided by the prevailing opinions of the age, might, without difficulty, be induced to adopt the arguments of the court. One of the bishops, Gregory of Neocæsarea, said, "I desire to learn what the patriarch, and the holy synod, will commend;" and he added, "since the entire assembly speaks and thinks in like manner, I, therefore, recognize the proposed doctrine as the truth."<sup>2</sup> People like this bishop, who, according to his own confession, could suffer the voice of the multitude to be equivalent to the voice of truth, could have no difficulty in changing their views according to the change of circumstances.

But there were many who scrupled to adopt the new opinions, from respect to the oath which they had taken under Constantine Copronymus. Others might employ this as a mere excuse to avoid changing their course. To overcome, however, this difficulty, it was decreed, that it is no perjury to break an oath taken contrary to God's law. Among the bishops who expressed the

<sup>1</sup> L. c. f. 41: της ἄκρας μου ἀμαθίας καὶ νοθρείας καὶ ἡμελημένης διανοίας ἐστὶ τοῦτο.

<sup>2</sup> Ἡνίκα πάντα ἡ ὀμίγηυρις αὐτῆ τοῦ ἐν λαλεῖ καὶ φρονεῖ, ἔμαθον καὶ ἐπληροφορήθην, ὅτι ἡ ἀλήθεια αὐτῆ ἐστὶν ἡ νυνὶ ζητούμενη καὶ κηρυτσομένη, f. 77.

deepest sorrow on this occasion, were some who had taken part, the year before, in the conspiracy against the Council at Constantinople. They too now exclaimed, "We have sinned before God, and the church! We fell through ignorance!" The Gregory of Neocesarea, whose shameful weakness we have before mentioned, had been himself one of the leaders of the opposite party<sup>1</sup> in the former Council; but it was now spoken of as cause of triumph, that such men had been spared to bear witness to their own shame, and to condemn their own doctrine. Those who consented to testify their present orthodoxy by a formal recantation of their late errors, were not only received into the communion of the church, but, as appears from certain documents, were allowed to retain their episcopal dignity. Why the men who had stood at the head of the adverse party, and who had taken the chief share in its machinations, should be treated with so much tenderness, contrary to the usual practice of the church in cases of this kind, can only be explained by reference to the peculiar circumstances of the times. The party opposed to image-worship was still powerful, and it was necessary that every means should be employed to deprive it of its leaders and supporters. This politic mode of proceeding, however, was in little accordance with the fiery zeal of the monks.

With regard to the form of recantation, we ought carefully to notice the anathema pronounced upon those who despised the doctrine of the fathers according to the tradition of the church, and whose language was, "If we be not certainly instructed by the Old and New Testaments, neither do we follow the doctrine of the fathers; of the general councils, or the tradition of the Catholic church."<sup>2</sup> We may suspect from this, that many of those who opposed image-worship, when accused of despising the

1 This was especially the case in regard to the Abbot Theodorus Studita. The monks used it as a ground of accusation against the greater number of the bishops that they had gained their offices by simony. See the letter of the patriarch Tarasius to the Abbot Johannes. Harduin. iv. f. 521. *Τούτων ούτως οντων ενεκάλεσαν, τῇ συνόδῳ τὸ πλείον μέρος τῶν εὐλαβῶν μοναχῶν. καὶ ημεῖς δὲ προεγινώσκομεν τὴν ἐγκλησιν ταύτην ὅτι οἱ πλείονες τῶν ἐπισκόπων χρήμασις ἠνόησαντο τὴν ἱερωσύνην.* This agrees with what we have quoted above, from the mouth of an image-worshipper, respecting the character of these bishops; and hence we have a still stronger proof of their dependence on the court.

2 L. c. f. 42.

traditions of the church, may have answered : that such traditions had themselves no claim to respect without the testimony of Scripture. This was an indication of that Protestant spirit which was subsequently still more plainly developed in this party.<sup>1</sup> According to the suggestion of one of the Roman envoys, an image was brought into the assembly. All kissed it.<sup>2</sup> In the seventh session it was decreed, that together with the sign of the cross, images of Christ, of Mary, of the angels, and of all holy and pious men, should be placed in the churches ; on the vessels of the church ; on mantles ; on walls and tablets ; in houses ; in streets ; and that they should be painted, or framed of Mosaic-work, or of such material<sup>3</sup> as seemed most proper. Still, how great an injustice was done to those who promoted image-worship, when they were charged with idolatry, appears from this express statement of the Council : “ When any one bows before an image, this sign of love and reverence must on no account be confounded with the devotion which belongs to God alone.<sup>4</sup> So also, in regard to the sign of the cross on the books of the gospel, and other consecrated things.” The use of incense and of lighted tapers was referred, in the same manner, to the general principle of a symbolic expression of the feelings.<sup>5</sup> It was especially declared, that the honour paid to the image belonged not to the image, but to the person represented.

When the synod had completed its labours, in the seven sessions, the patriarch received a command to proceed, with the whole assembly, to Constantinople. Accordingly, on the 23d of October, the eighth session was held in the imperial palace of Magnaura, the residence of Irene and her son Constantine. The

<sup>1</sup> The following was one of the anathemas pronounced in the eighth session of the Council, f. 484 : εἴ τις πᾶσαν παράδοσιν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν, ἔγγραφον ἢ ἀγράφον ἀθετεῖ ἀγίασμα ἔστω.

<sup>2</sup> Act. v., f. 322.

<sup>3</sup> Εἰκόνες ἐκ ψηφίδος.

<sup>4</sup> I. 456. Ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν, οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ φύσει.

<sup>5</sup> In the letter which Tarasius sent to the empress in the name of the Council, the προσκύνησις κατὰ λατρείαν is distinguished from the other kinds of προσκύνησις ; as, for example, from the homage rendered to the emperor, as stated in the language of Byzantine adulation. Ἔστι γὰρ προσκύνησις καὶ ἡ κατὰ τιμὴν καὶ φόβον καὶ φόβον, ὡς προσκυνοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τὴν καλλίνικον καὶ ἡμερωτάτην ὑμῶν βασιλείαν. Harduin iv, f. 476.



meeting was opened in the presence of a vast concourse of people, upon whom it was intended to make a deep impression. Irene having ordered the decrees of the Council to be read, she asked the bishops whether these decrees might really be regarded as the expression of their common convictions. All having answered in the affirmative, she directed the instrument containing the decrees to be laid before her, and she and her son signed it. Loud were the exclamations which immediately followed in honour of the orthodox empress.

Thus, after so long and fierce a struggle, victory declared itself, in the Greek church, in favour of image-worship. But the means which it was found necessary to employ to gain that victory, show clearly how powerful the vanquished party still was. Nor was it possible, that a sentiment which had operated so widely among a large portion of the people, should be at once suppressed. It could not but happen that reactions would follow; and hence we shall see, that, at the beginning of the following century, a new series of violent struggles arose between the two parties. It now only remains for us briefly to consider the share which the Western churches took in these disputes. The communications which passed between the Popes, and the Iconoclast emperors, show how prevalent the worship of images was in the Romish church. But it was otherwise in that of France. The only question here is, whether in the French-Gallic Church this opposition to image-worship was original, as it may be supposed to have been from the instance of Serenus, bishop of Massilia, in the time of Gregory the Great; or whether this tendency of its dominant spirit was merely derived from the peculiar character of the age of Charlemagne? We should have been better able to answer this question, if more certain information had remained respecting the first proceedings actually adopted on the subject of images in the time of king Pepin. An embassy having been sent to that sovereign from the Greek emperor Constantine, a discussion took place in an assembly of bishops at Gentiliacum (Gentilly) in 767, in reference to the then existing disputes between the Greek and Latin churches, and also in regard to the controversy about images. But in none of the historical documents in which this assembly is named, is any mention made of its decision on this subject. We can only, therefore, judge from the sequel of that which went

before. As Pope Paul I. then expressed his satisfaction<sup>1</sup> to the king respecting what had taken place in this assembly, to which he had sent an ambassador, we might conclude that it had shown some favour to the practice of image-worship. But such an inference would be far from certain, since it does not appear that the satisfaction expressed by the Pope had any connexion with this subject. The discussions of the synod referred not merely to matters of doctrine, but to an important political affair. The Greek emperor had endeavoured to obtain from the Frankish king the restoration of the lands seized from the Lombards, and given to the Roman church, or to the patrimony of the apostle Peter. This demand Pepin had firmly refused. But the satisfaction which the pontiff felt at this, might naturally incline him to take a milder view of the decisions of the synod respecting images.<sup>2</sup> In every case, however, the French church could hardly have failed to agree with that of Rome in the part which it took in regard to the disputes on this subject in the East. It may also be conjectured, that, while, owing to the circumstances which then existed, the opposition to the Greek church might be expressed with all possible sharpness, every effort might be made to smooth down the differences between those of Rome and France. If the religious character of the Carovingian era, in this respect, had been altogether new to the French church, some opposition would have been manifested; but of this we can find no trace.

Clearer information of the part taken by the French church in this controversy exists under the reign of Charles the Great. That emperor appeared as a zealous opponent of the second Nicene Council, and of the principles which it advocated respecting images. The hostile relations between him and the Empress Irene, who had broken the marriage contract between her son and the Princess Rothrud, may have influenced the views which Charles took of the Council. His expressions betray in many re-

<sup>1</sup> The words of the Pope are: *Agnitis omnibus a vobis pro exaltatione sanctae Dei ecclesiae et fidei orthodoxae defensione peractis laetati sumus.* See *Cod. Carolin.* ep. xx. *Mansi Concil.*, t. xii., f. 685.

<sup>2</sup> The pontiff had expressed a hope to the king, when the question was as to what answer should be given by the Council to the Greek ambassadors, that he would certainly afford in reply, *nisi quod ad exaltationem matris vestrae Romanae ecclesiae pertinere noscatis*; and that he would on no condition take back that which he had once given to the apostle Peter. This hope the pontiff now saw fulfilled.

spects a feeling of personal irritation. But, notwithstanding this, the conduct which he pursued is sufficiently indicative of the spirit of true piety by which both he and his ecclesiastical advisers were animated. Equally striking, in this respect, was the impression which the language of Byzantine superstition and Byzantine fanaticism, delighting itself in vain bombast, made upon the simple mind of the pious Frankish prince.

Three years after the termination of the Nicene Council, and, consequently, in the year 790,<sup>1</sup> a protest against it appeared in the name of Charlemagne.<sup>2</sup> No doubt can be entertained that he received the aid, as he himself intimates, of his theologians, in the composition of this famous production, which appeared under the title of the "Quatuor libri Carolini."<sup>3</sup> They furnished him with the matter, and took part in the execution of the work. This was especially the case with Alcuin;<sup>4</sup> but the prince who could form so decided an opinion on subjects of religion, and who had sufficient ability to aid an Alcuin in the correction of his work, may well be supposed to have done more with respect to a book which appeared under his name than merely to let it be read before him, or adapted to his views. He doubtless had largely

<sup>1</sup> As is said in the preface itself, p. 8, Ed. Heumann.

<sup>2</sup> He himself says: *Quod opus aggressi sumus cum conniventia sacerdotum in regno a Deo nobis concesso Catholicis gregibus praelatorum.*

<sup>3</sup> This work was first published by J. Tilius (Jean du Tillet, afterwards bishop of Meaux) in the year 1549.

<sup>4</sup> Charlemagne, it is well known, was constantly in the habit of consulting Alcuin in all matters of controversy, and of employing him as a writer. We may refer, in illustration of this subject, to the striking similarity of style apparent in lib. iv. c. 6, pp. 456, 457 of the Caroline treatise, and in the part of Alcuin's Commentary on John l. ii. c. iv., f. 500 ed. Froben. If we consider that he did not publish this commentary till ten years after the appearance of the "libri Carolini," as is shewn by the letter to his sister, prefixed to the commentary, so we shall find that the work appeared in the year in which Leo escaped from the conspiracy formed against him, and in which Charlemagne obtained the imperial crown. The most important argument against the belief that Alcuin had any share in the work is that of Gieseler, who, according to Froben's Chronology, shews that Alcuin was then still in England. T. ii. Opp. Alcuin, f. 459. But even if this was the case, he might yet aid the emperor by his pen. And this opinion is supported by the tradition found in the English annalist, Roger Hovedon, who wrote in the thirteenth century, but who says, in relating the events of the year 791, that Alcuin wrote a letter against the decrees of the second Nicene Council, in the name of the English bishops and princes, and that it was conveyed to the French king. Although this information is derived from too late a period to be viewed as a credible testimony, and even involves an anachronism, yet it might in part rest upon some old tradition deserving of credit.

<sup>5</sup> *Zelus Dei et veritatis studium.*

to do with the form in which it at last appeared. Thus he himself says, that zeal for God and the truth had moved him to break silence, and to come forth against error.

Whilst care is taken in this work to distinguish between the use and abuse of images, the writer severely rebukes the fanaticism of the Iconoclasts, as well as the superstition of the Iconolatracæ. In the same manner he assails the pretensions of the two synods which had assembled at Constantinople and Nicea to the character of Œcumenical Councils. Thus it is objected to the Iconoclasts, that they wished utterly to destroy the images which were an ornament to the churches, and which, as fitting memorials of the past, had been used from very early times;<sup>1</sup> that they foolishly confounded them all with idols; and that the members of the Council held under Constantine had given to that emperor the honour due only to Christ, for that they had ascribed to him their deliverance from idolatry.

But, notwithstanding this rebuke, the Council of the Iconoclasts is treated much more mildly than that of their opponents. It is praised for its zeal, though an erring zeal, for the honour of God, and its resistance to the superstition of the image-worshippers. On the contrary, it is said, in reference to the hard expressions used against it in the Council of Nicea, that it had in nowise committed a very great sin, although it had, from mistaken zeal, despoiled the churches of the images by which they were adorned.<sup>2</sup>

Very different is the language which the emperor employs in respect to the principles of the second Nicene Council, and the arguments by which it had been attempted to defend them. The interest which he took in the cause of spiritual religion is here remarkably displayed. If images be used at all, it is said, they can only properly be employed as the ornaments of churches, or as memorials of the past. Their use or disuse, therefore, is a matter of little importance in respect to Christian piety.<sup>3</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> Imagines in ornamentis ecclesiæ et memoria rerum gestarum ab antiquis positas, c. v.

<sup>2</sup> L. i. c. 27, l. iv. c. 4. In abolendis a basilicarum ornamentis imaginibus quodammodo fuerunt incauti; that is, they erred from "imperitia," not "nequitia."

<sup>3</sup> Utrum in basilicis propter memoriam rerum gestarum et ornamentum sint, an etiam non sint, nullum fidei Catholice afferre potuerunt præjudicium, quippe cum ad peragenda nostræ salutis mysteria nullum penitus officium habere noscantur.

expressions of the strongest kind are employed in reprobating the introduction of images for any other purpose; and it is easy to perceive how far the authors of this work were from sharing the enthusiasm of the Greeks in regard to art, or its productions. It is called folly and madness<sup>1</sup> to assert, as the second Nicene Council had done, that the actions of the saints may be contemplated in their images. The virtues and merits of these holy persons had their seat in the soul, and not in any material substance. They could not, therefore, be represented by colours, or made applicable by the senses. How, indeed, should their wisdom, their eloquence, their deep knowledge, be rendered visible to the natural eye?<sup>2</sup>

The object of the work, in fact, is to shew that images may be legitimately employed as memorials of sacred events, but not in such a way as to encourage the notion that they are required to remind us of that which, by its very nature, ought ever to be present to our religious consciousness. If employed, they should only be introduced with this especial consideration, that they may fitly ornament a church, and be an outward memorial of that which, without any such aid, will still be present to the mind. Hence the image-worshippers were censured for supposing that images were absolutely necessary as memorials of holy things. To ascribe such importance to them seemed an affront to the spiritual nature of Christianity. "Those who so expressed themselves plainly declared that they were grossly blind; for they acknowledged that they had so bad a memory, that without the help of images they might be easily drawn from the service of God and the love of his saints; they confessed that they were unable to raise the eyes of their understanding above the objects of sense, or to drink from the fountain of eternal light without aid from that which is material and bodily."<sup>3</sup> Since the spirit of man should exist in such close communion with him according to whose image he was created, that it should be able to embrace, without the

<sup>1</sup> *Quantæ sit absurditatis, quantæque dementiæ!*

<sup>2</sup> See l. i. c. 17, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> *Magna se cœitate obrutos esse fatentur, qui vim illam animæ, quæ memoria nuncupatur, ita se vitiatam habere demonstrant, cui nisi imaginum adminiculum suffragetur, ab intentione servitutis Dei, et veneratione sanctorum ejus recedere compellatur; nec se idoneos arbiliantur, mentis oculum supra creaturam corpoream levare ad laudandum æternum lumen, nisi creaturæ corporeæ adjutorio fulvauntur.* L. ii., c. 22.

intervention of any creature, the image of truth itself, which is Christ, so it is madness to say that this spirit needs some memorial to preserve it from forgetting the Redeemer. Such a notion bespeaks rather a shameful weakness than that freedom which is the proper characteristic of the Christian state.<sup>1</sup> The faith of Christians ought certainly not to depend upon outward things, but must be rooted in the heart."

The sense of the above passage is, that the faith of Christians refers to that which is invisible, and must, therefore, be directed, like the heart, to that which is above and unseen. In illustration of this, the writers quote Romans viii. 24 and x. 8. The argument involves a ruling idea of the work, and one which is continually recurring. God, who fills all space, is not to be worshipped or sought in sensual forms, but his constant presence must be enjoyed in a pure heart.<sup>2</sup> "O what an unhappy memory,"<sup>3</sup> it is said in another place, "is that which, in order to enjoy Christ, who never forsakes a righteous heart, needs the sight of an image; and which cannot realize his presence unless it behold his likeness painted on the wall, or represented by some other earthly and material means. A recollection nourished by such methods springs not from the love of the heart, which looks outwardly upon Christ from within; but it is forced upon the mind from without, just as we are constrained to represent to our souls even the most hated objects when they see them depicted by the painter. There is reason to fear, in the case of such people, that if sickness should deprive them of their sight, or that if they should be in any way left without images, Christ, whom they ought to have ever before their eyes, would soon be altogether forgotten." "We Christians, who contemplate with eyes unveiled the glory of God, and into whose image we are changed from glory to glory (2 Cor. iii. 18) must no longer seek the truth by means of images and pictures; we who, by his help, attain to the knowledge of the truth by hope, by faith, and love, must not adopt a method like this."

In answer to the second Nicene Council which had compared

<sup>1</sup> Cum hoc infirmitatis sit vitium, non libertatis indicium.

<sup>2</sup> Non est in materialibus imaginibus adorandus, vel quaerendus, sed in corde mundissimo semper habendus. L. iii. c. 29.

<sup>3</sup> L. vi. c. 2. p. 423.

<sup>4</sup> I. i. c. 15, p. 59.

the images employed by Christians to the cherubim, and the tables of the law, under the Old Testament, a distinction is made between the condition of believers under the two covenants. "We who are subject not to the letter which killeth, but to the Spirit which giveth life; we who are not the natural but the spiritual Israel; we who, despising the visible, look for that which is invisible,—we congratulate ourselves that the Lord has imparted to us not only greater mysteries than images, which, indeed, embody no mystery, can represent; but greater and loftier mysteries than even the cherubim, and the tables of the law, could convey. These were but types of that which was to come; whereas we have in truth and in spirit that which they foreshadowed."<sup>1</sup>

But while, as we have above remarked, the image-worshippers compared their images to holy Scripture, in regard to the sublime objects which they represented, so, in opposition to this comparison, the "Libri Carolini" insist upon the far greater value of the Scriptures considered as instruments of instruction and means of spiritual growth. The holy Scriptures are a treasury rich in all good things; and he who searches it devoutly will rejoice to find that he has discovered that which he believingly looked for.<sup>2</sup>

The sign of the cross had been compared to images by the Nicene Council, as it was by image-worshippers generally. But this, said our authors, was to ascribe far too high an honour to images. The cross was beyond comparison more precious than such things; but while such was the language employed, the writer was falling into the very error which he reprobated, for he was himself confounding the outward sign with the idea which it represented. "By this ensign," it was said, "and not by images, the old enemy was vanquished; by these weapons, and not by strokes of paint, was the might of the devil broken; by this, not by the other method, was man delivered; it was upon the cross, not upon a painted image, that the ransom of the world was laid. This, therefore, and not a picture, is the emblem of our king; the ensign to which his soldiers will ever look."<sup>3</sup>

Objections were also urged against the comparison instituted at the Council between images and the relics of the saints, equal

<sup>1</sup> L. i, c. 19, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> L. vi. c. 30.

<sup>3</sup> L. ii. c. 28, p. 215.

eneration being demanded for both. No slight injustice,<sup>1</sup> it was said, was thereby done to relics, which, as clothes and such things, having touched the bodies of the saints, had acquired a sanctity thereby, and ought to be revered accordingly. But images had received no such consecration. They were formed according to the different degrees of skill possessed by the artist, or workmen, and were sometimes beautiful and sometimes ugly. To show honour to the bodies of the saints was a great requirement of religion, for they reign with Christ in heaven, and their bodies will rise again. But it is far otherwise to exhibit veneration for an image, which has never lived; for which there is no resurrection; but which may, sooner or later, be consumed by rust or the fire.<sup>2</sup>

From this point of view not only was the worship of images, or *προσκύνησις*, treated as a transferring of the honour which God only ought to receive to the creature, and, therefore, as idolatrous;<sup>3</sup> but the use of any sign of reverence, or love, towards a mere dead image, corresponding to that which the bones of the saints might receive, was described as monstrous and absurd, "To express feelings," it was said, "before a senseless form, which it was only natural to utter before the living, was a manifest folly."<sup>4</sup> Several other customs of the Greeks were spoken of with similar contempt. "Do you," it is said to the image-worshipper, "stand and worship, and burn incense, before your images; we, on the other hand, will carefully study the commands of the Lord in the books of the divine law. Do you light up your pictures with tapers; we will employ ourselves with the holy Scriptures."<sup>5</sup>

The emperor here suggests that the following reply might be given to this argument. "You ridicule those who light tapers and burn incense, before lifeless images; but you yourselves light

<sup>1</sup> L. iii, c. 24.

<sup>2</sup> L. iii, c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Adorationem soli Deo debitam imaginibus impertire aut seguitiæ est; si utcunq̄ agitur, aut insanix vel potius infidelitatis, si pertinaciter defenditur (see p. 379); that is, if a man allows himself, in any way whatever, to be led into such practices, he is foolish and stupid. But if he be warned against committing the error, and still commits it, he then proves himself a madman, an infidel, or a heretic.

<sup>4</sup> Aliud est hominem salutationis officio et humanitatis obsequio adorando salutare; aliud picturam diversorum colorum fucis compaginatam sine gressu, sine sine voce vel cæteris sensibus, nescio quo cultu, adorare. L. i. c. 9.

<sup>5</sup> L. ii, c. 30.



tapers, and burn incense, in churches, which are but lifeless buildings." To this supposed objection he answers: "To light up the place consecrated to God's service; to offer up the incense of prayer, and material incense therein, in honour of God, is something very different to lighting a taper before an image which has no eyes that can see, or burning incense before one which is incapable of smelling. So, too, to show honour to the house built by believers, and solemnly consecrated by priests to the majesty of God, is to do something altogether different to that which is done when men absurdly worship and kiss any image, the work of some artist. Churches are the places where the multitude of believers assemble; where their prayers are heard by the all merciful God; where the offering of praise is brought him; and the sacrament of our salvation (the mass) is solemnized; where hosts of angels come together, when the company of the faithful offer the sacrifice by the hands of the priest, and where the word of God resounds, and softens hard hearts with the dew of blessing." The emperor objects to the Greeks, that, as he had learnt from his own ambassadors, and from those of his father, they were in the habit of letting their churches fall to ruin, while they spared no expense in adorning their images. He contrasts with this state of things the noble condition of the churches in his own kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

The Greeks being thus inclined to devote themselves to the worship of images, rather than to the genuine duties of their Christian profession, which it seemed easy for them to forget, the emperor evinced a sound knowledge of their religious state, when he reminded them, that there was no command in the Holy Scriptures respecting image worship, but that there were very plain injunctions directing us to avoid evil and to do good.<sup>2</sup> In regard to the distinctions and definitions by which it was sought to excuse and justify image-worship, he observed, that these niceties might avail among the learned, but could have no weight with the vulgar.

<sup>1</sup> L. iv. c. 3. Pleraque basilicæ in eorum terris non solum luminaribus et thymiamatibus, sed etiam ipsis carent tegminibus, quippe cum in regno a Deo nobis concesso basilicæ ipso opitulante, qui eas conservare dignatur, affluenter auro argenteoque, gemmis ac margaritis et caeteris venustissimis redundent apparatusibus.

<sup>2</sup> Deum inquirendum docuit (Script. S.) per Domini timorem, non per imaginum adorationem, et eum, qui vult vitam et cupit videre dies bonos, non imagines adorare, sed labia a dolo et linguam a malo instituit colibere. Nec picturam colere docuit, sed declinare a malo, et facere bonitatem.

The former, indeed, might not worship the image in itself, but that which it represented, and would thus avoid superstition; but still a stumbling-stone would be laid in the way of the ignorant, who would only worship the object which they could see. If now the Redeemer spoke with such awful severity against those who should offend one of his little ones, how much severer must be the punishment denounced against him, who either compels almost an entire church to the worship of images, or pronounces an anathema on those who refuse to comply? <sup>1</sup>

An appeal having been made to miracles supposed to have been wrought by images, Charlemagne replies, that, in the first place, no sufficient evidence had been brought to prove that such miracles had really been performed: the whole might be a fable. Or, in the next place, if such things had actually occurred, they might have been the work of the evil spirit, who was ever tempting men, by deceitful arts, to do that which is unlawful.<sup>2</sup> Or if real miracles had been wrought, and by the presence of God, still this would not justify the worship of images; since, though it might be his will to perform wonders by means of visible things, in order to arouse the attention of men, it would not follow that he desired the instruments by which he wrought them to be made objects of worship. The account of many miracles in the Old Testament would afford proof of this. The argument drawn from a vision of angels seen in a dream, and to which one of the members of the second Nicene Council had appealed, had no effect upon the emperor. A thing doubtful in itself, he reasoned, could not be established by a dream. There was no one to prove that the person who told the vision had actually seen what he described. A distinction must be made between dreams and things seen with the eye. Some dreams, indeed, were spoken of in the Holy Scriptures as having been produced by the divine Spirit; but these were remarkable cases. Dreams must be viewed according to their origin; that is, as they sprung from a divine revelation, from a man's own thoughts, or from the temptation of the devil.<sup>3</sup> Generally, however, they were calculated

<sup>1</sup> L. iii., c. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Ne forte calliditatis suae astu antiquus hostis, dum mira quaedam demonstrat, ad illicita peragenda fraudulenter suadeat.

<sup>3</sup> Veniunt nonnumquam ex revelatione, multoties vero aut ex cogitatione aut ex tentatione, aut ea aliquibus his similibus. J. iii. c. 25.

to deceive. With regard to the appearance of the angel, if such a thing really occurred, the precept of the apostle, "try the spirits whether they be of God," ought to be applied, and, according to the word of the Lord, they would have to be considered good or bad by their fruits. But as there was something unholy in the worship of images, that could not be a good spirit which would exhort men to such a practice.<sup>1</sup> As we have before stated, an appeal was frequently made by those who defended image-worship, to the image said to have been sent by Christ to King Abgarus. But neither the truth of the account, nor the genuineness of the pretended correspondence between Christ and Abgarus, was admitted in the book of Charlemagne.<sup>2</sup>

But the worship of images was not by any means ranked in the same class with the veneration entertained for the saints. The latter was recognised as, in some measure, a pure Christian duty, but always with such limitations as a sacred regard for the honour of God required. The images by which the supposed miracles had been wrought, having been compared in the Nicene Council to the brazen serpent, the emperor says: "Let them, when assailed by sickness, go to their images, and look upon them, so that if they be not cured by thus looking upon them, they may return to the Lord, and believe that, by the mediation of the saints, they shall obtain health from him who is the sole giver of both health and life."<sup>3</sup> It ought not to be supposed, it is said, that the extravagant and foolish homage paid to the saints by some men can be an acceptable service to those who in their earthly life sought not their own honour, but had often rejected the manifestation of reverence which was justly their due.<sup>4</sup>

Although this book appeared under the name of an emperor, the Byzantine king-worship was very severely handled by the writer. Especial notice was taken of the idolatrous character of the titles conferred on the sovereign, and of the homage which the Byzantine princes had always demanded of their people.

<sup>1</sup> L. iii. c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> L. iv. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Solus Deus adorandus, martyres vero, vel quilibet sancti venerandi potius, quam adorandi. L. iv. c. 27.

<sup>4</sup> L. iii. c. 16.

The Greek image-worshippers had referred particularly to the worship, *προσκύνησις*, rendered to the busts of the emperors. This led Charlemagne to protest strongly against such a practice. "What madness," he exclaimed, "to attempt to defend one wickedness by an appeal to another!<sup>1</sup> This usage is an off-shoot, and relic of the old heathen idolatry, and ought to be utterly banished by Christianity.<sup>2</sup> It is the duty of Christian priests to oppose such practices as are inconsistent with the gospel." Express objection is also made to the somewhat heathen style in which the empress Irene and her son affixed their signatures to the acts of the Council, assuming the title of *divi* (*θεῶι*), and giving to the imperial rescripts the epithet *divalia* (*θεῖα γράμματα*<sup>3</sup>). Severely, too, is the servility of the bishops assailed. They had ventured to speak of the emperor as the restorer of pure Christian doctrine, and to compare him, in that character, with the apostles.<sup>4</sup> This gives occasion for drawing a contrast between the emperor and those holy men.<sup>5</sup> The emperor, it had been said, derived his wisdom from the same spirit as the apostles. On this it is remarked, that this was not to attribute any great excellence to the emperor, for that the spirit spoken of was no other than the Holy Spirit, and all true Christians have the Holy Spirit, as the apostle Paul says, "He who has not the spirit of Christ is none of his." Rom. viii. 9.

It is represented as an especial disgrace to the Synod, that it suffered itself to be guided and instructed by a woman, and that she was allowed to take part in its proceedings, all of which was contrary to the proper character of a woman, and to the direct injunction of the apostle Paul, that a woman should keep silence

1 Nam quis furor est, quære dementia, ut hoc in exemplum adorandarum imaginum ridiculum adducatur, quod imperatorum imagines in civitatibus et plateis adorantur, et a re illicita res illicita stabiliri paretur? L. iii. 15.

2 Cum apostolicis instruamur documentis, nullam nos dare debere occasionem maligno, cum talem gentilibus occasionem demus mortalium regum imagines adorando, et ab his exempla sumendo.

3 L. i. c. 3. Qui se fidei et religionis Christianæ jactant retinere fastigium; qui et intra ecclesiam novas et ineptas constitutiones audacter statuere affectant, et se Divos, suaque gesta Divalia gentiliter nuncupare non formidant.

<sup>4</sup> O adulatio cur tanta præsumis?

<sup>5</sup> Tauta est distantia inter apostolos et imperatores, quanta inter sanctos et peccatores, l. iv. c. 20.

in the congregation. The teaching and admonitions of a woman ought to be confined to her domestic circle. This is farther proved by Titus ii. 3,<sup>1</sup>

We have remarked in the history of the constitution of the church, that Charlemagne ascribed to the popes a primacy over all the churches, and a certain degree of authority in the direction of all ecclesiastical affairs, and that he readily agreed with them in such matters. This is farther proved by the "Libri Carolini," in which, in other respects, he expresses himself with so much freedom, and openly differs in some important points from the Roman church.<sup>2</sup> Thus he says: that as the Frankish church had ever agreed with that of Rome in purity of doctrine, so, on the occasion of Pope Stephen's arrival in France, it agreed with it in the arrangement of its singing.<sup>3</sup> He adds, that through him, their agreement in the choral services of the churches had been still farther extended, not only in France, but in Germany, Italy, and among some of the northern tribes lately converted to Christianity.<sup>4</sup>

But as he here says that, after Christ, the church of Rome should be sought as the main source of help, so we find that Christ was to him the highest of all objects in his religious convictions; and that nothing could move him to sacrifice aught which he had learnt of the truth through the illumination of the spirit of Christ, to the dictate of a Romish bishop. This is shown by his conduct in regard to images. His protest against the second Nicene Council was sent to Pope Hadrian by the Abbot Angilbert.<sup>5</sup> The pontiff, according to the existing principles

<sup>1</sup> Aliud est enim matremfamilias domesticos verbis et exemplis erudire; aliud antistilibus sine omni ecclesiastico ordini, vel etiam publicæ synodo quaedam inutilia docentem interesse: cum videlicet ista, quæ domesticos debortatur, eorum et suum in commune adipisci cupiat profectum; illa vero in conventu ventosæ tantum laudis, et solius urrogantiae ambiat appetitum, iii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Thus he says, c. l. c. vi. p. 51, respecting the relation of the other churches to that of Rome: Omnes Catholice debent observare ecclesie, ut ab ea, post Christum, ad munendam fidem adiutorium petant, quæ non habens maculam nec rugam, et portentosa hæresium capita caleat, et fidelium mentes in fide corroborat.

<sup>3</sup> Ut quæ ecclesie unitæ erant unius sanctæ legis sacra lectione, essent etiam unitæ unius modulationis veneranda traditione.

<sup>4</sup> L. I, c. vi. p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> It is still a matter of doubt, whether the emperor sent his book against the Nicene Council to the Pope before, or after, the meeting at Frankfort.

of the Roman church, could, of course, not assent to the sentiments contained in this protest.<sup>1</sup> He replied to the emperor in a writing, which deserves no comparison with the “*Libri Carolini*,” in respect to its theological character, and was certainly not calculated to shake convictions which were so deeply seated.<sup>2</sup> In the synod which met at Frankfort on the Main, in 794, and at which the legates of the Pope were present, the great question in dispute was discussed, and by the second canon of the Council, the “*adoratio et servitus imaginum*” was formally condemned. A gross injustice, however, was committed against the second Nicene Council in the assertion, that the same homage was decreed to images as to the Trinity. The Council had expressly declared that such ought never to be the case.<sup>3</sup> It is probable, that care was designedly taken to avoid any minute inquiry into this matter. Had this caution not been observed, a dispute might have arisen between the Frankish church and the papal legates.

#### REACTION OF THE SECTS AGAINST THE PREVAILING SYSTEM.

We have still to speak of a reaction of Christian consciousness in the church against that ecclesiastical system which had been framed out of a mixture of Christian and foreign elements; of a reaction arising from the side of increasing sects at war with the dominant church; whence proceeded a series of the most remarkable manifestations of that religious spirit, which appeared in the middle ages under the form of the ecclesiastic theocratic system. We see in the period at which we are now arrived, the beginning of this reaction. The germ of the movement was indicated by the struggles which Boniface endured with the opponents of the Roman hierarchy in Germany. But its development was destined to receive a mighty and continued check from the hostility of the Greek church.

<sup>1</sup> Mansi Concil. T. xiii. f. 759.

<sup>2</sup> The object which the Pope, as he himself says, wished to effect by this reply, *ad incredulorum satisfactionem et directionem Fraucorum*, was not likely to be reached by the course which he took.

<sup>3</sup> *Ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut d. Trinitati servitium aut adorationem non impenderet, anathema judicarentur.*

Notwithstanding the persecutions, carried on by fire and sword, there were still existing in the East remains of those sects which had arisen in the first times of the Christian church, from a mixture of Christianity with the Dualistic doctrines of the ancient Oriental creeds. The compound thus founded had been receiving a constant supply of fresh nourishment from Parsism.

But the opposition of these sects to the dominant church had itself assumed a different character by the modification of their principles. Originally, the contest arose from a mode of Oriental reasoning, which reduced the peculiar doctrines of Christianity to its own rule. These sects which had thus been formed could not even now sufficiently overcome their originally narrow tendencies, so as to admit Christianity in its purity and fulness. But the opposition now existing formed one of the main elements by which Christianity was falsified and corrupted, and through which those doctrines were introduced, which are foreign to the religion itself. Whilst the sects of which we are speaking contended, from the first, against the blending of Christianity with Judaism, they now especially assailed those doctrines and practices which had arisen out of this mixture of the principles of the Old with those of the New Testament. In this respect the controversy was calculated to promote the diffusion of intelligence in the church.

Thus there appeared, at this period, a sect which had its origin as above described, but the immediate seat of which was the province sometimes designated as Armenia, and sometimes Syria. The adherents of this sect were known under the name of Paulicians. It is the opinion<sup>1</sup> of the two writers who have afforded the most important information respecting these people, and from whom later writers have drawn all their materials when describing the Paulicians, that they were a branch of the Manicheans; and had descended from a woman in the province of Samosata, named Callinike, who lived about the fourth century, and whose two sons, Paulus and Johannes, were the first founders of the sect. From Paulus it was that it derived its well-known name; and

<sup>1</sup> Petrus Siculus is one of the authors referred to. He was sent by the Greek emperor Basilius Macedo to Tephrikain, in Armenia, to treat concerning a change of prisoners. See the history of the Paulicians published by the Jesuit Rader. Ingoldstadt, 1604, and the work of Photius against the Manichees, which, in respect to the contents, is but little different from that of Petrus Siculus. It is published in the *Anecdota graeca sacra et profana*, ed. J. C. Wolf, Hamb. 1722, t. i. et ii.

there were some who believed that the names of both the founders were combined in the common appellation ; or in the form *Παυλωανναί*.<sup>1</sup> But powerful objections exist to this notion.<sup>2</sup> With regard to the charge of Manicheism, it was the common habit of those times to describe whatever had any connection with Dualism as Manichean ; and no distinction was made between Manicheism and Gnosticism. We find, however, not the least trace of anything in the Paulicians which could justify our regarding them as of Manichean origin.<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, there is much in their system directly opposed to such an idea. Thus, they ascribed the creation of the world to a spirit in conflict with the true God ; that is, to a Demiurgos, in the sense of the anti-Jewish Gnostics ; whereas Mani regarded the creation as a noble demonstration of the power of the supreme God.

In examining the organization of the sect, we miss the distinction, so characteristic of the Manichees, of a twofold state, of an esoteric and exoteric class ; of electi and auditores. Although Photius sometimes alludes to an esoteric and exoteric party among the Paulicians, such a distinction was certainly contrary to the spirit and character of this sect. They were, it is probable, falsely accused of making the distinction here spoken of, partly that an explanation might be found for an apparent contradiction in their doctrines ; and partly because it was conceived possible to shew that what was most essential to the Manichean theory might be discovered also in theirs.

But it would be far easier to prove that it was characteristic of the Paulicians to regard no distinction as higher than that of the true Christian ; that they recognized no dignity as nobler than that of a *χριστιανός* or *χριστοπολίτης* ; and nothing, therefore, as more valuable than the perfect and genuine knowledge of the truths which correspond to such a position. To purify these truths from foreign additions, and to make them generally known

1 Photius. l. i. c. 2.

2 We must agree in this point, as in most of that which we have to say respecting this sect, with the acute and profound treatise of Gieseler. See his *Theolog. Stud. and Kritik*. B. ii. heft i. 1829.

3 The only semblance of Manicheism and Parsism to be found in the accounts given of them is that which is said by Johannes Ozniensis, who, however, deserves but little respect. He ascribes to them, in his treatise against the sect, a sort of worshipping of the sun, p. 87, but this is not in accordance with their known principles.



was their highest aim. They regarded the Holy Scriptures as having a far higher value than they could have supposed them to possess according to Manichean principles. For certain it is that they earnestly adhered to Scripture, not merely in imitation of the common Christian practice ; not merely as a means to promote the circulation of their principles ; but from a sincere desire (as appears from the manner in which their teachers write to the members of the sect, and from the ordering and naming of their church-officers) to cling, in all respects, to the New Testament, and especially to the apostle Paul. In this respect, as also in their main practical tendencies, they were in close agreement with the sect of Marcion.<sup>1</sup> But we know from the statements made by Theodoretus respecting the great number of Marcionites in Armenia, that that sect was widely diffused in the country of the Paulicians. It is not difficult, therefore, to believe that they might be a branch of that Gnostic party which they so much resembled.

We also gather from what Theodoretus and Chrysostom say, that these later Marcionites, dispersed as they were among a rustic and unlettered people, were themselves ignorant and uncultivated, and but little acquainted with the original doctrines of Marcion himself. Hence it might happen that, especial circumstances awakening a spirit of reform among these degenerate people, it might be the especial object of the movement which followed to restore a pure Christianity, according to the peculiar intention of the original sect, and in conformity with the principles of St Paul's epistles. And thus the Paulicians might have their beginning. Or we may suppose, as is indeed possible, that whilst, through the study of the New Testament, a reforming spirit was awakened among the founders of this sect, they themselves being descendants of the old Gnostic party, the movement of itself took a direction in the line of Marcionitism, this being further favoured by the blending of the Gnostic elements with a practical Christian piety, promoted by the study of the New Testament. With regard to the account given of Callinike, we see

<sup>1</sup> It is also worthy of remark, that in the anathemas, as published by Tollus, *Insignia Itinerar. Ital.* p. 106, the Marcionites, but not the Paulicians, are mentioned with the Bogomiles and Euchites, and other sects of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Hence they might be considered, perhaps, as a branch of the Marcionites.

no sufficient reason for altogether rejecting<sup>1</sup> the statement that two men, Paulus and Johannes of Samosata, the sons of a woman named Callinike, and a devoted friend of Manicheism, or Gnosticism, laboured in establishing the sect of which we are speaking.

But however this may be, it is plainly a point of no importance in our inquiries respecting the Paulicians; and we may safely regard the connection between the sons of Callinike and that sect as involving much which is fabulous. It is very certain that no idea was ever entertained by the Paulicians themselves of pronouncing the same condemnation on the sons of Callinike which was pronounced upon Mani, with whom their enemies so maliciously connected them.<sup>2</sup> Nor can it be said that this was a mere invention for concealing their actual opinions. They were very far from ever allowing themselves to be moved, from mere outward considerations, to use such language in regard to those whom they viewed as the founders or teachers of their sect.<sup>3</sup> It is evident that the traditional name of Paulicians was the sole cause of the effort made to discover some Paulus as the author and founder of the sect. Hence many writers have endeavoured to trace the name to Paulus, an Armenian, one of the later teachers of the party. There was, doubtless, a teacher of that name,<sup>4</sup> but he could not have given it to the sect, which had been long before known by the common appellation of Paulicians. It appears, therefore, that these attempts to explain the name of the sect have no connection with historical tradition, but are merely founded in the notion that the title must necessarily have

<sup>1</sup> Gieseler thinks that the whole account of the sons of Callinike ought to be treated as a fable. The Paulicians, it is thought, by always appealing to Paul and John, as genuine apostles, gave rise to the idea of calling them Paulians. Afterwards, in order to deprive them of the honour of naming themselves after two apostles, their enemies published the report that their founders were two heretics, Paul and John. This explanation appears too artificial. Although the Paulicians did attribute an especial worth to the Gospel of John, it does not appear that they bound themselves to that apostle as they did to Paul.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. l. i., c. 4, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Petrus Siculus asserts, indeed, that the Paulicians were real disciples of Mani,—of the sons of Callinike: *εἰ καὶ κενοφωνίας τινὰς ταῖς πρώταις ἐπισυνῆψαν αἱρέσεσι*: but he allows that they themselves appealed only to the later chiefs of the sect, and acknowledged them only as their teachers.

<sup>4</sup> Photius says, l. i., c. 18, of this Paulus: *ἐκ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Παύλου μερὶς οὐκ ἐλαχίστη τῆς ἀποστασίας καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔλκειν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκ τῶν τῆς καλλινίκης παιδῶν τὸ μυσαρὸν τῶν Μανιχαίων ἔθνος νομίζουσιν.*

been derived from some heretical teacher of a defined epoch. But the very form of the name is opposed to such an idea. Had the above supposition been correct, the name would have taken the form of *Παυλικοί*, or *Παυλιανοί*. It is highly probable, however, that *Παυλικοί* had the same origin as the name *Παυλικίανοι*, the received appellation of the sect. We may also believe, with some certainty, that this sect, like that of Marcion, making a strong distinction between Peter and Paul, and adhering firmly to the latter, sought by every means to establish the pure doctrine of Christianity according to his teaching, and that this led to their being Paulicians, as Photius himself intimates.<sup>1</sup> An effort was made in after times to trace the appellation to the name of some founder of the sect.

But the man most deserving of notice at this period as the chief founder of the Paulicians, now appearing under that name, was Constantine, who laboured towards the end of the seventh century, and chiefly during the reign of the emperor Constantinus Pogonatus. He was a member of the Gnostic, or, probably, Marcionite sect, then widely spread through the districts of Syria and Armenia, and dwelt in the borders of Mananalis, not far from Samosata.

It was of vast importance to the improvement of Constantine, both in knowledge and character, that having hitherto been utterly ignorant of the New Testament, or having read it only in fragments, he at length became master of a perfect copy of the sacred book. It was given him by a deacon, who, on being delivered from prison (probably among the Saracens), was hospitably taken by Constantine to his house, and manifested his gratitude for the entertainment which he received there for many days by this gift of the New Testament. Constantine read it with great zeal. It made a deep impression upon his mind. This was especially the case in regard to the epistles of Paul. His thoughts and life took a new direction. It is but another instance of the hateful and unjust mode in which men allow themselves to regard heretics, when it is said of Constantine and his followers, that they exhibited so much love for the New Testament only to escape by this hy-

<sup>1</sup> L. ii., c. 10, p. 196. From the apostle Paul, οὗ ψευδεπώνυμοι παραγραφονται although he is unjust in saying that they so called themselves.

pocrisy, from the punishment which they dreaded, and to accomplish their purpose with less difficulty or danger. We are far more justified in believing, that the fundamental ideas of the New Testament, exhibited in the form in which they are there found, operated powerfully on his mind, and that he felt himself called to be a reformer, not only in regard to the dominant church, but to the sect to which he belonged. But he was still compelled by the principles of that sect, from which he could not set himself free, to acknowledge the principles of Dualism. Since he had commenced the study of the New Testament while subject to these views, so he believed that that which he here read of the conflict between darkness and light, flesh and spirit, the world and God, was but a confirmation of his old ideas. His Christianity was one derived from the writings of Paul, and partially of those of John, but in the forms of Gnostic dualism. By this means the Paulicians hoped to effect a reformation of the church—a revival of the church of the apostolic age.

In order to characterize himself as an apostolic reformer, Constantine assumed the name of Silvanus. His example was followed by the other distinguished teachers of the sect, whose custom it was to call themselves by the name of some one or the other of the companions of the apostle Paul. This served to indicate the object of their labours. They desired to be animated entirely by the spirit of that apostle ; and to carry forward his work, as it had been continued by his own immediate associates. For twenty-seven years, that is, from 657 to 684, did this man labour with unceasing energy for the extending of his sect. Its increase excited against it a new and violent persecution. The emperor above named despatched in the year 684, or in one of the latter years of his reign, an officer of state, Symeon, to seize the head of the sect ; to punish the obstinate adherents to its doctrines with death ; and to commit those who shewed tokens of repentance to the bishops, that they might be instructed in the knowledge of orthodox doctrine. Constantine, if we may believe the report of his enemies, was, at the command of Symeon, stoned to death by his faithless disciples, his ungrateful adopted son, Justus, being the first to raise his hand against him.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The memory of Constantine's death appears to have been kept up by the name of the place *σωρός*, the stone-heap. Photius i. 16.

But the greater number of those who were committed to the care of the bishops, persisted in their earlier convictions, and when Symeon himself, animated by a desire to lead them back to the faith of the church, undertook to converse with them, his imperfect knowledge as a layman of what was called orthodoxy, and his freedom from prejudice, left him open to the feeling that many of their doctrines, though opposed to the received opinions, were sound and scriptural; while the deep impression made upon him by their Christian piety, inclined him more and more to embrace their views.

Thus impressed he returned to Constantinople, and after having spent three years more in his official capacity, he found himself constrained to take his departure secretly from the capital, and thus escape from a position in which he was constantly compelled to belie his inward convictions. He proceeded to Kibossa in Armenia, where he joined the remnant of Constantine's party, and being placed at its head, assumed the apostolic name of Titus. Having laboured three years in this character, and converted many to his faith, he was accused, with his followers, before the bishop of Colonia, by the same traitorous Justus, at whose instance Constantine had been stoned to death. The emperor Justinian II. was hereby induced, in the year 690, to order a new inquiry to be instituted respecting the sect; and the consequence was that Titus, with many others, died upon the scaffold. Paulus, one of those who narrowly escaped from this persecution with life, now became the head of the sect. He appointed his eldest son, Gegnaesius, to whom he gave the name of Timotheus, his successor. But from this period, a schism existed in the sect. The origin of this dispute may be traced to the contest which arose between a Catholic and a Protestant principle. Gegnaesius founded his proceedings upon the principle of a traditional communication of spiritual gifts in the line of a visible succession; and upon this he established his own claims to the first place in the sect. But his younger brother, Theodorus, refused to acknowledge his title to this pre-eminence; asserting that he needed no such outward medium of communion; that he had received the spirit from above immediately, and from the same fountain as the father.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. 18: *μη πατρόθεν εκ του λαβόντες δευτέρα δώσει μετασχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐκ της πρώτης δωρεᾶς και ὅθεν ὁ πατήρ ταύτην εἴλκυσε.*

In the reign of the emperor Leo, the Isaurian, the Paulicians were again accused at Constantinople; and the emperor summoned Gegnaesius to the capital, to undergo an examination. The duty of conducting the inquiry was entrusted to the patriarch. Gegnaesius was able to answer satisfactorily the questions put to him; but he assigned a different meaning to the orthodox forms of the church to that which they outwardly bore. Thus the patriarch asked him, why he had separated from the Catholic church? He answered, that it was far from his wish to separate from the Catholic church, in which alone salvation was to be found. But by the Catholic he meant the sect of the Paulicians, who believed themselves appointed to restore the true church of Christ. Again, the patriarch asked him, why he did not render becoming honour to the mother of God? Gegnaesius immediately pronounced an anathema against every one who refused to honour the mother of God, as her into whom Christ entered and from whom he came, and who is thus the mother of us all. But he meant the invisible and heavenly communion of God's people; the Jerusalem which is above; the mother of divine life, the way to which Christ opened for the redeemed; and which he as their forerunner first entered. The patriarch asked him, why he did not worship the sign of the cross? Gegnaesius replied by pronouncing an anathema upon every one who did not reverence the cross, but he understood thereby Christ himself, described symbolically by the name of the cross. The patriarch then inquired why he disregarded the body and blood of Christ, and did not partake of them? Gegnaesius gave to this question also a satisfactory answer; but by the flesh and blood of Christ he understood the doctrine of Christ, of which he was a partaker. So too he answered respecting baptism; but he regarded Christ himself as the living water, the water of life.

The emperor having been informed of the result of this examination, Gegnaesius received a safe conduct, and was thus secured against all further danger of persecution.

A suspicion may here arise that the emperor Leo, as an enemy to image-worship, might feel favourably disposed towards the Paulicians, and allow his influence to be employed in securing a happy termination to the above inquiry. It is evident that a certain degree of relationship existed between the religious tendencies of the Paulicians, and those of the party opposed to

images. The former were known to be violent antagonists of image-worship: they began their career by attacking the dominant church on account of its idolatry; and, according to an Arminian writing against the Paulicians, only lately brought to light,<sup>1</sup> some probability exists that the struggle about images first led many to oppose the ruling church; and then, influenced by this reforming spirit, to join the sect of the Paulicians. We cannot, indeed, assert that all who were enemies to image-worship were necessarily favourable to the Paulicians. The contrary is shown to be the case from the conduct of the later Iconoclast emperors. We know also that the more the Iconoclasts were accused of heresy, the more anxious they were to prove their orthodoxy, and remove all suspicion on the subject. Hence it must always be a matter of doubt whether the Emperor Leo did really favour the Paulicians as supposed. Still, if the report of the examination of Gegnaesius may be depended upon, it is scarcely conceivable that the patriarch should have allowed himself to be so easily deceived, unless he had good reason to wish to be so. He would otherwise have put questions which, notwithstanding the acknowledged skill of the Paulicians in this respect, must have compelled Gegnaesius to give definite replies.

Gegnaesius died after labouring in his calling for thirty years. He was succeeded by his son Zacharias; but a rival, named Joseph, contended with him for the chief place, and hence a new schism was created in the sect. Joseph, however, apprehending danger from the Saracens, removed the seat of his labours to Antioch, in Pisidia; and thus the sect extended its operations beyond the limits of Armenia into the provinces of Asia Minor.<sup>2</sup> The suc-

<sup>1</sup> We mean the controversial tract of Johannes of Oznun, so named from his native city of Oznun, in the province of Tascir in the greater Armenia. He was born in 668, and was appointed in 718 Catholicos or primate of the Armenian church. His works were published by the Mechitarists of the island of St Lazari, near Venice, with Aucher's Latin translation, in 1834. He says, in his discourse against the Paulicians, that, when they first came into company with simple and inexperienced people, they began by attacking images, p. 79. In p. 89 he says that many enemies of images, having been expelled the Catholic church, joined the Paulicians. It were to be wished that those who are versed in Armenian literature would examine the original sources for an explication of the historical force of the words, *ad quos Paulicianos Iconomachi quidam ab Alvanorum Catholicis reprehensi advenientes adhaeserunt.*

<sup>2</sup> If the account of the Byzantine historian does not give too early a date to that which, we believe, happened at a later period, this sect had already established itself in

cessor of Joseph was Baanes, who, from the cynical mode of life which he favoured and practised, was called "the dirty," *ὁ ῥυπαρός*; which rendered both him and his party hateful. But at this time, that is at the commencement of the ninth century, the sect which, through internal divisions, and the influence of corrupt teachers, was beginning to degenerate, received a fresh impulse from the energy of a new reformer sprung from among its members.

This was Sergius, born in the district of Ania, not far from the city of Tavia, in Galatia, and who had become attached to the sect in his early youth.<sup>1</sup> The occasion which led to this was remarkable, and tends to shew how the neglect with which the religious wants of the people were treated by the clergy, led many to join the Paulicians. Sergius happened to meet with a woman who belonged to the sect; and, in the course of conversation, she asked him, whether he had ever read the Gospels? Sergius answered in the negative, adding that this duty belonged to the clergy only; and that the mysteries of the holy Scriptures were too sublime for the laity. The woman immediately replied, that the Scriptures were appointed for all, and stood open for all, for that God would have all men come to the knowledge of the truth. It was the object, she added, of the clergy to prevent the people from acquiring this knowledge. They, therefore, spoke obscurely respecting the mysteries of the divine word, and thus hoped to prevent the laity from discovering their corruptions of the truth. Hence it was, too, that only fragments of Scripture, violently separated from the context, were allowed to be read in the churches. She then asked him of whom the Lord spoke (Matt. vii. 22), when he said that they had wrought miracles, and had prophesied in his name, and yet should not be acknowledged by him at the

Thrace, in the reign of the emperor Constantinus Copronymus. The historian relates, under the 11th year of that emperor's reign, that having again conquered the Armenian province of Melitene, he had transferred many Paulicians to Constantinople and Thrace.

1 Petrus Siculus, p. 54, in speaking of Sergius, says nothing of his having sprung from a Paulician family. But Photinus says, p. 95, that his father Dryinos was a member of the sect, and that Sergius had, consequently, been instructed in its doctrines from his childhood. Still, that which he himself relates of his conversation with the Paulician woman contradicts this statement, and leads to the belief that Sergius, at that time, still belonged to the Catholic church.



last? or who the children of the kingdom were, of whom he said that they shall be cast out? (Matt. viii. 12.) "They are those," she said, "whom you call holy: of whom you say that they work wonders,<sup>1</sup> and cast out evil spirits; and whom you honour, to the insult of the living God."

These words made a deep impression upon the mind of Sergius. He studied zealously the writings of the apostle Paul. They taught him what belongs to a living Christianity, and conveyed to him a clearer understanding of the distinction between what is divine and what is profane, between the spirit and the flesh. The strongly marked distinction which he thus observed impelled him to attack that mixing of Christianity with the world which characterized the dead ecclesiastical system of the state religion. But he connected his practical opposition with the theoretical opposition of the Gnostic dualism. Assuming the name of Ty-chicus, he laboured as a teacher for thirty-four years with ardent zeal and unwearied activity. During this period he travelled into all parts of Asia, everywhere preaching the doctrines of his sect, confirming the congregations already formed, and founding others. He could, indeed, without impropriety, say, in one of his epistles to the Paulician churches, "I have journeyed from the east to the west, from the north to the south, preaching the gospel till my knees trembled."<sup>2</sup> He seems also to have imitated the apostle Paul in this, that he would not be maintained by others, but supported himself by the work of his own hands. Thus he laboured as a carpenter.<sup>3</sup> His enemies could not refuse to bear testimony to his severe morality, to his heart-winning benevolence and gentleness, irresistible even among those most hostile to his views.<sup>4</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> It may here be questioned, whether the Paulician woman here meant that the accounts given of the miracles of the saints were fictitious, or that the miracles were wrought, but by the power of the Demingos, whom these people served.

<sup>2</sup> These words have some importance, as indicating the geographical position of the place at which he began his labours.

<sup>3</sup> Ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ μέχρι δυσμῶν καὶ (ἀπὸ) βορρῶς καὶ (μέχρι) νότου ἔδραμον κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἑμοῖς γόνασι βαρήσας, Pet. Sic. p. 60, where the words are quoted more completely and exactly than in Photius. L. i. p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> Καὶ ταπεινὸν ἦθος καὶ δεξιώσεως κατεσχηματισμένος τρόπος καὶ ημερότης οὐ τοὺς οἰκείους ὑποσυναίνουσα (perhaps it should be ὑποσαίνουσα) μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τραχύτερον διακειμένους ὑπο λαιίνουσά τε καὶ συλαγωγούσα, Phot. l. i. c. 22, p. 120. Naturally, all this goodness in a heretic could only be a mere mask, assumed for the purpose of enabling him the more easily to deceive his victims.

greatly contributed to his success with many, that at the beginning he contented himself with pointing out to them the doctrines of practical Christianity, which had been sacrificed to the interests of a formal orthodoxy. He pursued this course till he had won the confidence of his hearers, and could more safely lead them into conflict with the dominant church.<sup>1</sup> Thus in the same manner in which he himself was induced to join the sect, many of the laity were led to attach themselves to it by the course which he and his followers pursued. They made known to their hearers the words of the Gospels and of the apostle Paul,—words of which they had hitherto remained ignorant; and they then proved to them how opposed, in many respects, the principles of the church were to the divine truth.<sup>2</sup> He even obtained a favourable reception among many of the monkish orders.

But in the consciousness of his zeal as a reformer Sergius often spoke of himself in a tone which, however much may be allowed for the hyperbolic style of oriental oratory, can yet scarcely be regarded as consistent with Christian humility. Thus he writes to one of his communities: “Let no one deceive you; but be comforted by the knowledge that you have received this doctrine from God; for we write to you in the full confidence of our heart, seeing that I am the watchman at the door, and the good shepherd, and the leader of the body of Christ, and the light of the house of God. I am with you always, even to the end of the world; <sup>3</sup> for when I am absent in the body, I am present in the spirit.”<sup>5</sup> And to the same community (that of Colonia, in Armenia) he also wrote: “As the primitive congregations had their pastors and teachers, so have you received the illuminating torch,

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Petrus Siculus says, p. 6: *χαλεπόν τὸ μὴ συναρπασθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀπλουτεροῦς, διότι πάντα τὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου λόγια διαλέγονται.*

<sup>3</sup> Thus Peter Siculus charges him with having perverted many monks, priests, and levites, p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> Photius i. 21. p. 115 quotes the words only thus far, but, by their connection with what follows, which is found in Petrus Siculus, p. 64, that which Sergius says of himself is somewhat softened.

<sup>5</sup> *Μεδεῖς ὑμᾶς ἐξ ἀπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, ταύτας δὲ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἔχοντες παρὰ θεοῦ θαρσεῖτε, ἡμεῖς γὰρ πεπεισμένοι ὄντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ θυρωρὸς καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς καὶ ὁδηγὸς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ ὁ λόχνος τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Ἐι γὰρ καὶ τῷ σώματι ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι· λοιπὸν χαίρετε, καταρτίζεσθε καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐιρήμης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν.*

and the clear-shining light, and the guide to salvation.”<sup>1</sup> He then quotes Matt. vi. 22, by which he probably intended to intimate that the clearness of their internal vision,—their developed perception of what is divine,—had led them to recognize and acknowledge him as the light.

If we, indeed, dare trust the accounts given by his opponents, we should be obliged to admit that Sergius had carried his self-exaltation to self-idolatry, since, according to some statements, he did not shrink from assuming the name of the Paraclete, and the Holy Ghost. But we have every reason to regard such accounts with suspicion. Independent of the internal improbability which they present, it appears from expressions of the Paulicians, in which we might expect to find, if in any, the application of such titles to their master, how utterly opposed they were to an error of this nature. Thus it is said, that they prayed in the name of Sergius, as the Holy Spirit; for they used as the sealing of their prayers the words: “The prayer of the Holy Spirit is, ‘Have mercy upon us.’”<sup>2</sup> But very certain it is, that in this passage, evidently framed in correspondence with Rom. viii. 26, Sergius was not meant by the Holy Spirit. Either the intercession of the Holy Spirit, as related to the Supreme God; or, according to Paul, the inward prayer of believing desire, as a prayer of the Holy Spirit himself, praying in and out of the souls of believers, is intended by the expression referred to. If, therefore, there be any truth whatsoever in the accusation, that Sergius spoke of himself as the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete,<sup>3</sup> the most that can be believed is, that he described himself not as the former, but as the latter. His opponents not distinguishing the one from the other, they unjustly interpreted his words, as if he, no more than they, made a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete. But supposing that he did make this distinction, and by the Paraclete understood, as Mani did, an illuminated teacher promised by Christ; one, that is, who should purify his doctrine from all unholy admixtures, and unfold its true meaning; this character he might possibly then assume. But as

<sup>1</sup> He calls himself *λαμπάδα φαιεῖνῶν, λύχνον φαίνοντα.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ἡ εὐχὴ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐλεήσει ἡμᾶς,* Phot. i. 114.

<sup>3</sup> Phot. l. i. p. 111.

Sergius did not regard himself as the first and only reformer of corrupted Christianity, he could not properly claim to be considered as the promised Paraclete ; as the teacher, that is, through whom the faithful were first brought to a consciousness of the truth purified from all the elements of error. While, however, such was the case, yet, although he acknowledged the earlier teachers of the Paulicians, in their proper character as teachers, Sergius claimed for himself the honour of being the great teacher promised by Christ ; the man through whom a reformation of the whole church was to be accomplished ; and superior to all the rest, who were to be regarded but as his forerunners. Thus we may observe a regular gradation of rank. His predecessors he called *ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*, but himself *λαμπὰς φαινή* ; the *λύχνος φαίνων*, or *λυχνοφανῆς ἀστήρ*. But in answer, again, to this opinion, it may be said that he described the apostle Paul alone as the great teacher, as the one through whom pure Christianity must be brought to light ; that he spoke of himself as standing in the same relation to this apostle as that in which Tychicus stood to him ; that he wished to be considered in no other light than in that of a messenger and disciple of Paul ; of one who taught his hearers not the doctrines of his own wisdom, but the doctrine of that apostle. By much the most probable conjecture therefore, is, that Sergius was as far from representing himself to be the Paraclete, as he was from pretending to be the Holy Ghost ; and that it is only by the misinterpretation of those passages in which he speaks of himself as the organ of the Holy Ghost, or as the Paraclete, in respect to the restoration of pure Christianity, that the false charges of which we have spoken can be brought against him.<sup>2</sup>

1 *Ἄ διαγγέλλει μὴ τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας εἶναι, τοῦ δὲ διδάξαντος καὶ ἀπειστακότου Παύλου παραγγέλματα.* Photius himself remarks the contradiction involved in the supposition that Sergius could say such lofty things of himself, and yet assume so subordinate a position in respect to Paul. He endeavoured to explain this contradiction by a very forced idea. Thus he supposed the latter to be those who had only been just gained over to the sect, the exotics ; while the former were those who were perfectly imbued with the knowledge of the mysteries. L. i. p. iii. This notion is at once refuted by the fact that the same predicates are employed in the epistle of Sergius in reference to the whole community.

2 From some such misinterpretation, probably, arose the anathema which is found among those pronounced upon the Bogomiles or Euchites, if Sergius is to be understood by the person named Tychicus. It is there laid to his charge, that he had trans-

The operations of Sergius were begun under the most favourable circumstances. The Greek emperor, Nicephorus, who reigned at the commencement of the ninth century, had positively refused to allow himself to be made an instrument in the hands of the hierarchy for persecuting the Paulicians. He left them, on the contrary, to enjoy the most perfect freedom in the practice of their religion in Phrygia and Lycaonia.<sup>1</sup> It is natural to inquire whether Nicephorus had been led to pursue this gentle course towards the Paulicians through any favourable impression made upon his mind by their habits of living ; whether the inducement had been furnished by his dislike to the domination of the clergy ; or whether he was influenced by principles altogether different to those usually adopted in the treatment of heretics ? With regard to the latter supposition, it is to be observed, that there existed a small right-minded party in the Greek church, which regarded it as unchristian to persecute heretics with the sword ; and which declared that it was opposed to the duty of priests to shed the blood of those whom they ought to lead to repentance. Such were the men who, when Michael Curopalates, the successor of this emperor, had been induced, by the patriarch of Constantinople, to denounce death against the heretics, laboured to prevent the execution of the law.<sup>2</sup> And one of the most zealous defenders of orthodoxy, a fanatical champion even of image-worship, Theodorus Studita, abbot of the monastery of that name at Constantinople, happily appears as a representative of this small but Christian-minded party. Thus he writes to a bishop of Ephesus, Theophilus, who had declared it a glorious work to put Manicheans to death,<sup>3</sup> “ What say you ? Has not the Lord in the gospel forbidden us to pull up the tares, lest we pull up the wheat with them ? Has he not told us to let both grow together till the har-

ferred that which is said in Holy Scripture of God the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, to his spiritual father—to one of the coryphæi of his sect, and thus had been guilty of the following perversion : τυχικῶ, τῷ πάσις τὰς περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ῥήσεις εἰς τὸν πνευματικὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα παρερμηρεύσαντι. See Jacobi Tollii *Insignia Itinerarii Italici*, p. 111.

<sup>1</sup> Theophanes Chronograph. f. 413, ed. Paris.

<sup>2</sup> Although we are not always justified in giving credit to the tales which the Byzantine historians, full of hatred to him, relate respecting his connection with the Paulicians.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. ii. 155.

vest? (Matt. xiii. 29.) Can you then call it a most glorious thing to root up the tares?" He then quotes a beautiful passage from Chrysostom's Homilies on St Matthew's Gospel; and adds, "Nor may we pray against heretics: much rather ought we to pray for them, even as the Lord prayed upon the cross for sinners. We must no longer appeal to Phineas or Elias as examples. The distinction between the Old and New Testaments ought to be carefully kept in view. When the disciples would have acted towards the Samaritans in the spirit of the former, they were rebuked by Christ, because they thereby showed themselves opposed to the good and gentle spirit which should animate his followers." He next cites 2 Tim. ii. 25, and says, we must not punish the ignorant, but teach them. The magistrate, indeed, bears not the sword in vain; but he is not to use it in the case of those against whom the Lord has forbidden him to draw it. Their authority regards men in a civil capacity, and they are to punish those who break the laws of the state. But their power of punishment has no connection with that which is purely inward. The right to punish, in this case, pertains solely to those who have the government of souls, and the punishments which they inflict are spiritual; as, for example, excommunication,

But a few individual voices could not avail against the dominant spirit of the age. Iconoclasts and Iconolatras agreed together in the determination to persecute this sect. But still it continued to increase; and traces of its progress are easily discoverable under the successors of Nicephorus, the emperor Michael Curopalates, and Leo the Armenian. The general zeal against the worship of images could not induce the latter monarch to pursue a milder course towards the Paulicians. He probably wished to prove by the severity with which he treated them, his entire devotion to the pure doctrine of the church. Thomas, bishop of Neocesarea, in Cappadocia, and the abbot Paracondaces, were nominated Inquisitors of the Paulicians. Such of them as manifested repentance were to be delivered to the bishops for in-

<sup>1</sup> Hom. xlvii.

<sup>2</sup> Σωματίων γὰρ ἄρχοντες, τοὺς ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς ἀλόντες ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς κολλάειν, οὐχὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ (we ought probably to read οὐχὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς) κατὰ ψυχὴν. Ἐὼν γὰρ ψυχῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦτο, ὡν τὰ κολαστήρια ἀφορισμοὶ καὶ αἰλοπαῖ ἐπιτιμίαι, f. 497.

struction, and to be reconciled to the church. The rest were to be punished by the sword.

The fury with which the inquisitors fulfilled their office, induced the Paulicians, who inhabited the city of Cynoschora, in Armenia,<sup>1</sup> to form a conspiracy against these barbarous persecutors, and they eventually murdered them. They then fled to that part of Armenia which was subject to the Saracens, who readily afforded them, as enemies of the Roman empire, a hospitable reception, and assigned them the city of Argaum,<sup>2</sup> as their place of abode. The kind treatment which their brethren had thus received from the Saracens, and the continued persecutions to which they were exposed at home, induced vast numbers of the Paulicians to seek the same refuge. Here also the head of their sect, Sergius, fixed his residence. Their power gradually increased: they found themselves sufficiently strong to make attacks upon the neighbouring provinces of the empire; and the prisoners which they took, they zealously endeavoured to convert to their faith. Sergius himself but little approved of such proceedings. He sought to restrain his people from a course like this; but his counsels were disregarded. Happily for him, however, he could fairly assert, that he was guiltless of the evils which ensued, and that he had continually, though in vain, intreated his followers to make no prisoners among the Romans.<sup>3</sup> Having carried on his labours for some years longer, he was murdered by one Tzanio of Nicopolis, a fierce zealot for the doctrines of the church. This event took place in the year 835,<sup>4</sup> and the crime was perpetrated on a mountain to which Sergius had gone alone, in order to pursue his customary occupation of felling wood for the use of his buildings.

<sup>1</sup> Οἱ λεγόμενοι κυνοχωρῖται, Phot. i. p. 128. Οἱ κατοικοῦντες κυνὸς τὴν χώραν. Petr. Sicul. p. 66. This community was designated by Sergius as the Laodicean.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀργαοῦν, perhaps Arcas. See Gieseler, p. 91. Unless this city, which is described as built on a hill, received its name from the mountain Argæus, and no other can be suggested. The inhabitants are named by Petrus Siculus Ἀργαοῦνται. Sergius denominates them Colossians, Pet. Sic. p. 66.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐγὼ τῶν κακῶν τούτων ἀναίτιός εἰμι, πολλὰ γὰρ παρήγγελλον αὐτοῖς, ἐκ τοῦ αἰχμαλωτίζειν τοὺς ῥωμαίους ἀποστήναι, καὶ οὐχ' ὑπήκουσάν μοι. Pet. Sic. p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> See Gieseler's remarks on the Chronology in the treatise above referred to, p. 100.

With regard to the doctrine of the Paulicians, the only two sources of information which we possess, furnish us with but scanty details; and such as are utterly insufficient to afford any complete or distinct idea of the sect. Starting with the supposition that the Paulicians derived their origin from the Manichaeans, the authors of these accounts might very probably believe their opinions and representations to be corrupted by Manichaean absurdities. But it is far more likely that the system of the Paulicians sprung from the dualistic theory, for they seem to have ascribed the visible creation to the evil principle, and to have converted this into a Demiurgos. As we find, however, in all the older gnostic systems, the Creator of the world distinguished from the evil principle, the doubt may arise, whether, since in the Paulician system the Demiurgos, as the principle of evil, was opposed to the kingdom of the Most High and perfect God, this did not cause the actual distinction between the two systems to be overlooked. The doctrine of the Paulicians, as described to us,<sup>1</sup> namely, that the wicked Spirit, or the Demiurgos, arose from darkness and fire, seems to have some reference to this distinction, there being here two elements which together formed the essence of the Demiurgos, that is, Darkness, the peculiar principle of the wicked, and Fire, the principle of the siderial world, in opposition to the divine life, as in the Clementines, in the doctrine of the Zabier, or Johannites. Thus the Paulicians, like Marcion, may have adopted three fundamental principles, or two fundamental principles, strictly so considered, and a middle principle. At all events, they regarded the distinction between a Demiurgos, the author of the material world, and the all-perfect God, from whom only the world of spirits proceeds, and who cannot become visible to the material world, as constituting the peculiar characteristic of their sect in relation to the Catholic church, which they accused of confounding together the Demiurgos and true God, while it worshipped only the former. When they met with Catholic Christians, they said, "you believe in the Creator of the world; but we believe in him, of whom the Lord says, that he has never revealed himself either by a sensible voice or form, like

<sup>1</sup> Phot. ii. 3.



the world-creator of the Old Testament (John v. 37.)<sup>1</sup> Photius says,<sup>2</sup> that all the Paulicians did not thus exclude the perfect God from the work of creation. Some of them ascribed the creation of the heavens to the good God; and to the evil principle, the creation of the earth, and all that lies between heaven and earth; while others attributed the creation of heaven itself to the Demiurgos. The Paulicians may, no doubt, have understood the word "heaven" in different senses, and may thus have affirmed and denied that it was the creation of the perfect God. Thus the name of heaven was applied to the visible heavens; the starry heavens; which the Paulicians regarded as a part of the creation and the kingdom of the Demiurgos, and as contrasted with those of the perfect God. But when the term heaven is employed as signifying the spiritual heaven, far exalted above the starry world, and as symbolizing the region of the divine, then heaven is to be considered as the creation and kingdom of the Almighty. The good God and the Demiurgos have each their own heaven.<sup>3</sup> Hence it is possible that Photius, not clearly understanding the various meanings given to the word "heaven" among the Paulicians, may have unjustly ascribed to them a distinction which they did not intend to affirm. It is, however, also possible that a difference of opinion may have arisen among the Paulicians themselves, in reference to the more or less imperfect theory of dualism. We find this to have been the case with the sects who held similar notions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

According to the Paulician system, the entire material world proceeds from the Demiurgos, who formed it out of the matter which is the source of all evil. The soul of man, however, is of heavenly origin, and has a germ of life answering to the being of the highest God. Thus human nature consists of two antagonist principles; but this union of the soul with the body, of a different

<sup>1</sup> See Pet. Sic. p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> ii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> According to the representation given of the doctrine of Marcion by the Armenian bishop Esnig, in the fifth century, and which Professor Neumann has translated in Illgen's *Journal for Historical Theology*, iv. B. i., the perfect God has his dwelling in the third heaven.

nature, and in which all sinful desires have their root; this its banishment into the sensual world, a world which owes its existence to an altogether different creator, and in which it is held captive, cannot possibly be the work of the supreme and perfect God. It must be the work, therefore, of that hostile Demiurgos, which has sought to draw the germ of divine life into his own empire, and there to hold it prisoner. According to this account we must ascribe to the Paulicians an anthropogony and anthropology corresponding to these principles. They must either have deduced their theory from the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, connecting it with the supposition that the Demiurgos is perpetually striving to entice the souls which belong to a higher sphere into the material world; or, like the old Syrian Gnostics, they must have believed that the Demiurgos was able to drive from its original seat the germ of divine life into the visible form of the first man, created after the type of a higher world; that this germ is ever in process of development; and that hence is the beginning of human souls.

We might have derived an important help in our inquiries into the opinion of Sergius on this subject from a fragment of one of his epistles preserved by Photius and Petrus Siculus, but unfortunately it is disconnected and imperfect, and its meaning is very obscure. "The first act of fornication, in which we are ensnared with Adam, is a good; the second is a greater (that is, fornication or sin), of which Paul says: 'Whosoever committeth fornication, sinneth against his own body;'"<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 18. To understand these words aright, in the sense of Sergius, we must connect them with what he says afterwards, but not immediately.<sup>2</sup> Thus it is evident, from the following words, that Sergius here understood the term *πορνεία* in a spiritual sense; that is, as a falling away from the Supreme God,—from the true body of Christ, or the pure Christian communion, which existed among the Paulicians, and

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ πρώτη πορνεία, ἦν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδάμ περικείμεθα, εὐεργεσία, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα μείζων ἐστὶ, περὶ ἧς λέγει καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος· ὁ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει. See Phot. l. p. 117, Petr. Sicul. p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> The words: ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν σῶμα χριστοῦ, εἴ τις δὲ ἀφίσταται τῶν παραδόσεων τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, τουτέστι τῶν ἐμῶν, ἁμαρτάνει, ὅτι προστρέχει τοῖς ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦσι καὶ ἀπειθεῖ τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις.

the perfect rule of faith which they enjoyed, to the reprobate church which belonged to the Demiurgos. But if the whole is to be taken in a spiritual sense, we must understand what is said of Adam's fornication in the same manner; and as his unfaithfulness to the Supreme God could not in any wise be regarded as a good act either for him or his descendants, nor as such, according to the reasoning of Sergius, so we must conclude that by the unfaithfulness of which he spoke, he meant an unfaithfulness in respect to the Demiurgos, and not the Supreme God. His argument must, therefore, be as follows: The Demiurgos endeavoured to hold the first man in constant bondage, and to prevent him from ever arriving at a consciousness of his higher nature, lest he might rise superior to the kingdom of the Demiurgos. Therefore it was that he gave him the command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Adam was disobedient; and this his disobedience, this his fornication, by which he broke the fetters which bound him to the Demiurgos, proved the means through which he and his race became aware of the superiority of their nature, and of its exaltation above the kingdom of the Demiurgos, and hence he could rightly call the action referred to good, it being a necessary preparation for the redemption which was to follow.

But the expression *περικείμεθα τὴν πορνείαν* does not agree so well with this spiritual theory. It evidently alludes to something visible, and adhering. We must, therefore, interpret it metaphorically. The consequences of that *πορνεία* of the first man, which rendered it a benefit for him and his descendants, have been transmitted to us; but this would still not be a natural explanation of the word. Nor are we quite justified in taking all which Sergius said in a spiritual sense. Whatever forced allegorizing explications of this kind we may employ in the interpretation of such writings, we cannot believe that Sergius understood the words of Paul as signifying a spiritual fornication, a renouncing of pure doctrine, which would be to make them involve a contradiction. It is altogether most probable, that he took them, at first, in their literal sense, and then found them to involve a warning against *πορνεία* in a peculiar sense; which could not appear superfluous to the Paulicians, who insisted so strongly upon the

necessity of moral purity.<sup>1</sup> But he added,<sup>2</sup> according to the known principles of spiritual interpretation, a spiritual signification in reference to the departure from pure doctrine, as spiritual fornication.

These considerations might lead us to suspect that where the discourse refers to the *πορνεία* of Adam, something sensual is meant, and that Sergius regarded the union between Adam and Eve as a *πορνεία*, an eating of forbidden fruit ; but which sin was still a benefaction, inasmuch as it led to the development and the manifold individualizing of the germ of the divine life in man. Or, on the other hand, we must suppose that he regarded the union of the soul with a body formed out of matter as a *πορνεία* ; and his argument may be thus traced : The Demiurgos enticed a heavenly soul to descend into the material world ; from this soul proceeded all other human souls ; it is the mother of all spiritual life in man. Now, in so far as, according to the first constitution, the development of the spiritual life in man promoted too manifold a selfishness ; while in the way described the ruin of the kingdom of the Demiurgos was prepared, so in this respect especially the *πορνεία* might be viewed as a benefit. The expression *περικείμεθα τὴν πορνείαν* closely agrees with this mode of viewing the subject ; since at the birth of each man there is an enveloping of the soul with the body, as signified by the *περικεῖσθαι τὴν πορνείαν*.

The supposition of an original relationship of the soul to God makes an important difference between the Paulician and the strict Marcionite doctrine. Thus the former insisted upon an enduring union between the souls originally related to God, and the Supreme from whom they were descended ; a union which the power of the Demiurgos could not destroy. They also believed in an original revelation of God, which being communicated to all such souls as had been banished into the kingdom of the Demi-

1 It is an evident perversion of the words of Sergius, if Petrus Siculus intends us to understand therefrom that Sergius did not regard fornication as a sin, but justified it. We see from this example how much cause there is to look with suspicion at the charges brought against the Paulicians.

2 We must recollect that Petrus Siculus, who having cited the first words, says, *ἐπί- γίσις λέγων*, quotes them not in their connection, but with the omission of an intervening passage.

urgos, might act upon them in opposition to his influence. The God of the spiritual creation enlightens every man who cometh into the world. This is the application which they make of the introduction to the gospel of John;<sup>1</sup> and thence they deduce all the expressions of a consciousness of truth in human nature. It depends, they suppose, upon the will of man, whether he will give himself up to the power of the wicked or not; and whether, therefore, he suppress the germ of divine life in his soul, more and more, or follow the awakening voice of revelation, and so promote the continual growth of that divine principle in his inner being. But still, however low a man may sink, he is never, seeing that he is by nature related to God, excluded altogether from that heavenly and external revelation. The enemy, say the Paulicians, has not so entirely won the souls of those who have yielded themselves up to him, but that, darkened as they are, some beam of heavenly truth may reach them. The good God ever has been, ever is, and ever will be; and, therefore, can never cease to reveal himself.

From what has been here said, it is easy to understand what place the doctrine of redemption occupied in the system of the Paulicians. The single rays of light revealing the incomprehensible God,<sup>2</sup> and falling upon the souls held captive in the kingdom of the Demiurgos, are not sufficient to raise them to perfect communion with the Supreme, or to perfect freedom. The good God must impart himself, in some perfect way, to humanity, in order to enable it to enter into communion with Him, and free itself from the power of the Demiurgos. This was effected by means of the Redeemer. No distinct account is given of his person and nature in the system of the Paulicians. Thus much, however, is certain. He came down, as a heavenly being, from the heaven of the good God; from that higher sphere, which is the fountain of all divine life; that home of the Almighty; and when he had finished his work upon earth, he reascended to his

<sup>1</sup> See Phot. l. ii. p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> Photinus l. ii. c. 3, οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' οὕτω κατεκράτησεν οὐδὲ τῶν ἐκόντων προδεξιότων ἑαυτοῦς τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ ἐχθρὸς, ὡς μηδαμῆ πρὸς μηδεμίαν ὄλως τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγγλὴν τοὺς εσκοτισμένους ἐπιστρέφειν, ὅτι ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς ἦν αἰεὶ καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται.

<sup>3</sup> He is described as the ἀόρατος and ἀκατάληπτος, Phot. ii. 147.

heavenly fatherland, with which it is his purpose to bring all believers into communion.<sup>1</sup>

According to the views of the Paulicians on matter, and material bodies, they could not ascribe a material body to the Redeemer. Such a body would have been inconsistent with his perfect, sinless nature. That which is divine cannot enter into union with the kingdom of darkness. They avoided, however, falling absolutely into the error of the Docetae, and, like the Valentinians, seem to have attributed to the Redeemer a body of a nobler kind, and which was only in appearance similar to those which are earthly. The matter of which this body was composed, he brought from heaven, and it passed through Mary as a channel, but without taking aught from her.<sup>2</sup> We must not here forget that the native country of the Paulicians was Armenia. But Monophysitism was the prevailing feature of the Armenian church, and of this doctrine there was a ruder and a wilder form. The upholders of the one, employed this formulary : Christ consists of two natures ; but in the actual union of the two natures, there is but one nature, as there is but one person in him, that is, the one nature of the Incarnate Logos. According to this account, however, of their faith, they were able to keep the predicates of the divine and human nature sufficiently distinct from each other, to accommodate themselves in some degree to the Catholic doctrine. The supporters of the other, and ultra system of Monophysitism, exposed themselves by their excesses, as for example, by their “Aphtharto docetismus,” to the charge of Docetism.<sup>3</sup> Thus they refused to acknowledge the likeness of the body of Christ to other human bodies ; they would not allow that he had *passiones secundum carnem, sive per carnem* :<sup>4</sup> they denied that he was *ex virgine incarnatus*, but *in virgine*. The doctrine of the Paulicians respecting the person of Christ might easily find a support in these expressions of the ultra Monophysites.

From the point of view which they had thus taken, the Paulicians could have no cause to adopt the worship of Mary ; but must

<sup>1</sup> Hence the expression *ἡ παρὰ γὰ θεοτόκος, ἐν ἣ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ κύριος.*

<sup>2</sup> *Δι' αὐτῆς ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος διεληλυθέναι.* Phot. i. 7.

<sup>3</sup> See the work of Johannes Ozniensis, p. 111, against these ultra-Monophysites.

<sup>4</sup> *Ne forte duas naturas in uno Christo innuere videamur, sed ipsummet verbum divinum erat, quod utraque tum humana tum divina obibat.*

rather have felt themselves called upon to oppose it, the more closely it was connected with superstitions so hateful to their minds. In order to compel their adversaries to renounce this object of excessive veneration, they availed themselves of those passages of the evangelical history which seem to favour the notion, that Mary had other sons after the birth of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> This argument must have been decisive with those who regarded marriage rites as inconsistent with perfect holiness. Petrus Siculus says,<sup>2</sup> “that full of hatred against Mary, they would not even allow her a place among good men.” Hence we may conclude, that they employed many passages of the evangelical history to lower the religious character of Mary, as for example, those which related to her want of faith.

According to the view which they took of the body of Christ, the Paulicians could scarcely regard it as capable of actual suffering. He was rendered superior to suffering by the dignity of his divine nature. It is highly probable that they taught, that the Demiurgos, when he learnt that the power of Christ threatened to overturn his kingdom, excited his servants to crucify him; that this, however, was done in vain; since Christ, by the superior nature of his body, could suffer from no wound. Or they might, perhaps, ascribe to the crucifixion, as the Manicheans did, a symbolic meaning; teaching, that it signified Christ’s descent into the realms of the Demiurgos, with that divine life of his with which he overspread them. That this was the case is rendered probable by the fact, that the Paulicians were ready to honour the cross as a symbol of Christ, in so far as he spread out his hands in the form of a cross.<sup>3</sup> But they could ascribe no part of the work of redemption to his suffering; and the idea of a divine satisfaction, effected thereby, had, probably, no place in their system. They spoke against honouring the cross, as it was but mere wood, or an instrument of punishment for malefactors,<sup>4</sup>—a sign of male-

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. 22.

<sup>2</sup> P. 18, μηδὲ κἄν ἐν ψιλῆ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνθρώπων τάττειν ἀπεχθῶς ἀπαριθμήσει.

<sup>3</sup> Καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ εἰς σταυροῦ σχῆμα τὰς χεῖρας ἐξήπλωσε, and in the anathematisms given by Tollius, the Paulicians are designated as νοοῦντες ἀντὶ σταυροῦ τὸν χριστὸν, ὃς ἐκτείνας, φασὶ, τὰς χεῖρας τὸν σταυρικὸν τύπον διεχάραξε. Insignia itiner. Ital. p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> The expression *κακούργων ὄργανον* in Photius i. c. 7, p. 23, is obscure. It properly means an instrument of which malefactors avail themselves; and hence those who

diction, Galat. iii. 13. They could have said nothing of this kind, had they believed in Christ's atoning sufferings.

It was the wish of these people to restore an apostolic simplicity to the church. Thus they asserted, that among the varieties of outward forms and ceremonies in the dominant church, the true life of piety was lost; and they contended against every species of trust in outward things, especially the sacraments. They carried this opposition so far, that they rejected altogether the formal celebration of baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Hence they argued, that Christ never intended to institute a water baptism for all times; but that by this baptism he had signified a spiritual baptism, in which, by means of his doctrine, that living water,<sup>1</sup> he imparts himself to all mankind.<sup>2</sup> In the same manner they also believed, that the eating of the flesh, and drinking of the blood of Christ, consisted only in a lively communion with him by his doctrine, by his word, which are his true flesh and blood. It was not of material bread, or material wine, that he spoke, as his flesh and blood, but of his words, which ought to be for souls, what bread and wine are for the body.

Still, if we may give credit to the account of Photius,<sup>3</sup> these Paulicians, if seized with dangerous sickness, were accustomed to have a wooden cross laid upon them. If they recovered, they threw it away. According to the same account, they allowed their children to be baptized by captive priests; but they, at the same time, affirmed, that all this, though it might be useful to the body, could be of no avail to the soul. If this be true, we can only reconcile it with what we know of the doctrine of the Paulicians<sup>4</sup> by the consideration that they had heard many things related, concerning the wonderful efficacy of the sign of the cross, and of infant baptism, in cases of sickness. Nor is it improbable that many ignorant members of their sect might have been eye-wit-

employ it to torment other men would be the *κακοῦργοι*. This, however, would be without meaning; and the expression must be regarded as elliptical; and as signifying that the cross is an instrument whereby the wicked are punished.

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. i. 9, Pet. Sic., ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον, ὃν ὁ κύριος εἰδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ δείπνου, ἀλλὰ συμβολικῶς τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ αὐτοῖς εἰδίδου, ὡς ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον.

<sup>3</sup> I. c. 9, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Gieseler also reasons.



nesses of such marvels, and draw from them a conclusion corresponding to their want of ability to enquire properly into their causes. They ascribed to the Demiurgos the government of the material world, and hence they might say, as in the case of the supposed miracles of the saints, that these outward things, which were wrought by the servants of the Demiurgos, had received from him that virtue which they exercised on the body, while they left untouched the inner life which is exalted above the reach of his influence. Photius might not follow a mere popular report in the statements referred to, but they mainly regarded some few of the Paulicians who were less informed than the rest, and who in the moment of distress allowed themselves to act inconsistently with their received faith. We must not, therefore, deduce any theory from these accounts as to the actual creed of the Paulicians. It is evident, however, that they regarded the blending of faith with Judaism and with politics, as the cause of the corruption which prevailed in the church. They desired to restore both in life and doctrine the simplicity of the apostolic age, and they called themselves, therefore, the Catholic church, Christians,<sup>1</sup> (*χριστοπολίται*), in opposition to the confessors of the Roman state religion (*ῥωμαίους*). It was their object in every case to imitate the apostolic rule; and they carefully avoided every thing which seemed to have even a remote connection with either heathenism or Judaism. Hence they would not call their places of religious assembly by any name which corresponded to the Jewish or heathen word for temple: *ναοί* or *ἱερά*, but simply by the unpretending appellation of a place of prayer *προσευχαί*.<sup>2</sup> Hence we may also conclude that prayer was an essential part of their services.

Among the corruptions of the Christian element they particularly numbered the institution of the priesthood, according to the model of the Old Testament priesthood. They viewed Christianity in its peculiar nature as involving a sublimer communion, a more living union of its members, and as consequently excluding any distinction between the clergy or priests and the laity. There were, indeed, persons among them appointed to perform

<sup>1</sup> The name *χριστοπολίται* occurs in the anathematisms of the Euchites in Tollius, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. i. 9.

certain services in the church ; but they were only to be regarded as members of the society ; they were distinguished by no particular dress, nor by any other outward mark, from the rest of the congregation.<sup>1</sup> The very names of their church offices were chosen with the most strict regard to the exclusion of any comparison between them and those of the priesthood. They were considered as purely spiritual. Thus the terms *ιερείς* and *πρεσβύτεροι*, were rejected with equal care. The latter had a tinge of Judaism about it no less than the former, because it brought to mind the sanhedrim assembled against Christ.<sup>2</sup>

At the head of the sect appeared the general instructors and reformers, as a Constantinus, Sergius, and others, who, awakened as it was supposed by the spirit of God, were designated by the title of apostles and prophets. Sergius numbers four of this rank.<sup>3</sup> Then followed those who were known by the name of teachers and pastors (or *διδάσκαλοι* and *ποιμένες*), and next, the messengers of the faith (*συνέκδημοι*), or missionaries who, having been the companions of the illuminated leaders of the sect, had been formed by the conversation of those eminent men, and were now to be regarded as living organs, chosen for the diffusion of that spirit which had been originally given to the founders of their faith. Next came the *νωτάριοι* or copyists,<sup>4</sup> so called, it is probable, because they were employed in transcribing those original documents which served as sources of knowledge to the sect. It was a principle with the Paulicians that all might be enabled, under the immediate illumination of the divine Spirit, to draw knowledge from the pure fountain of Christ's own doctrine ; and the interpretation of Scripture was probably one of the duties assigned to these *νωτάριοι* or writers.

Sergius had been regarded as the leader of the whole sect ; as called to be a prophet ; and, at his death, no one was considered

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. p. 31, οὔτε σχήματι, οὔτε διαίτη, οὔτε τινὶ ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ βίον σεμνότερον ἐπιτελοῦντι τὸ διάφορον αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος ἐπιδείκνυνται.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. i. p. 31, διότι τὸ κατὰ χριστοῦ συνέδριον οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ συνεστησαντο. Petrus Siculus mentions among the peculiarities of the Paulicians τὸ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποτρέπεσθαι, ὅτι οἱ πρεσβύτεροι κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου συνήχθησαν καὶ διὰ τουτο οὐ χρὴ αὐτοὺς ονομάζεσθαι.

<sup>3</sup> Photius, p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Gieseher compares them with the Scribes of the New Testament.

of sufficient dignity to be viewed in the light of his successor. His own immediate disciples, therefore, the *συνέκδημοι*, each possessing an equal share of authority, were placed at the head of the society. The guardians and interpreters of the written word had been at first subordinate to these officers.<sup>1</sup> But when, in after times, the immediate disciples of Sergius, and first recipients of the Spirit, no longer remained, the notarii, the men, that is, who had studied with the greatest diligence the principles of their faith in its original sources, and who were most skilled in their interpretation, obtained the largest share of influence. Those who spoke only according to the immediate dictation of some present awakening, were under the control of those who were learned in the Scriptures. Thus the knowledge which had been acquired by the careful study of the original sources of religious intelligence was considered as of more worth than an immediate inspiration, unaccompanied by the fruits of inquiry.<sup>2</sup> Hence the appellation of *ἄστατοι*, the meaning, however, of which is not very strictly defined. It reminds us of the *ἄστατεῖν* of the apostle Paul, 1 Corin. iv. 11, whence it was probably derived, and where it is used as descriptive of the life of wandering and persecution led by the first missionaries of the Gospel. We may conclude, therefore, that a higher class of *συνέκδημοι* was intended when this word was used. Such an opinion agrees with what Photius relates of these persons, who are spoken of as the elect among the disciples of Sergius.<sup>3</sup> One of their number was the leader of the Cynochorites, in the insurrection above described, against the imperial inquisitors, although, in this respect, he was certainly not acting in conformity with the principle of his founder.

On proceeding to examine the moral system of the Paulicians, we find them charged by their opponents with crimes of the most odious character. The fiercest of their adversaries, Johannes Ozniensis, boldly asserts that they were guilty of every species of licentiousness; but it is evident that accusations brought with such violence and passion are deserving of little attention. The

<sup>1</sup> Phot. i. c. 25, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> In the anathematisms in Tollius, p. 144, we read, ὧν (συνεκδήμων) οἱ προβαθμιώτεροι Νωτάριοι κατονομαζόμενοι τὴν τῶν βδελυκτῶν Ὀργίων ἐνεχειρίζοντο ἐπιμίλειαν.

<sup>3</sup> Τῶν τοῦ Σεργίου μαθητῶν οἱ λογιώδεις.

history of sects, regarded as heretical, presents, in every age, a similar amount of unsubstantiated charges. Among them may be especially noted the shameful accusation, that children were murdered in order that their blood might be employed in the rites of witchcraft or magic. We have already remarked that the misunderstanding, or wilful perversion, of an expression used by Sergius, led to his being charged with describing fornication as innocent. That the Paulicians disregarded the Old Testament laws, which prohibit marriages within certain degrees of consanguinity, and which prohibition they believed to spring from the Demiurgos, might also favour the belief that they considered no relationship, however near, as properly a hindrance to the marriage union. But by this contempt for the laws of the Demiurgos, the Paulicians might have been led to disregard every kind of moral restriction. But we must here remark, that the enemies of the Paulicians are obliged to acknowledge, that Baanes and his followers were expelled from the sect on account of their lax principles in these respects; that Sergius appeared as a reformer in opposition to the corrupt influence of Baanes; and that the worst opponents of the party confess, though ascribing the whole to hypocrisy, that Sergius exhibited the force of a moral spirit. And although among some of the Armenian Paulicians, as Johannes Ozuiensis shews, the principle of Parsism, in regard to marriage, had been diffused by the efforts of Baanes, this cannot be said of the whole sect. It is certain that the Paulician system, on the whole, tended to promote an earnest, severe, and moral spirit; and that it contemplated, as the proper fruits of its theoretical principles, the emancipation of the oppressed religious consciousness; the deliverance of the germ of divine life, kept down by the power of sensuality; and its development in boundless activity. Whatever immorality could be discovered in the system might be traced entirely to a deviation from the spirit of its founders, or the original character of the sect. In itself it was rather calculated to foster a severe ascetic disposition, such as we see in fact marking the religious bodies which, whether in earlier or later times, could be viewed under a similar light. So far, however, as existing information will allow us to judge, no direct ascetic principles were admitted by the Paulicians themselves; and the practical Christian spirit which their reformers imbibed from the study of the

New Testament might lead them to adopt a somewhat freer course of life than that of the older sects, to which theirs was related. Thus they protested against many of the precepts of the dominant Greek church. The apostolic injunctions respecting the flesh of strangled animals was still in force in that church ; but the Paulicians refused to be bound by such niceties, and probably viewed them as savouring of Judaism. Hence they were accused of defiling themselves by eating of unclean things. They equally disregarded the fasts of the church ; and even in those of their own sect, they partook of cheese and milk.<sup>1</sup>

But the defence of falsehood, which, it is said, they carried to a wide extent, has furnished grounds for a still weightier charge against the Paulicians. Photius accuses them of regarding it as a trivial matter to deny their faith, and asserts that they did it a thousand times.<sup>2</sup> The account which we have given of the manner in which Gegnaesius, during his examination at Constantinople, endeavoured to escape by using language with a double meaning, affords an instance of the laxity of their principles in regard to truth. We find, indeed, frequent indications among the Theosophic sects of the existence of a notion that falsehood may be sanctified by a pious intention. But in such sects, the principle here referred to is taken in connection with the belief, that only a certain class of superior natures are capable of knowing pure truth. As Christianity, through the institution of a sublimer communion, proceeding from the same general religious consciousness, embracing all within its circle, had established, in opposition to the old distinction of the exoteric and esoteric in religion, a new principle of veracity, and had torn away the supports on which a partial falsehood had hitherto rested,—so the old mode of justifying a lie had again found admission, wherever, that fundamental principle of Christian communion being set aside, the separation-wall which the gospel had cast down was restored. It cannot, however, be said of the Paulicians, that they would have done

<sup>1</sup> Among the anathemas directed against the Paulicians, as seen in Tollius, p. 146, is the following: ἀνάθεμα τοῖς τῇ βρώσει τῶν θηρίων τῶν θησιμαίων μελουμένοις καὶ τοῖς πᾶσαν μὲν ἐκτρεπομένοις χριστιανικὴν νηστείαν κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς δοκούσης αὐτοῖς τεσσαρακοστῆς τυροῦ τε καὶ γάλακτος ἰμφορουμένοις.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. i. 8, 25.

ought in this respect, to prevent the reformation of the prevailing system. They recognized the injury which the consciousness of God had suffered in the human heart; the narrow room afforded for the germ of divine life; the point from which the announcement of divine truth, to be made for all, must proceed; and the union of these great objects with the interests of their own particular creed. If, therefore, they allowed a large share of liberty in the practice of deception, when the honour of God, and the cause of truth were concerned, they yet acknowledged, in common with other Christians, the importance of bearing testimony to the truth; and when they resorted to "accommodation," it could only have been as a means of promoting or defending some vital principle.

We have already observed, how greatly the Paulicians revered the written documents of their faith. The Old Testament, however, was not included in these valued books. It was regarded as derived, in common with Judaism, from the Demiurgos. Like the ancient Gnostics, they referred the words of Christ (John x. 8<sup>1</sup>) to the teachers of the Old Testament; whom they accordingly viewed as having come not to call godly souls to a consciousness, and free development of their sublime nature, or to the knowledge of the Almighty, but rather to win them away from his service, and entice them to the worship of the Demiurgos. But that they refused to acknowledge any connection between the Old and the New Testament, is scarcely reconcilable with the manner in which, according to Photius,<sup>2</sup> they interpreted the words of John i. 11. In his view, they must have understood by the *ιδίους*, the *λόγους προφητικούς*. But if such was actually their interpretation, we can only reconcile the two assertions by supposing that they represented the prophets as designedly engaged in promoting the reign of the Demiurgos, while unconsciously, and against their will, they were actually instruments in the hands of the Supreme God, and were employed by him in smoothing the path for the Redeemer who was destined to free mankind from the tyranny of the Demiurgos. But Photius has not given the words of the Paulicians (or of Sergius), in the form in which they were delivered by these people themselves; and as they

1 See Phot. i. p. 24. Petr. Sic. p. 18.

2 I. c. 7, p. 163.

might be easily misunderstood, we may suspect that such was the case in this instance. Another interpretation of the words may be suggested; one far more consonant with the system of the Paulicians, and especially with their explanation of John i. 9. Thus, since they regarded the material world as the work of the Demiurgos, and utterly opposed to the Supreme God, but the souls of men as related to the divine nature, and especially designed to receive the revelation of the heavenly Logos, so it must very naturally appear that by the *ιδίοις* those men were meant who bear in themselves a slumbering consciousness of the Godhead.

From what we have remarked above, it must be evident that they had a profound respect for the authority of the apostle Paul, and that his epistles formed the principal fountain of their religious intelligence. According to the marginal notes of Petrus Siculus (p. 18), at least in reference to the later Paulicians, we learn that, like Marcion, they had a letter of the apostle addressed to the Laodiceans. Whether this was the epistle to the Ephesians, only under another name, or an apocryphal letter, may be questioned. The Paulicians viewed with especial reverence whatever had been spoken by Christ himself, and which had been handed down through the medium of the Gospel. Hence they had no wish to dispute with the Catholics on the homage which they paid to the book of the Gospel. They were themselves accustomed to fall prostrate before it, and to kiss it; but they took care to warn people against supposing that this respect was shewn to the sign of the cross with which the volume was commonly adorned. They worshipped the book only in so far as it contained the words of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

According to Photius and Peter Siculus,<sup>2</sup> they received the whole of the four gospels as equally authoritative sources of the word of Christ; but the latter of these authors states, in a marginal note, that the later Paulicians<sup>3</sup> used only two of the four gospels. This statement deserves the more attention on account of its clearness and definiteness, and it shews how the other report must have arisen. Since the Paulicians, wherever the words of Christ

<sup>1</sup> Φασὶ δὲ τὸ βιβλίον προσκυνεῖν ὡς τοὺς δεσποτικούς περιέχον λόγους, Phot. i. p. 33.

<sup>1b</sup> p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Οἱ γὰρ νῦν μόνοις τοῖς δύο χρῶνται εὐαγγελλίαις.

were quoted, from either the one gospel or the other, received them with profound respect, and probably repeated the expressions so used in controversy, it began to be supposed that they ascribed equal authority to all the four gospels. But their practice in this respect might be easily reconciled with their receiving only two of the gospels as genuine throughout; as perfectly uncorrupt sources of religious knowledge; although they would not reject that which in the other gospels seemed to bear the trace of primitive Christian truth.<sup>1</sup> The two gospels to which they attributed so superior an authority were, first (as with Marcion, and from the same cause), the gospel of Luke, from the reference made to it by Paul; and, secondly, the gospel of John, as appears from the words of Christ which they quote from it, and which, from its peculiar character, must have been especially agreeable to their views. That which is said in regard to their mode of employing the other two gospels may also be applied, according to the remark of Petrus Siculus, to their manner of using the other portions of the New Testament, with the exception of the Pauline epistles. The epistles of Peter they rejected altogether; because they refused to acknowledge Peter as a true apostle, numbering him rather with thieves and robbers, falsifiers of divine doctrine. Photius adduces his denial of Christ as the foundation of this opinion.<sup>3</sup>

We can well believe that it was not a mere imagination of Photius that the Paulicians referred, in controversy, to the denial of Christ, on the part of Peter, as a sign of his unapostolic character; of his untruthfulness. It has been stated above that they regarded a denial of faith, when it proceeded from mere cowardice, as a heavy crime, making a great distinction between such a concealment of the truth, and that which they described as an *οἰκονομία*.<sup>4</sup> But this was certainly not the peculiar ground on which they refused to acknowledge Peter as a true apostle. It was

1 They allowed themselves, however, to take liberties with these other gospels. Hence the accusation against Sergius, that he had especially falsified the gospel of Matthew. See anathema ii. against Tychicus in Tollius, p. 114.

2 In the above cited marginal note: *καὶ μᾶλλον (χρῶνται) τῷ κατὰ λουκᾶν.*

3 f. 24.

4 We here differ from Gieseler, who thinks that Photius dishonestly referred that which the Paulicians said in reference to the denial of the truth at Antioch, to Peter's denial of his Master.



doubtless the same as that on which Marcion had rejected him. They viewed him, in fact, as a Judaizing apostle; as the opponent of Paul; as guilty of endeavouring, according to what occurred at Antioch (Galat. ii.) to mix up Christianity with Judaism. But, to render Peter, whom they so hated, an object of suspicion from the beginning, they constantly referred in dispute to his denial of the Lord. "How could we place any confidence," they said, "in such a man; a man so cowardly and unstable, and who is afterwards seen as the preacher of Judaism in the place of Christianity?"<sup>1</sup>

But this sect is only one particular manifestation<sup>2</sup> of a deeply grounded antagonism. Though confused and obscured by its mixture with Gnosticism, we recognize in it the presence of Christian consciousness connecting itself with both the past and the present, striving after freedom, and opposing itself to the union of Judaism with the gospel in the later systems of the church. We discover in it the commencement of a wonderful reaction, which in the following century displayed itself in a more and more developed and manifold form as the antagonist of the far-spread hierarchical system.

<sup>1</sup> The farther history of the Paulicians will be given in that of the following period.

<sup>2</sup> Although the Paulicians were those who obtained the greatest notice among the Oriental sects opposed to the hierarchy, we do not mean to intimate that they were the only sect of this kind in the period described. There were probably sects existing which had derived their origin from the Manicheans and Gnostics, and branches of which, confounded at this time with the Paulicians, will demand a stricter notice in the following period. Thus we find in the Byzantine historians a sect of the *Αθίγγανοι* identified with the Paulicians. They were probably accused of imitating the Gnostics, or Manicheans, in regarding many things as unclean: *μη θίγης*. Coloss. ii. 21.



# SCRIPTURE TYPOLOGY.

*Second Volume on Mosaic Dispensation now ready.*

## THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE,

OR THE

DOCTRINE OF TYPES INVESTIGATED IN ITS PRINCIPLES,

AND APPLIED TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE EARLIER REVELATIONS

OF GOD, CONSIDERED AS PREPARATORY EXHIBITIONS OF

THE LEADING TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL.

VOL. I. INVESTIGATION OF PRINCIPLES AND PATRIARCHAL PERIOD, 7s.

VOL. II. *now ready*, MOSAIC DISPENSATION, 7s.

BY THE REV. P. FAIRBAIRN, SALTON.

"It is by far the soberest, most systematic, and most satisfactory work of the kind we have yet seen, and will, we trust, speedily obtain extensive reputation."—*Church of England Quarterly Review*.

"Among the ablest of modern interpreters, Mr Fairbairn has undoubtedly won for himself a distinguished place. To the examination of his subject he has brought a mind deeply imbued with reverence for the divine word, a sober judgment, and an extensive acquaintance with the labours of others, both among the ancients and moderns, who have laboured in the same field. . . . We cordially commend his labours to the attention of all Biblical Students. His work is unquestionably superior both in critical skill and argumentative power to most treatises on the same subject in our language, while it is inferior to none in reverence for the words of the Spirit, and in richness of Evangelical truth."—*Eclectic Review*, August 1849.

"A learned, judicious, and truly evangelical work."—Extract of a Letter from DR PYE SMITH, of Homerton College.

"The substance of the book is of sterling merit, and highly creditable to the author's learning and judgment. The theological student will not find so much material on the same subject within the same limits elsewhere."—*British Quarterly Review*, No. 3.

"It affords us great satisfaction to introduce to our readers a work on Typology incomparably superior to any that we have previously seen. It is not often that we meet with a book on any subject in which originality of conception and solidity of judgment are so thoroughly blended as in this. We have derived from it instruction as well as pleasure. Our only regret is, that it was not written and placed in our hands years ago, that it might have produced its effects on the pastoral ministrations of bygone days. There are some matters of detail in which we differ from the author, and should probably continue to differ after the most mature consideration; there are some other points respecting which, at present, we hesitate; but there is a large mass of sound evangelical sentiment, illustrative of divine wisdom and benignity, and throwing light upon obscure but valuable parts of the Inspired Volume—*Baptist Magazine*.

---

*Just Published, in One Volume 18mo, Price 1s 6d.*

## A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS.

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER S. PATTERSON, GLASGOW.

"This Commentary is brief, but it is as clever as it is brief.—It should be added to the collections of all students who are studying that sometimes difficult portion of the Holy Scriptures comprised in the Epistles."—*Church and State Gazette*.

---

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK. London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

## OLSHAUSEN ON THE ROMANS.

*In One Volume, 8vo, Price 10s 6d, Cloth,*

### A BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

By DR HERMANN OLSHAUSEN,

TRANSLATED BY

CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

“As an aid to ministers, in the close and critical study of the Epistle to the Romans, we particularly recommend this Commentary; it is a very remarkable book, and will reward the most minute examination of its contents. No man could have written it who had not studied earnestly, with the most scholarly endowments, to follow out the Apostle's train of thought, with all its minute ramifications. From the highly evangelical tone which in general pervades his Commentaries, he may be regarded, in most cases, as a safe guide to the student, who is just entering on the critical study of the New Testament.”—*Evangelical Magazine*.

“It is to us very pleasant to be able to speak of a German Commentator on the Scriptures in terms of high commendation; and with very little drawback, this we can do, in the case of Olshausen. This Work will afford large assistance to preachers and students, if wisely consulted.”—*British Quarterly Review*.

“Olshausen deservedly occupies a high place among modern Commentators; and will always be consulted with advantage by the scholar and the preacher.”—*Evangelical Christendom*.

NOW READY,

*In One Volume, 8vo, Price 10s 6d. Cloth,*

### SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,

By DR CARL J. NITZSCH,

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH REVISED AND ENLARGED GERMAN EDITION,

By THE REV. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, A.M., OXON,

Author of *Gospel in Advance of the Age*, &c.

AND

JOHN HENNEN, Esq. M.D.

“A master in theological learning and thought.”—*Archdeacon Hare*.

“Few works are more deserving of the attention of Theologians than this. The fact that it has reached a fifth edition in Germany speaks volumes in its favour, and we are satisfied the perusal of the work itself will elicit, from all who can understand it, no less decided testimony in its favour. Nitzsch belongs to the noble band, perhaps he may be considered the ablest of them all, whose writings have formed the most powerful barrier against the scepticism of many of the theologians of Germany. The distinguishing feature of this work, is this, that Christian doctrine is viewed in its combined, dogmatical, and ethical aspects; and while the importance of doctrines, as the foundation of Christian ethics is recognized, its absolutely practical character, even where no direct argument is led to prove it, is clearly impressed on the mind.”—*Edinburgh Evening Post*.

“Nitzsch's system is without doubt the production of a profoundly learned man. Of vast powers of mind, and long regarded as the leading Theologian of his peculiar school, he has acquired a decisive influence on the culture of a large class who regard him with the most enthusiastic esteem, veneration, and gratitude. He has restored Christian ethics to their proper place in a system of Theology, and thus it possesses a merit of the highest order, which distinguishes it to its advantage above all other systems which have been produced for two centuries. This is the incomparable merit of his system, on account of which it stands prominently out from all its rivals. He demonstrates the close and indissoluble connexion which unites Christian doctrine and Christian ethics on the basis of union to Christ and of self-surrender to him. In no system of Theology, not even in the incomparable institutes of Calvin, is anything to be found so comprehensive as the healthy, broad, and buoyant, and energetic delineation of Christian life which Nitzsch has given. We must candidly confess that we know nothing finer in the whole compass of systematic Theology than this department of his work. Though embosomed in a system of so much erudition, his delineation of the Christian life possesses the rare merit of being more practical and full, more minute and extensive, more clear, accurate, and fresh, than is almost ever heard in the most popular enforcement of the subject from the pulpits of this country. The introduction of this element, which is peculiarly his own, and in which he has obviously bestowed his strength, will be read, we think, with no less surprise than delight. Both in compass and detail, as well as in the biblical tone with which it is replete, it is a masterpiece.”—*Free Church Magazine*.

Edinburgh: T. & T CLARK. London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.





COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0315024679

r

931

Theander.

931

N26<sub>5</sub>

N26

5

